


Attachment 2 - Comment Matrix (Brampton Plan)

 Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (General Comments)						
Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
24-May-22	Member of the Public	Marlene Spence	General		I've been a resident of Brampton for 43 years. I'm excited about Brampton's growth but VERY disappointed with all the housing development. Brampton has 1 movie theater, 1 hospital, 1 major mall. How is this exceptable for a city with over 650,000 residents? When will Brampton have fun attractions to take the kids to? Brampton residents go to Vaughn, Mississauga, Toronto because there is NOTHING exciting to do here. When will Brampton stop filling every square foot with housing and begin building more museums, parks, movie theaters, recreation centers, entertainment centers, tourist attractions or outlet malls? What is the plan?	The aim of Brampton Plan is to create 15-minute neighbourhoods, places where people can live, work, learn and play all within a 15 minute walk or bike ride. This will help to provide fun attractions and a greater mix of uses across the city, not just residential development, to ensure that there are great locations across the city for entertainment. Brampton Plan envisions lively, exciting and fun locations across the city, with major tourist and entertainment sites located in the city's Urban Centres (Downtown, Uptown and Bramalea). We want both our urban and town centres to be attractive to other neighbouring cities that brings their residents here to Brampton, supported by a connected transit system to help reduce car congestion.
30-May-22	KLM	Kevin MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch	General		The sheer size of the Official Plan is too large, is difficult to read and should be reduced.	Comment received - a review for any redundancies is being conducted as the final draft Plan is completed. This will help to reduce the size of the document.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive			As a general comment, the redevelopment of the Canadian Tire Lands for employment uses (including the proposed warehousing uses under the first phase of redevelopment) through the Minister Zoning Order (MZO) that was endorsed by Council, should be reflected in the applicable Draft Official Plan Policies and Framework.	Comment received - staff will continue to have ongoing conversations regarding this property.
2022/06/07	Blake, Matlock, and Marshal Ltd	Matlock Bobechko	General Comment	Requires Clarification	Our office is seeking the Current Official Plan and Zoning By-law for the property at 11665 McVean Drive, which is currently under construction. It would also be helpful to know if there are any other Secondary Plans applicable to the site. Furthermore, we would like to know how the Draft Official Plan would affect these policies, if at all. Prior to Council approving the new Official Plan, we respectfully request confirmation of the following: 1. That there is no land use policy conflicts between the local Secondary Plan and Draft Official Plan (Refer to Official Plan Amendment OP2006-185, Section 8.6 of the Brampton Flowertown Secondary Plan); 2. That the subject site may be re-developed in accordance with the in-force Zoning By-law (i.e. 17-storey apartment, 385 Units, 4.0 FSI); and 3. That the Site Plan Approval Application that is currently in process is exempt from having to prepare a Precinct Plan and/or Area Plan. Lastly, we request notification of the passage of any and all By-laws and/or Notices in connection with the Draft Brampton Plan (Official Plan).	Comment received - for current information on Official Plan and Zoning, please contact planning and development - 905-874-2090 or https://www.brampton.ca/EN/Business/planning-development/Pages/Contact-Us.aspx
31-May-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of Maebrook Scott Inc. (owner), 80 Scott Street	Request for Confirmation			Comment received - notification will be provided to the relevant GWD staff provided.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaws Companioes Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands tot he south of 85 Steeles Ave West; 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	Request Clarification		We request clarification as to the applicability of Section 22(2.1) of the Planning Act, that states that no person or public body shall request an amendment to a new official plan before the second anniversary of the first day any part of the plan comes into effect, which is the same for Secondary Plans under 22(2.2.1).	Comment received – staff will align with legal direction and comply with the Planning Act. Bill 23 changes this two-year moratorium.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	General	Requires Clarification	We request clarification as to the applicability of Section 22(2.1) of the Planning Act, that states that no person or public body shall request an amendment to a new official plan before the second anniversary of the first day any part of the plan comes into effect, which is the same for Secondary Plans under 22(2.2.1).	Comment received – staff will align with legal direction and comply with the Planning Act. Bill 23 changes this two-year moratorium.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfield Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfield Dr and Bovaird Dr	2.3.474	Requires Clarification	We request clarification as to the applicability of Section 22(2.1) of the Planning Act, that states that no person or public body shall request an amendment to a new official plan before the second anniversary of the first day any part of the plan comes into effect, which is the same for Secondary Plans under 22(2.2.1).	Comment received – staff will align with legal direction and comply with the Planning Act. Bill 23 changes this two-year moratorium.

2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	General	Needs Discussion	In consideration of the extent of the proposed Official Plan policy updates and the impacts that the new proposed policy framework may have on residents, businesses, employees and various landholders, it is our opinion that the short 71 day review period provided to the general public is insufficient and does not represent meaningful and appropriate public consultation. Given that the Planning Act does not require that the City of Brampton proceed to final consideration of the draft Brampton Plan in such a truncated fashion, it is only appropriate that stakeholders be provided with additional time to review the draft policy framework and work with City Staff to discuss their questions or concerns in effort to have them addressed, where deemed appropriate, prior to final City of Brampton Council consideration. We do not believe the review, comment and consultation period that has been provided is sufficient.	Proposed Process Modification: City Council defer its consideration of a final Recommendation Report on July 6, 2022 to Q3/Q4 2022 to provide additional time and opportunity for stakeholders with an identified interest to discuss identified policy concerns with City/Regional Staff and have revised draft policy issued, where appropriate, prior to final Council consideration of the Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - staff proposed a new approach to provide additional time for review and comment of the second draft Brampton Plan prior to progressing with adoption.
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	MTSAs (2.2.4, 2.1.33c and 2.1.49)	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.130 requires that Area-Specific Urban Design Guidelines be submitted as part of a complete site plan application for any sites that area greater than 1 hectare or if the site is located in a Centre, Boulevard, Corridor or Hub. Good urban design is an important component of the development process. However, Policy 3.1.130 is a mandatory policy and does not allow room for consideration of a site's physical or policy context or the type of development being proposed in the determination of whether an Area Specific Urban Design Guideline must be prepared as part of the site plan process. This would suggest that such guidelines are required even when there is sufficient urban design policy in the existing OP, secondary plan, precinct plan or the city-wide guidelines. Policy 3.1.130 should be modified to state that Area-Specific Urban Design Guidelines "may" be required to allow the flexibility and discretion in circumstances where there is sufficient urban design guidance.	Comment received- the Area-Specific Urban Design Guidelines will be scoped based on the context. There will be flexibility based on the context and what is required.	
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	General	Needs Discussion	Proposed Process Modification: City Council defer its consideration of a final Recommendation Report on July 6, 2022 to Q3/Q4 2022 to provide additional time and opportunity for stakeholders with an identified interest to discuss identified policy concerns with City/Regional Staff and have revised draft policy issued, where appropriate, prior to final Council consideration of the Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - staff proposed a new approach to provide additional time for review and comment of the second draft Brampton Plan prior to progressing with adoption.	
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	1.1.7 b) and 3.1.91	Requires Clarification	In accordance with draft Policy 1.1.7.b), the subject site should continue to be designated as Central Area in the draft new Brampton Plan to reflect the current land use permissions for the subject site and its role within the City Structure. The City's Central Area and Urban Growth Centre have been the primary focus for the accommodation of the City's planned growth, at the City's highest intensity, since the City's adoption of the current BOP in 2006. The proposed designations and overlays for the subject site, as identified in the draft new Brampton Plan, effectively down-designates the subject site within the City hierarchy by removing it from the Central Area designation and omitting it from the conceptual limits of the new Urban Centre overlay that is centred in the City's Downtown. Please provide clarification on policies 1.1.7 b) and 3.1.91 including an explanation of how the City intends on addressing development applications that have been submitted to the City in advance of City Council approval of the new draft Brampton Plan and/or in advance of Region of Peel approval.	Comment received- discussed through meetings with the commenter.	
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen	2.1.21 a), 2.1.30 and 2.2.3 a)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.21.a), Policy 2.1.30 and Policy 2.2.3.a) be modified to provide clear policy direction that the Urban Growth Centre is a location where the tallest buildings will be directed in addition to the Urban Centres.	Comment addressed	
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	General - Employment Areas	Revision Requested	If the City is truly prioritizing walkable neighbourhoods, then the Employment Areas need to be more flexible in allowing for retail/commercial uses to facilitate 15-minute walkable neighbourhoods. The City provides for a large contiguous Employment Areas that would not be walkable to nearby retail/commercial areas if these uses are not permitted. The focus of creating distinctive land use designations that may impede 15-minutes walkable neighbourhoods needs to be adjusted through land use policy that permit 15-minute walkability to commerce and place of residence.	Comment received- the Mixed-Use Employment provides opportunities for employment supportive uses to support mixed-use communities.	
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon, Richard Domes and Nikhail Dawan on behalf of Zia Mohammad and Shamyia Hameed (8671 Heritage Road)	General	Needs Discussion	Proposed Process Modification: City Council defer its consideration of a final Recommendation Report on July 6, 2022 to Q3/Q4 2022 to provide additional time and opportunity for stakeholders with an identified interest to discuss identified policy concerns with City/Regional Staff and have revised draft policy issued, where appropriate, prior to final Council consideration of the Brampton Plan	Comment addressed	
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Creditview 4-P Holding Inc. (Owner of 7614, 7624, 7650 and 7662 Creditview Road)	General	Needs Discussion	We request that prior to Council approving the 'new' Official Plan, City Staff provide confirmation of that the 1993 City Official Plan (Office Consolidation October 7, 2008) remains in the applicable governing Plan. Until such time as the appeals are dealt with neither the 2006 City Official Plan nor the new Official Plan will apply.	Comment received.	
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of Rotary Club of Brampton Glen Community Centre (1857 Queen Street West)	General	Needs Discussion	Prior to Council approving the 'new' Official Plan, we respectfully request confirmation that the Rotary Application (City File OZS-2021-0018) complies with Draft Official Plan. Based on our interpretation of policy and mapping, there are no land use conflicts and the proposal satisfies the additional permissions criteria. The subject site and abutting lands are located within the Queen Street West Special Policy Area 2 Tertiary Plan Area (Non-statutory) which was approved in 2019. The Plan demonstrates that the area can be developed in a comprehensive and coordinated manner. It includes, among other things, residential categories, a street/road network, and the location of a public park, stormwater management ponds, and natural heritage feature buffers.	Comment received.	

2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of 1905372 Ontario Inc. (10785, 10799, 10807, 10817 McLaughlin Road North)	General	Needs Discussion	Prior to Council approving the 'new' Official Plan, we respectfully request confirmation that the Amendment Application (OZS-2020-0037) conforms to the Draft Official Plan.	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	General	Revision Requested	<p>There are inconsistencies in the planned function of Mississauga Road north of Bovaird Drive as opposed to south of Bovaird Drive. On Schedules 1 and 2, Mississauga Road south of Bovaird Drive is designated as a 'Corridor' but there is no Corridor designation north of Bovaird Drive. Bovaird Drive is designated as 'Planned Corridor' and 'Corridor' and Sandalwood Parkway is designated as 'Planned Corridor' that terminates on Mississauga Road. Also on Schedule 3B, Mississauga Road north of Bovaird Drive is designated as 'Future Rapid Transit Route' that promotes higher intensity and densified urban forms along the route.</p> <p>It is good planning to continue to plan Mississauga Road from Bovaird Drive to Mayfield Road as a 'Planned Corridor' to complete the urban structure and to allow the Planned Corridor on Sandalwood Parkway to have a contiguous looped corridor rather than terminating it on an arterial road. Mississauga Road north of Bovaird Drive is already being planned with more urban and densified built forms in the Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan and the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan areas so it is only logical and good planning for the New Official Plan to recognize the importance of Mississauga Road as a Corridor. Based on the explanation of what a Corridor is in the New Official Plan, this section of Mississauga Road meets the criteria in the New Official Plan for a Corridor.</p> <p>The section of Mississauga Road north of Bovaird Drive will be widened and urbanized to a 6-lane Regional road in the near future. Mississauga Road will be an important north-south link for both the Heritage Heights and the Mount Pleasant communities. We are of the opinion that a 6-lane Regional Road with Rapid Transit would create a Corridor for mixed use</p>	Comment received- please review updated mapping. Significant updates have been made to the schedules, please review and let us know if any of your comments still apply.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	General	Revision Requested	<p>In consideration of the extent of the draft City of Brampton policy updates and the impacts that the new proposed policy framework may have on residents, businesses, employees and various landholders, the short 71 day review period provided to the general public is insufficient and does not represent meaningful and appropriate public consultation. Given that the Planning Act does not require that the City of Brampton proceed to final consideration of the draft Brampton Plan in such a truncated fashion, it is only appropriate that stakeholders be provided with additional time to review the draft policy framework and work with City Staff to discuss their questions or concerns in effort to have them addressed, where deemed appropriate, prior to final City of Brampton Council consideration. We do not believe the review, comment and consultation period that has been provided is sufficient.</p> <p>• Proposed Process Modification: City Council defer its consideration of a final Recommendation Report on July 6, 2022 to Q3/Q4 2022 to provide additional time and opportunity for stakeholders with an identified interest to discuss identified policy concerns with City/Regional Staff and have revised draft policy issued, where appropriate, prior to final Council consideration of the Brampton Plan</p>	Comment addressed
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	General	Needs Discussion	<p>We note our understanding that the 'Mixed-Use Employment' designation of the draft Brampton Plan (which is separate to the Mixed-Use Districts designation) permits a broad range of non-residential uses as well as limited opportunities for residential uses within MTSAs subject to the adjacent context and applicable policy for the MTSAs area (Page 2-80). More specifically Policy 2.2.126 of the draft Brampton Plan directs that lands designated Mixed-Use Employment and located within an MTSAs may permit compatible residential uses.</p> <p>Subject to consultation with the City of Brampton and/or Region of Peel, Soneil reserves the right to make additional comments regarding the draft schedules and policies of the Brampton Plan as they relate to the Mixed-Use Employment designation.</p>	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Mustafa Ghassan on behalf of Lark Investments Inc. (10 and 26 Victoria Crescent; 376, 387 and 391 Orenda Road; and 24 Bramalea Road)	General	Needs Discussion	<p>Transforming the lands in the currently under-utilized Bramalea GO MTSAs would assist in creating additional housing to assist in the growing housing crisis. While the current draft Brampton OP supports greater mixed-use/residential densities, it heavily restricts the level of density that can be accommodated within the Bramalea GO MTSAs and it is currently not in-keeping with the Regional Official Plan and the vision that Council has endorsed. For instance, the Regional Official Plan does not restrict heights or densities but adds that Municipalities may include maximum building heights within a Secondary Plan. In our opinion, the current Draft Brampton Plan is far too restrictive and provides too much authority to guidelines, which are meant to establish design intent vs. prescriptive development criteria. We strongly believe that by restricting heights and densities in an area well-supported by Municipal, Regional, and provincial transit, the current draft Brampton OP will dissuade and limit growth in the City of Brampton, as this site has significant potential for substantial residential and employment growth. Attached herein is a memo prepared by Bousfields Inc. which highlights key concerns regarding the urban design and built form policies.</p>	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Mustafa Ghassan on behalf of Lark Investments Inc. (10 and 26 Victoria Crescent; 376, 387 and 391 Orenda Road; and 24 Bramalea Road)	General - Land Use	Revision Requested	<p>Response: In our opinion, the Draft OP should implement the Draft Regional Official Plan (the "Draft ROP") and provide a similar policy framework for the Bramalea GO MTSAs that specifically recognizes its ability to accommodate non-employment uses. This will ensure conformity with the Growth Plan and ensure the policy goal of providing a mix of uses on the subject site and entire Bramalea GO MTSAs. More specifically, the policies in sections 2.2.126-2.2.130 should apply to the subject site and Bramalea GO MTSAs.</p>	Comment received - this is to be determined through an MTSAs study.
2022/06/03	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of Mayfield Commercial Centre Ltd	General	Requires Clarification	<p>It is our understanding that the existing applications that have been submitted, which are under review with City of Brampton Staff, will continue to be reviewed in accordance with the existing policies of the current, in-force City of Brampton Official Plan and that the adoption of a new Official Plan will not impact the approval of these applications.</p>	Comment addressed - Brampton Plan is not in force and effect. Until adopted and approved, the existing 2006 Official Plan is in effect.
03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of 110 East Drive (owner)	General - MTSAs and Mixed Use Areas	Requires Clarification	<p>We also request additional clarification regarding lands which are both designated Mixed-Use District and Employment, such as the Subject Property. The former permits a larger scope of uses, including residential uses, while the latter prohibits them. We request that City Staff clarify whether the Mixed-Use District policies take precedence over the Employment policies. We understand that the MTSAs study will provide more specific direction for each Mixed-Use District, but it is our opinion, that properties maintaining the Mixed-Use District designation should have increased flexibility, as-of-right, in terms of the range of permitted uses, including residential uses.</p>	Comment addressed - through the updated policies, the clarification should be provided. Please review the updated draft and submit comments based on these revisions.

03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of McVean Commercial Centre Ltd	General	Requires Clarification	The proposal for the subject property complies with the City's Zoning By-law and conforms with the current, in-effect Official Plan and Vales of Humber Secondary Plan. It is our understanding that the Site Plan Approval application that is currently under review by City of Brampton Staff will continue to be reviewed in accordance with the current policy framework and that the passing of a new Official Plan will not impact approval of the Site Plan Approval application.	Comment received
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Domes on behalf of Soneil Mississauga Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 261 and Soneil Oakville Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 263 (261)	General	Revision Requested	City Council defer its consideration of a final Recommendation Report on July 6, 2022 to Q3/Q4 2022 to provide additional time and opportunity for stakeholders with an identified interest to discuss identified policy concerns with City/Regional Staff and have revised draft policy issued, where appropriate, prior to final Council consideration of the final draft Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Mississauga Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 261 and Soneil Oakville Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	General - Urban Growth Centre	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.1.21.a), Policy 2.1.30 and Policy 2.2.3.a) be modified to provide clear policy direction that the Urban Growth Centre is a location where the tallest buildings will be directed in addition to the Urban Centres. BILD recognizes that parkland is an essential component of good planning and in building complete communities, with a direct impact on the quality of life of Brampton residents and businesses. BILD members also accept their share of responsibility for providing parkland with new development. BILD members are proud to have delivered high quality parkland to communities throughout Brampton. It is critical to note, however, that parkland dedication can, if left unchecked and not properly calibrated, impose a very significant increase in the price of housing, of which the burden is ultimately paid by the purchasers. Often these purchasers are first-time homebuyers who are least positioned to carry such a large burden. The impact of an improperly calibrated parkland dedication requirement will further exacerbate the current housing affordability crisis. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the City of Brampton to ensure that it does everything within its authority to mitigate the rising price of housing while ensuring that future residents have access to adequate parkland. The City's ultimate parkland dedication by-law must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and must conform with the Growth Plan. Central to both of those provincial documents are the principles of intensification within urban areas (especially within the built boundary) and affordability. Accordingly, the City's goal to achieve parkland through the development approval process must be tested against impacts on planned intensification and required affordability. It is also critical that parkland dedication rules (including cash-in-lieu) not be used to supplement existing parkland deficiencies for existing residents. Doing otherwise would unfairly place an additional burden on new homeowners for an existing deficiency that they had no hand in. Doing so would also not respect the principle that growth pays for growth.	Comment addressed - UGC has been added to relevant mapping.
2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	Parkland Dedication Rate As City staff are aware, applying the maximum parkland dedication (be it land or cash-in-lieu) to higher density development can have a devastating impact on intensification and housing affordability. Left unchecked, parkland dedication can sometimes exceed the entire development site size (or the cash equivalent thereof). Even where a reasonable quantum of land dedication is required, it should never be used as a tool to effectively kill a development project. The City should not, for example, require parkland dedication which is so large, or which is so located as to makes the development (or any reasonable development) impossible. The size and location of parkland should always be evaluated by using good planning principles which seek to balance the need for parkland with the promotion of intensification and improvements in housing affordability. BILD recommends that the City's parkland dedication requirement be moderated by incorporating a percentage cap. A survey of municipalities which have now (or have historically) used a percentage cap, reveals a typical range of 10%-25% of the site area. Additionally, BILD recommends that the City's parkland dedication requirement include a sliding scale whereby the parkland dedication rate decreases as the density of development increases. In addition, the City's Parkland Dedication By-law should include a provision which requires that, in cases where a plan of subdivision is draft approved, that there be a parkland dedication draft plan condition imposed. That condition will require that land be dedicated or that cash-in-lieu be paid on registration of the plan, or a combination of both, as is most appropriate in the circumstances. In this way, and pursuant to s. 51.1(4), the value of the cash-in-lieu is based on the land value the day before draft plan approval (i.e. s.51.1 value) and not the day before building permit issuance (i.e. s.42 value)	Brampton Plan provides high-level direction for Parkland Dedication, but this work is currently being undertaken as part of the Parkland Dedication Strategy. Comments are reviewed in tandem with the Parks and Open Space staff and the work being undertaken as a part of that process.
2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	Identifying Which Land Should Qualify for Parkland Credit Parkland is far more than just baseball diamonds, soccer pitches and splash pads. More and more people desire trails for walking, running and cycling; sometimes the best of these are not located on flat, open areas, developable lands but are instead located in woodlands, valleys and otherwise undeveloped (or undevelopable) areas. Historically, however, municipalities have not recognized such lands as being eligible for parkland dedication even though accepting them as parkland would promote intensification and lessen the burden on affordability. This historical thinking must change such that all land which could serve the purpose of a park or for public recreational use be recognized as parkland and be eligible for parkland dedication credit. Historically, municipalities have been reluctant or unwilling to provide parkland dedication for land beyond developable table land because they expected those lands to be dedicated to them (or another public authority) at no cost anyway. They reasoned that providing a parkland dedication for lands they were going to get anyway was bad business or bad planning. It is of BILD's opinion that this is not so. Municipalities should no longer assume that they will get these lands for free. Moreover, if the land is capable of providing a public open space for recreational purpose, then it should receive a parkland credit.	Brampton Plan provides the high-level direction for Parkland Dedication, but this work is currently being undertaken as part of the Parkland Dedication Strategy. Comments are reviewed in tandem with the Parks and Open Space staff.
2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	Off-Site Parkland Off-site parkland is parkland; it should be recognized as such and credited appropriately. Planned properly, off-site parkland has an important role to play. It allows, for example, parkland to be provided outside of key intensification areas but close enough such that new residents who live in the intensification areas can utilize it. Such off-site parkland means that more efficient use can be made of lands within the intensification area by accommodating more people in areas with higher order transit services. To encourage and achieve off-site parkland, the amount of the credit must be fair and reasonable	Comment received
2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	Comment received - To be evaluated through the Parkland Dedication Strategy - draft policy 2.3.429 identifies applicability of off-site parkland.	

2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	<p>Strata Parks and POPS (Privately Owned Public Space)</p> <p>There was a time when municipalities would only consider 'fee simple ownership' as acceptable parkland dedication. While fee simple ownership will remain an important parkland dedication element, it cannot be the only acceptable alternative. Strata parks result in City ownership of the surface (with appropriate depth for plantings and services). The developer or condominium corporation owns below grade which is typically used for required underground parking. Keeping the parking below grade is a well-established urban design principle and should be encouraged. The surface park delivers the recreational or open space required for the development. The public who use the park is often unaware (or do not care) that there is parking beneath the park.</p> <p>POPS should likewise be accepted for parkland credit and to do otherwise is, respectfully, short-sighted. In some ways POPS offer the best of both worlds for the City. They are subject to public easements which means they provide important public open space without taxpayer dollars having to build or maintain them. Of course, to be eligible for a parkland credit the POPS should meet reasonable and relevant criteria in terms of location, accessibility and design. Additionally, the POPS should be accessible from the public realm and inviting to members of the public to use.</p>	Comment received - for Parkland Dedication Strategy project team to discuss through consultations.
2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	<p>Dual Use Parkland and SWM Facilities</p> <p>A dwindling land supply and increased intensification force us all to think differently and to make more efficient use of land. Stormwater management facilities need not be limited to surface ponds. Rather, they can be buried underground in engineered tanks. This is a proven technology. Like strata parks, the surface of such dual use lands can be effective open space while the area beneath is used for stormwater management. Just as condominiums house people vertically, the dual use facility (SWM or park) accommodates municipal facilities vertically. If the engineering proves the viability of these dual use facilities, and the surface provides active or passive open space for residents of new development, then there is no compelling reason to disqualify it from a parkland dedication credit. In this case, both elements of the dual use facility will be owned by the City.</p>	Comment received - provided to Parks and SWM for review.
2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	<p>Sustainability Measures Under the Planning Act</p> <p>At this current juncture, when the issue of climate change demands much attention, the City may be missing an opportunity to do something concrete about it, as contemplated by the Planning Act. Section 42(6.2 & 6.3) provide as follows:</p> <p>Redevelopment, reduction of payment</p> <p>(6.2) If land in a local municipality is proposed for redevelopment, a part of the land meets sustainability criteria set out in the official plan and the conditions set out in subsection (6.3) are met, the council shall reduce the amount of any payment required under subsection (6) or (6.0.1) by the value of that part. 2006, c. 23, s. 17 (1); 2015, c. 26, s. 28 (6).</p> <p>Same</p> <p>(6.3) The conditions mentioned in subsection (6.2) are:</p> <p>1. The official plan contains policies relating to the reduction of payments required under subsection (6) or (6.0.1).</p> <p>2. No land is available to be conveyed for park or other public recreational purposes under this section. 2006, c. 23, s. 17 (1); 2015, c. 26, s. 28 (7).</p> <p>BILD strongly encourages the City to study this possibility.</p> <p>Additional Considerations</p> <p>-We would request that details be provided by the City that sets out in general detail showing the size, scale, typology and geography for future parkland acquisitions. Should the City set a fixed per unit cap on Parkland CL, the methodology and underlying land values used to calculate the per unit rate should reflect the weighted distribution of parkland to be acquired in terms of both geography and parcel sizes being sought.</p> <p>-When undertaking any measurements of parkland surpluses or deficits, for parks that are of a City-wide nature, we would request the calculation of surplus or deficiency should be done City-wide as well. Calculations of surpluses or deficits for parks that are more local in nature (without sports fields or other features that would be used by residents City-wide) can be done on a more specific basis depending on the catchment areas for these local parks.</p> <p>-At our meeting on March 23rd the City agreed to provide BILD with the appraisal methodology. We kindly ask that this is provided so we can review and discuss throughout the consultation process.</p>	Comment received - for Parkland Dedication Strategy project team to address through consultations.
2022/04/01	BILD	Paula Tenuta & Victoria Mortelliti	Parkland Dedication	Needs Discussion	<p>-We would request that details be provided by the City that sets out in general detail showing the size, scale, typology and geography for future parkland acquisitions. Should the City set a fixed per unit cap on Parkland CL, the methodology and underlying land values used to calculate the per unit rate should reflect the weighted distribution of parkland to be acquired in terms of both geography and parcel sizes being sought.</p> <p>-When undertaking any measurements of parkland surpluses or deficits, for parks that are of a City-wide nature, we would request the calculation of surplus or deficiency should be done City-wide as well. Calculations of surpluses or deficits for parks that are more local in nature (without sports fields or other features that would be used by residents City-wide) can be done on a more specific basis depending on the catchment areas for these local parks.</p> <p>-At our meeting on March 23rd the City agreed to provide BILD with the appraisal methodology. We kindly ask that this is provided so we can review and discuss throughout the consultation process.</p>	Comment received - for Parkland Dedication Strategy project team to address through consultations.
Draft Brampton Plan - General Public Feedback (Online Comment Form)						
2022/06/03	General Public				<p>It looks very exciting and I hope some of it will happen. Although I don't like all the tall condominium projects. It seems these days all the empty lots have proposed condo towers and they get tall and taller.</p> <p>I would love to see movie theatre and some interesting shops, even a Tim Hortons downtown would be great.</p> <p>Great to see it is somewhat aligned with The Vision 2040. I see there is about 110 references to The Region of Peel. Good to know there is coordination and alignment. Having a matrix would be helpful. City of Brampton Plan - Vision 2040 - Region of Peel Official Plan - What is new and Improved.</p> <p>Having Table of Content links to the sections would be helpful.</p> <p>I did not see the impact on Property Taxes.</p> <p>What is this going to cost the taxpayers in the next 5 to 10 years?</p> <p>How will we know This Plan actually achieve improvements in financial terms, health, well being, community relations and the like?</p> <p>I did see any valid or reliable measures of effectiveness and efficiency.</p> <p>How is this plan different from the prior plans? How effective was the prior plan?</p> <p>How will this plan provide for measurable improvements in: day care, education, job creation, youth programs, reduction in</p>	Comment received
2022/06/03	General Public				<p>Much more has to be done in regards to architecture and the public realm. Vague statements and encouragements are not enough. Our city and region are too ugly and need beauty in all aspects of the urban form. Architecture and Public Realm policies should be requirements, not encouragements.</p>	Comment Received - please review the updated urban design policies, culture and cultural heritage policies in the second draft and provide further comments.

2022/06/03	General Public			<p>In the Mobility and Connectivity section, the headline targets state that "25% of trips are made by transit and 10% of trips are made by active transportation" by 2051. This seems like an extremely low and unreasonable target, considering that the plan frequently claims that active transportation and transit should be the future of mobility in Brampton. The city needs to recognize that these are EXTREMELY low targets, and we need to aim higher. Brampton needs to invest in mixed-use spaces and public transit infrastructure to ensure that we can stop being a car-dependent city. We are in the middle of a climate crisis and it would be disgraceful if our goal is for only 10% of all trips to be made by active transportation. This is an extremely achievable goal that will have no impact on the climate crisis — we need cars to be the minority, and walking/cycling/transit to be prioritized.</p> <p>Please consider changing the headline targets in the Mobility and Connectivity section.</p>	Comment Received
2022/06/03	General Public			<p>I am quite impressed with your draft plan. You have taken many sectors into account. I have been watching Brampton's population explode over the past 28 years and it is refreshing to know that the protection of our greenspace will continue to be a top priority.</p> <p>I am looking forward to the implementation of additional public transit (i.e. LRT) to alleviate the dependence on private automobiles.</p>	Comment Received
2022/06/03	General Public			<p>Work trailers do need to be removed from driveways, especially when the driveways cannot accommodate the cars in the household. I get it, when my kids lived at home there was 4 cars in my driveway. We widened the driveway attractively, paved, and secured a permit with the City to cut back the curb correctly. Throwing down patio stones, which crack and break fairly quickly across most of the front yard is not the way to go about it.</p> <p>A number of my neighbors would love to see a light pollution bylaw initiated. The City of Mississauga currently has one. A current neighbor has two strong lights mounted on the corners of his home on the second floor. It's very much like daytime in our backyards for surrounding neighbors. Trying to speak to them politely to reach a solution produced a lot of profanity on their part. Very sad for some 40+ years residents.</p>	Comment Received
2022/06/03	General Public			<p>endorsed Block Plan/Community Design Guideline document has been in place since August 18, 2017. The Policy and guideline each prescribe anticipated, rationalized and consultation-based density requirements, and these targets were calculated across the entirety of the Secondary Plan Area. Existing and forthcoming Zoning By-law Amendment Applications implement these requirements; planning staff have attested through a recent report to Council that our application conforms to the approved Policy. In saying so much, we have concern with proposed language in the Draft Official Plan, respecting the provision of density bonussing as a measure to obtain community benefits over and above those that would otherwise be required as part of the City's development review process.</p> <p>As stated through the Draft Policy:</p> <p>3.1.152 Until the earlier of September 18, 2022 or Council enactment of a Community Benefits Charge By-law, the City will continue to enter into Section 37 Community Benefits agreements in consideration of increased density permitted pursuant to Council-approved Section 37 Implementation Guidelines.</p> <p>In accordance with said Guidelines, the City may authorize increases in the height and density of development above the levels otherwise permitted by the Zoning By-law or the Community Planning Permit By-law in return for the provision of community benefits.</p> <p>Such community benefits must be over and above those facilities and services that would otherwise be required as part of the City's development review process....</p> <p>Notwithstanding that community uses for the Countryside Village Area were settled through the Secondary and Block Plan processes, the likes of which are attributable to approved population numbers/density distribution across the Secondary Plan/Block Plan, we feel it would be appropriate and necessary to specify the limitations of the application of Section 37, where applicable zoning has not been updated to implement the Plan by including further language in the Official Plan that recognizes this point. We feel this is in keeping with the spirit of the Act, regarding provisions for density bonussing. Like Toronto's implementation guideline, the Policy should state that where the existing Zoning by-law does not implement the Official Plan, the City will not apply Section 37 where new development plans and applications intend to conform to such. The rationale being that if an area containing the proposed development should be expected to be zoned for higher densities (like approved Greenfield areas), it "is not fair to measure the density increase for the proposal in question from the existing zoning density limits, for the</p>	Comment Received

				<p>something that true world-class cities pride themselves on, something that separates them from other cities and something where local pride fosters a community where residents, visitors and those who conduct themselves in cultural environments, business, tech etc. act as brand ambassadors for their city. If a city and its residents has a strong image that separates them from other municipalities, there is a broad culture or tagline that a city can use to attract residents more readily and truly create a unique city that is unlike many others. Design was something that I saw in the draft Brampton Plan which was inspiring to see because it is the visual outward representation of the ambitions of the city, a reflection of its peoples and values. Architecture is probably on the top three of the most defining characteristics of a city that injects life in a city; i.e. many visitors and tourists will travel to cities like Copenhagen or Paris to admire the beautiful classical or contemporary architecture. A city with architectural excellence is also the basis of cultivating a sense of local pride, mental wellness and liveability.</p> <p>Cool architecture, bold built from and expressive urban design actually encourages people to go outside and walk around the streets and feel happy by seeing contemporary and unique architecture. I think more studies should be done on how architectural excellence can be held to the best standard, because even though neighbouring cities like Toronto have a design review panel, developers still tend to be 'money hungry' and don't care about actually designing an apartment building or condominium that actually contributes to the cultural heritage of the site, is forward-thinking and where design is actually unique and interesting. A telltale sign of this is that in Toronto, the majority of new apartment buildings and condos look almost identical — this essentially means that the subjectivity of thinking about good design vs bad design is removed from the situation if all of the buildings are objectively a cookie-cutter and carbon copy of one another despite being designed by [different] developers/architectural firms. My feedback would be to think about how a city's image, design, architecture and city-building can be further studied and held to the best standard so that growth can be balanced but also done in a way that brings robust creative energy back into city planning in the GTA but that also separates Brampton from Toronto, Hamilton, Mississauga or Vaughan (which are all building their own urban centres).</p> <p>I also want to say that with the new 413 highway coming, I am absolutely terrified of sprawling car-dependent communities further building themselves in Brampton. More needs to be done to ensure that development in the city restricts car-parking spaces and car-forcing communities so that we can build for cycling, walkability and transit. Pedestrian 'high streets' like we see in London, England is much needed in suburban Brampton and I think it would also contribute back to the 2040 vision of building healthy communities. I really want to live in Brampton in the future (when I get priced out of Toronto) but I do not want to own a car. I cannot drive and I want to be able to live in a city where I see residents walking on streets enjoying street performances, cycling en masse, rather than see dead streets of cars and strip plazas.</p>	
2022/06/03	General Public				Comment Received
				<p>I think new creative solutions for Brampton could really put people and communities first - On a one-on-one with a former city planner in Toronto, an idea they talked about was that communities or neighbourhood groups could pool capital and buy out commercial spaces from developers/or otherwise so that neighbourhoods could have their local shops, art galleries, music venues, Gelateria etc. Many people are getting tired and do not feel a sense of place when walking down an arterial Toronto road and seeing an oversaturation of rexalls, shoppers drug marts and chain stores, when instead they could actually gauge the vibrance, soul and authenticity that the community has to offer. So more study and better planning needs to be done to figure out how future neighbourhoods do not completely lose their draw, character and creative identity in the future. Brampton is lucky because it is so young, just starting out, and creative studio spaces could co-exist alongside ethnic cuisine spots and this Mecca of cultures that Brampton prides itself in carrying forward could intermingle and learn from one another in a way we may never have seen before.</p> <p>Brampton needs to realise that the only way to be competitive in the Greater Toronto region is to be 'the' place for creatives to relocate and chase their dreams. Trying to recreate Toronto's tech scene, commerce scene, and finance scene is not going to bring jobs to Brampton and fix the 60% live/work in Brampton, 40% commute to Toronto/live in Brampton goal that the city has. By creating a self-sustaining economy of commercial creatives (that could range from content creators such as streamers/gamers, to architects, to musicians, to entrepreneurs that work in digital/fine arts) will ensure that Brampton's economy will be more individualised that will eventually attract other industry. Los Angeles has become the new New York City in the respect that whether you're an aspiring dancer, filmmaker, writer or musician you will risk everything and move there because of the rich and competitive community where creative ideas are shared and where those same creative people moving there coincide between working a day job and pursuing creative fields that 'make the city', rewrite it by hosting their own DIY events (like singing or busking on previously empty streets) or hosting experimental art shows/performance in an abandoned factory.) Brampton has this opportunity to be gritty, be cool, be the cheaper and less glossy creative scene compared to Toronto and ironically attracting more industries and tech workers that can amplify fashion tech, film tech, and graphic design/new media. Let's think more strategically about how Brampton could create its own niche in the world.</p>	
2022/06/03	General Public				Comment Received
2022/06/03	General Public			I am generally in favour of the draft Brampton Plan, and think that enclosed and unenclosed utility trailers should be permitted in residential driveways.	Comment Received
				<p>There should be a plan to address our aging population esp those living with multiple chronic conditions who need acute care as well as home care needs. The Brampton population has high disease burden due to their ethnicity and hence our hospital and primary care should be equipped to handle their health care needs.</p> <p>Missing from Brampton Plan:</p> <p>Healthcare - Aging and Multiple chronic diseases (should be dealt as a whole instead of fragmenting it into DM, Dementia etc) Primary care capacity - eliminate solo practice and advocate for team based care approach. Our population has complex health care needs that is too much for a solo physician practitioner to manage. It is time to involve other healthcare disciplines such as NPs, RPhs, SW etc</p>	
2022/06/03	General Public				Comment Received
2022/06/03	General Public			More music venues and artist spaces are needed so badly - Music space and artist space and artist retail	Comment Received
2022/06/03	General Public			Schedule 4 - Provincial Plans and Policy Areas, appears to show 10534 Hurontario Street as a "Provincially Significant Employment Zone." This is not consistent with provincial or Region of Peel Mapping. We request that this schedule be updated as this property is not within a Provincially Significant Employment Zone.	Comment addressed - any updated mapping now conforms to the Provincial data provided through LIO. Please review the relevant updated schedules.
2022/06/03	General Public			Schedule 4 - Provincial Plans and Policy Areas, appears to show 5-7 Sandalwood Parkway West as a "Provincially Significant Employment Zone." This is not consistent with provincial or Region of Peel Mapping. We request that this schedule be updated as this property is not within a Provincially Significant Employment Zone.	Comment addressed - any updated mapping now conforms to the Provincial data provided through LIO. Please review the relevant updated schedules.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 1)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	P. 1-2	Revision Requested	<p>Rapid Growth: change "to 1 million by 2051" to "to 1 million or more by 2051", to include that the plan also considers that possibility.</p> <p>Getting Around: Growth Plan section 3 specifies transit as the first priority, section listing the modes ought to clearly specify that. Setting aside the Growth Plan, on a practical level, to achieve the transformational redevelopment enabling a modal shift to pedestrians and cyclists, the City has to focus on transit first so that redevelopment makes sense without being auto oriented.</p>	Comment addressed - changed to "over 1 million"
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 1-3	Revision Requested	<p>Celebrating Our Diversity: Brampton is not home to one of the largest South Asian communities in Canada, it is home to the largest one, period, and I believe internationally, it is second only to London UK for concentration of South Asians outside of South Asia,</p> <p>Health Wellness and Safety: The diabetes statistic is for OVER 20, the paragraph references under 20 https://www.peelregion.ca/strategicplan/20-year-outcomes/diabetes-prevalence.asp</p>	Comment addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 1-6	Revision Requested	How do you measure the success of 15 minute neighbourhoods? Goals need metrics. Also, keep in mind how grocery stores work in urban areas, they require a significant amount of population, which means 15 minutes may not include grocery without major upzoning.	Comment received - To be addressed through contextual planning by identifying metrics in the Implementation & Monitoring section of Secondary Plans and the Nurturing Neighbourhoods program.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 1-7	Revision Requested	Brampton Tomorrow: It again mentions pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users in that order, this works for safety, but not mobility planning. In practice prioritizing transit users also benefits pedestrians, but prioritizing pedestrians does not mean that it necessarily benefits transit users	Comment received - framework established through 2040 Vision, endorsed by Council and will be further explored through the Transportation Master Plan.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell	1.1.7 b)	Revision Requested	Please provide clarification on the above noted policies including an explanation of how the City intends on addressing development applications that have been submitted to the City in advance of City Council approval of the new draft Brampton Plan and/or in advance of Region of Peel approval.	Comment addressed - the existing 2006 Official Plan will be in force and effect until Brampton Plan receives final approval by the relevant planning approval authority.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Section 2.1)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
			2.1 and Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	The above noted policies are contrary to the Brampton Plan's intended Growth Management Framework. More specifically, the City's various Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) and Urban Centres are delineated in the new Brampton Plan, within which the underlying Growth Management Hierarchy is substantially comprised of the City's Neighbourhoods. As a result, many of the Centres and MTSAs, where the tallest buildings in the City are to be directed, are also identified as being within the City's Neighbourhoods where "lower-scale" uses are to be reflected. Proposed Schedule Modification: Schedules 1 and 2 be modified to remove Neighbourhoods from the delineated limits of the Urban Growth Centre, Urban Centres and MTSAs to remove this built form conflict within the City Structure and City-wide Growth Management Framework, and to clearly distinguish these areas based on their position as high intensity growth areas within the City Structure.	Comment addressed - The Urban Growth Centre boundary has been identified in the updated Land Use Designation schedule. The overlays set the framework for these locations identified in the comment to evolve to become Mixed Use Areas through subsequent planning studies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Ameson Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)				
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Part 2.1 (page 2-2)	Requires Clarification	Part 2.1 of the draft Brampton Plan be updated to include the City's Urban Growth Centre as one of the primary elements of the City Structure and City-Wide Growth Management Framework.	Comment addressed-identified role of UGC as a strategic growth area and added in 2.1. Schedule 2 now consists of the UGC as a mixed-use area on the mapping.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	Part 2.1 (page 2-2)	Requires Clarification	Part 2.1 of the draft Brampton Plan be updated to include the City's Urban Growth Centre as one of the primary elements of the City Structure and City-Wide Growth Management Framework.	Comment addressed-identified role of UGC as a strategic growth area and added in 2.1. Schedule 2 now consists of the UGC as a mixed-use area on the mapping.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	City-Wide Growth Management Framework	Revision Requested	2-4 Schedules 3A-3C, looks like the last "s" is not in bold	Comment addressed - revision made and bolded.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Part 2.1.2 a)	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.1.2 a) be modified to include the inclusion of the Urban Growth Centre as part of the City's Centres.	Comment received- The Provincial UGC will be reflected as a Mixed Use area on the City's Land Use Designation Page, but will not be reflected as a "Centre" on City Structure Maps.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	Part 2.1.2 a)	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.1.2 a) be modified to include the inclusion of the Urban Growth Centre as part of the City's Centres. Policy 2.1.2 a) - The Urban Growth Centre and Centres are those areas of Brampton where the highest concentration of growth and mix of uses is planned to occur. They connect residential and non-residential opportunities and enhance the ability for more residents to live, work, and play locally. Centres are comprised of Urban Centres and Town Centres.	The Provincial UGC will be reflected as a Mixed Use area on the City's Land Use Designation Page, but will not be reflected as a "Centre" on City Structure Maps.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon, Richard Domes and Nikhal Dawan on behalf of Zia Mohammad and Shamyia Hameed (8671 Heritage Road)	2.1.2.d	Revision Requested	2.1.2.d - Neighbourhoods reflect new and existing lower-scale residential, commercial, and institutional areas of Brampton, where people live, shop, work and play, with the amenities, including parks and open space, they need for day-to-day living close to home. Where appropriate, mid-rise building typology will be permitted at select locations within Neighbourhoods.	Comment received - The height regime proposed in Brampton Plan is general, and will allow within reason and where appropriate additional height should it be contextually appropriate and reflective of good planning. No change
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	2.1.3	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.1.3 be modified to include reference to the Urban Growth Centre as a location where the tallest buildings will be directed in addition to the Urban Centres.	The Provincial UGC will be reflected as a Mixed Use area on the City's Land Use Designation Page, but will not be reflected as a "Centre" on City Structure Maps.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.3	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.1.3 be modified to include reference to the Urban Growth Centre as a location where the tallest buildings will be directed in addition to the Urban Centres.	The Provincial UGC will be reflected as a Mixed Use area on the City's Land Use Designation Page, but will not be reflected as a "Centre" on City Structure Maps.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.1.3 and 2.1.4 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 directs that the tallest buildings will be directed to Urban Centres, and that within Boulevards and Major Transit Station Areas. The policy also states that taller buildings may be permitted subject to the implementation of other policies of the Official Plan. The subject site is located along a Primary Urban Boulevard and within a Planned Major Transit Station Area. Table 4 identifies that within Primary Urban Boulevard Areas that the building typology should be Low-Rise Plus and Mid-Rise. It is recommended that the policy include flexibility to allow for greater building heights where appropriate. The policy as currently drafted will not likely achieve the Municipality's intended housing and residential objectives.	Comment received - flexibility is integrated into Table 4 to provide a general approach to heights to ensure that the objectives of Brampton Plan are achieved.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon, Richard Domes and Nikhal Dawan on behalf of Zia Mohammad and Shamyia Hameed (8671 Heritage Road)	2.1.6	Revision Requested	2.1.6 - Neighbourhoods will be planned at a lower scale than Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors and will accommodate the lowest densities and building heights, while providing a full range and mix of housing options, however, mid-rise building typology will be permitted, where appropriate, at select locations.	Comment received - the flexibility is provided through Table 4 to identify the general application of heights.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 7927959 Canada Corp.(9610 McLaughlin Road)	2.1.6 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4 notes that Neighbourhoods will be planned at a lower density than Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors, while providing a full range and mix of housing options. It is recommended that the policy be revised to provide greater flexibility for greater building heights in strategic locations where appropriate, such as along Corridors, Minor/Major Arterials, key intersection locations, etc.	Comment received - the flexibility is provided through Table 4 to identify the general application of heights.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of 1905372 Ontario Inc. (10785, 107150, 10807, 10917 McLaughlin Road North)	2.1.6 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4 should be revised to provide greater flexibility to permit modest increases in building height on a site specific basis where appropriate.	Comment addressed - Table 4 provides a general heights framework and the implementation through the overlays will help to deliver the flexibility and mix of uses/heights.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of Rotary Club of Brampton Glen Community Centre (1857 Queen Street West)	2.1.6 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4 should be revised to provide greater flexibility to permit modest increases in building height on a site specific basis where appropriate.	Comment addressed - Table 4 provides a general heights framework and the implementation through the overlays will help to deliver the flexibility and mix of uses/heights, based on where it is appropriate.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of 27665321 Ontario Inc. (11860 and 0 Bramalea Road)	2.1.6 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4 should be revised to provide greater flexibility to permit increases in building height in strategic locations where appropriate, including key intersections. In the case of the subject site, immediately to the southeast is a recently constructed 6-storey apartment building. The 'new' developed retail commercial plaza located east of the subject site was approved in 2012. In 2019 a Pre-Consultation Application was submitted to develop the four (4) parcels at the north and south edges of the property fronting onto Mayfield Road and Inspire Boulevard respectively. The proposal contemplates the development of a mixed-use development consisting of 10-storey, 7-storey, 4-storey and 3-storey buildings to be serviced by underground parking	Comment addressed - implementation through the overlays will help to deliver the flexibility and mix of uses/heights.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Surinder Mahi (owner), 3407 Countryside Drive	2.1.6 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4 notes that Neighbourhoods will be planned at a lower density than Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors, while providing a full range and mix of housing options. It is recommended that the policy be revised to provide greater flexibility for greater building heights in strategic locations where appropriate, such as along Corridors, Minor/Major Arterials, key intersection locations, etc.	Comment addressed - implementation through the overlays will help to deliver the flexibility and mix of uses/heights.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.1.6 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4 notes that Neighbourhoods will be planned at a lower density than Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors, while providing a full range and mix of housing options. It is recommended that the policy be revised to provide greater flexibility for greater building heights in strategic locations where appropriate, such as along Corridors, Minor/Major Arterials, key intersection locations, etc.	Comment addressed - implementation through the overlays will help to deliver the flexibility and mix of uses/heights.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.1.9 and 2.1.33.b)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.9 identifies that Employment Areas will accommodate a diverse mix of employment uses. Employment Areas within MTSAs may permit other non-employment uses subject to further planning studies. Policy 2.1.33.b) identifies that where Employment Areas are within a MTA the integration of specific portions of Employment Areas within non-employment uses shall be permitted subject to municipal study. It is our opinion that in the case of the subject site the necessary study to permit residential uses has already been completed through the approval of the 2020 Hurontario-Main Corridor Secondary Plan. OIP/Proposed Policy Modification: Policy 2.1.9 and Policy 2.1.33.b) should be modified to specifically identify residential uses in the mention of permitted non-employment uses.	Comment received - the policy identifies that non-employment uses will be determined through the MTA study. There may be some instances where residential may not be appropriate and defer to those processes to determine permitted uses.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.1.16	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.16 speaks to providing for "minimum" growth forecasts on Table 1, as noted in the ROP. It is noted that the ROP does not use the word "minimum", but rather "target". We recommend that the word "minimum" be replaced with "target" so that the reference to forecasts is consistent with the ROP.	No language in the recently approved ROP that use the word "target". No change
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.1.16	Revision Requested	ROP does not use the word "minimum", but rather "target". We recommend that the word "minimum" be replaced with "target" so that the reference to forecasts is consistent with the ROP.	No language in the recently approved ROP that use the word "target". No change
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Surinder Mahi (owner), 3407 Countryside Drive	2.1.16	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.16 speaks to providing for "minimum" growth forecasts on Table 1, as noted in the ROP. It is noted that the ROP does not use the word "minimum", but rather "target". We recommend that the word "minimum" be replaced with "target" so that the reference to forecasts is consistent with the ROP.	No language in the recently approved ROP that use the word "target". No change
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Claireville Holdings Limited (owner)	2.1.16	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.16 speaks to providing for "minimum" growth forecasts on Table 1, as noted in the ROP. It is noted that the ROP does not use the word "minimum", but rather "target". We recommend that the word "minimum" be replaced with "target" so that the reference to forecasts is consistent with the ROP.	No language in the recently approved ROP that use the word "target". No change
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Surinder Mahi (owner), 3407 Countryside Drive	Page 2-20	Revision Requested	General Comment - On Page 2-20, under the heading "Secondary Plans", we note that the introductory paragraph is identical to the paragraph in the "blue box" printed immediately to the right thereof. Is there any significance to the "blue box" versus the regular text?	Call out box removed
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 7927959 Canada Corp.(9610 McLaughlin Road)	Page 2-20	Revision Requested	General Comment - On Page 2-20, under the heading "Secondary Plans", we note that the introductory paragraph is identical to the paragraph in the "blue box" printed immediately to the right thereof. Is there any significance to the "blue box" versus the regular text?	Call out box removed
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	Page 2-20	Revision Requested	General Comment - On Page 2-20, under the heading "Secondary Plans", we note that the introductory paragraph is identical to the paragraph in the "blue box" printed immediately to the right thereof. Is there any significance to the "blue box" versus the regular text?	Call out box removed
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	Page 2-20	Revision Requested	General Comment - On Page 2-20, under the heading "Secondary Plans", we note that the introductory paragraph is identical to the paragraph in the "blue box" printed immediately to the right thereof. Is there any significance to the "blue box" versus the regular text?	Comment addressed.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Claireville Holdings Limited (owner)	2.1.33 e)	Revision Requested	General Comment - On Page 2-20, under the heading "Secondary Plans", we note that the introductory paragraph is identical to the paragraph in the "blue box" printed immediately to the right thereof. Is there any significance to the "blue box" versus the regular text?	Comment addressed.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.4	Revision Requested	2.1.4 What does along Corridors mean? Does it mean parcels fronting onto it, or is this including walksheds	Comment addressed -Defining the Corridor Overlay in policy 2.2.5.2 of the draft Plan identifies what this refers to

03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 7927959 Canada Corp.(9610 McLaughlin Road)	2.1.16	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.16 speaks to providing for 'minimum' growth forecasts on Table 1, as noted in the ROP. It is noted that the ROP does not use the word 'minimum', but rather 'target'. We recommend that the word 'minimum' be replaced with 'target' so that the reference to forecasts is consistent with the ROP.	No language in the recently approved ROP that use the word 'target'. No change.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd and (SIA)	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	2.1.16	Requires Clarification	Section 2.1.16 speaks to providing for 'minimum' growth forecasts on Table 1. The use of the word 'minimum' implies that if the City does not achieve the minimum forecasts, it infers that the New Official Plan implementation may not be successful. We don't believe that this was the intent of this section. As such, we suggest that the word 'minimum' be changed to 'target' so that these forecasts are directions that the City strives to achieve but if not achieved, the actual growth that is less than the forecasts can still be successful.	No language in the recently approved ROP that use the word 'target'. No change.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.1.16	Requires Clarification	Section 2.1.16 speaks to providing for 'minimum' growth forecasts on Table 1, as noted in the ROP. It is noted that the ROP does not use the word 'minimum', but rather 'target'. We recommend that the word 'minimum' be replaced with 'target' so that the reference to forecasts is consistent with the ROP.	No language in the recently approved ROP that use the word 'target'. No change.
2022/06/14	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.21	Revision Requested	a Directing intensification and highest densities and heights primarily within Urban Centres, which includes the Downtown Brampton Urban Growth Centre, Town Centres, Boulevards, along Corridors and within Major Transit Station Areas. b Promoting a variety of built form in Corridors and Boulevards. Development in these areas will respond to the existing and planned built form context in Neighbourhoods, subject to the transition, form and design policies of this Plan. c Promoting gentile appropriate intensification in Neighbourhoods located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors. Neighbourhoods will continue to evolve through infill development on underutilized vacant properties and lands, the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and the establishment of additional residential units, as appropriate.	"Downtown Brampton" portion was deleted and replaced with "Provincial Urban Growth Centre". "C" was left unchanged based on updated edits to the draft Plan. Neighbourhoods are the key areas where gentile intensification is appropriate, no edits incorporated. "Downtown Brampton" portion was deleted and replaced with "Provincial Urban Growth Centre". "C" was left unchanged based on updated edits to the draft Plan. Neighbourhoods are the key areas where gentile intensification is appropriate, no edits incorporated.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.1.21.c	Revision Requested	a Directing intensification and highest densities and heights primarily within Urban Centres, which includes the Downtown Brampton Urban Growth Centre, Town Centres, Boulevards, along Corridors and within Major Transit Station Areas. b Promoting a variety of built form in Corridors and Boulevards. Development in these areas will respond to the existing and planned built form context in Neighbourhoods, subject to the transition, form and design policies of this Plan.	Comment received - Neighbourhood Centre policy sections established to provide clarity on where greater intensification within neighbourhoods should be supported.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of 1905372 Ontario Inc. (10785, 10750, 10807, 10817 McLaughlin Road North)	2.1.21.c	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.21.c should be modified to state that appropriate intensification should be promoted in Neighbourhoods located outside of Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors.	Comment received - Neighbourhood Centre policy sections established to provide clarity on where greater intensification within neighbourhoods should be supported.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of Rotary Club of Brampton Glen Community Centre (1857 Queen Street West)	2.1.21.c	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.21.c should be modified to state that appropriate intensification should be promoted in Neighbourhoods located outside of Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors.	Comment received - Neighbourhood Centre policy sections established to provide clarity on where greater intensification within neighbourhoods should be supported.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	behalf of Creditview 4-P Holding Inc. (Owner of 7614, 7624, 7650 and 7662 Creditview Road)	2.1.21c	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.21.c should be modified to state that appropriate intensification should be promoted in Neighbourhoods located outside of Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors.	Comment received - Neighbourhood Centre policy sections established to provide clarity on where greater intensification within neighbourhoods should be supported.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 2765321 Ontario Inc. (1860 and 0 Bramaalee Road)	2.1.21c	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.21.c should be modified to state that appropriate intensification should be promoted in Neighbourhoods located outside of Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.21	Revision Requested	2.1.21 Intensification in Brampton will be accommodated, subject to the policies of this Plan, by: a Directing intensification and highest densities and heights primarily within Urban Centres, Urban Growth Centre, Town Centres, Boulevards, along Corridors and within Major Transit Station Areas. b Promoting a variety of built form in Corridors and Boulevards. Development in these areas will respond to the existing and planned built form context in Neighbourhoods, subject to the transition, form and design policies of this Plan. c Promoting gentile appropriate intensification in Neighbourhoods located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors. Neighbourhoods will continue to evolve through infill development on underutilized vacant properties and lands, the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and the establishment of additional residential units, as appropriate.	No change required. Policy 2.1.21b speaks to "promoting a variety of built form in Corridors and Boulevards Development in these areas will respond to the existing and planned built form context in Neighbourhoods, subject to the transition, form and design policies of this Plan." Corridors in the structure plan are supported by Frequent Transit.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	2.1.21	Revision Requested	2.1.21 - Intensification in Brampton will be accommodated, subject to the policies of this Plan, by: a Directing intensification and highest densities and heights primarily within Urban Centres, Urban Growth Centre, Town Centres, Boulevards, along Corridors and within Major Transit Station Areas. b Promoting a variety of built form in Corridors and Boulevards. Development in these areas will respond to the existing and planned built form context in Neighbourhoods, subject to the transition, form and design policies of this Plan. c Promoting gentile appropriate intensification in Neighbourhoods located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors. Neighbourhoods will continue to evolve through infill development on underutilized vacant properties and lands, the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and the establishment of additional residential units, as appropriate.	Comment received - some edits were incorporated. In "a", the "Downtown Brampton" portion was deleted and replaced with "Provincial Urban Growth Centre". "C" was left unchanged based on updated edits to the draft Plan. Neighbourhoods are the key areas where gentile intensification is appropriate, no edits incorporated.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	2.1.21	Requires Clarification	2.1.21 - Intensification in Brampton will be accommodated, subject to the policies of this Plan, by: a Directing intensification and highest densities and heights primarily within Urban Centres, Urban Growth Centre, Town Centres, Boulevards, along Corridors and within Major Transit Station Areas. b Promoting a variety of built form in Corridors and Boulevards. Development in these areas will respond to the existing and planned built form context in Neighbourhoods, subject to the transition, form and design policies of this Plan. c Promoting gentile appropriate intensification in Neighbourhoods located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors. Neighbourhoods will continue to evolve through infill development on underutilized vacant properties and lands, the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and the establishment of additional residential units, as appropriate.	Comment received - some edits were incorporated. In "a", the "Downtown Brampton" portion was deleted and replaced with "Provincial Urban Growth Centre". "C" was left unchanged based on updated edits to the draft Plan. Neighbourhoods are the key areas where gentile intensification is appropriate, no edits incorporated.
2022/06/14	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.21 a)	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.1.21 a) reads, "Intensification in Brampton will be accommodated, subject to the policies of this Plan, by: a Directing intensification and highest densities and heights primarily within Urban Centres, which includes the Downtown Brampton Urban Growth Centre, Town Centres, Boulevards, along Corridors and within Major Transit Station Areas..."	Comment received - some edits were incorporated. In "a", the "Downtown Brampton" portion was deleted and replaced with "Provincial Urban Growth Centre". "C" was left unchanged based on updated edits to the draft Plan. Neighbourhoods are the key areas where gentile intensification is appropriate, no edits incorporated.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.27	Needs Discussion	2.1.27: 71 people and jobs per hectare for neighbourhoods seems low, how much land area you planning to dedicate to single detached? Townhouses can easily exceed 71 people per hectare.	Comment received - a minimum of 71 people and jobs per hectare is required to be conform with the Regional Official Plan
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Penroll Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tech Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owner)	2.1.27	Needs Discussion	This policy sets out a minimum greenfield density target of 71 persons and jobs per hectare whereas the minimum in Places to Grow is 50. Why is there a significant increase in the minimum density?	Comment received - a minimum of 71 people and jobs per hectare is required to be conform with the Regional Official Plan
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 2-11		Yes, actually the City can grow in a ton of places at once, and if we are to address the housing crisis, not only can we, we must. The City is short tens of thousands of units because it tried to micromanage growth, hindering dely needed small units. Policies can be created to encourage the growth to frequent transit areas, and that can mean a relatively wide area is experiencing development. Toronto focusing development too intensely on certain areas has caused significant problems.	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Ameson Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	2.1.30	Revision Requested	2.1.30 - To optimize the use of land in Brampton, a significant portion of growth will be directed to Centres and Boulevards. Table 2 establishes the minimum density targets for each Centre which includes and the city's Urban Growth Centre, and other nodes and corridors identified in the Region of Peel Official Plan. The city's Urban Growth Centre will be planned to achieve, by 2031 or earlier, a minimum density of 200 residents and jobs combined per hectare.	Comment received - The policy does not preclude this density from being achieved.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	2.1.30	Requires Clarification	2.1.30 - To optimize the use of land in Brampton, a significant portion of growth will be directed to Centres and Boulevards. Table 2 establishes the minimum density targets for each Centre which includes and the city's Urban Growth Centre, and other nodes and corridors identified in the Region of Peel Official Plan.	Comment received - The policy does not preclude this density from being achieved and the UGC minimum density is identified in Brampton Plan.
2022/06/14	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.30 2.1.33	Requires Clarification Revision Requested	2.1.30 - To optimize the use of land in Brampton, a significant portion of growth will be directed to Centres and Boulevards. Table 2 establishes the minimum density targets for each Centre which includes and the city's Urban Growth Centre, and other nodes and corridors identified in the Region of Peel Official Plan. The city's Urban Growth Centre will be planned to achieve, by 2031 or earlier, a minimum density of 200 residents and jobs combined per hectare. Add in the first row of Table 2 the following: Location (Schedule 2): Urban Growth Centre Classification: Urban Growth Centre	Comment received - density target has been reiterated through policy.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.1.33	Revision Requested	Secondary Plans, Block Plans and/or MTSAs Plans, where required by the City of Brampton, should not be at the cost of development proponents. The scope of these exercises within the urban Built-Up Area, which may involve many landowners, should be borne by the City of Brampton unless these pre-existing plans are being amended on a site specific basis through individual Amendment Applications. Draft Brampton Plan Policy 2.2.53 directs that existing Secondary Plans or MTSAs Plan studies will provide more specific direction for each distinct Mixed-Use District. In the case of the subject site, it is our opinion that the existing Hurontario-Main Corridor Secondary Plan, which through policy already considers the subject site as being located within a Mobility Hub/centre and MTSAs, provides sufficient land use policy direction to advance a mixed use development on the subject site without the need for additional Secondary Plan, Precinct Plan, MTSAs Plan and Area Plan approvals. The majority of the lands located within the City's Primary and Planned MTSAs, Centres and the Urban Growth Centre do not currently have Precinct Plans. Further, it is our opinion that the proposed multi-faceted approval process for the redevelopment of sites within the City's Strategic Growth Areas, which may include upwards of four (4) additional studies/plans to be approved through a public consultation process, is excessive and unnecessary and will severely delay the facilitation of residential uses in 2.1.33 - Each Major Transit Station Area is unique with its own growth potential. The City will study Major Transit Station Areas in accordance with the implementation policies of Chapter 3 of this Plan based on local context and conditions to facilitate intensification, a Where a Major Transit Station Area is also within a Centre or Urban Growth Centre, the density and height policies governing Centres and/or Urban Growth Centre will prevail. b Where Employment Areas are within or overlap with a Major Transit Station Area, the City will initiate a study, in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan and Part 2.2 of Brampton Plan, to support the integration of specific portions Employment Areas with non-employment uses to develop vibrant, mixed-use areas, and innovation hubs. c Where a City-initiated study of a Major Transit Station Area has not been initiated or approved by way of an amendment to Brampton Plan, the City may require encourages the coordination of development applications between applicants, by way of a Secondary Plan and/or Precinct Plan at the cost of the applicant. The Secondary Plan and/or Precinct Plan will be subject to the applicable policies of the overlapping Centre or Boulevard, or other similar approaches to ensure an orderly, coordinated, and phased approach to the provision of Civic Infrastructure prior to or coincident with development.	Comment received - should a proponent want to proceed ahead of a city-initiated study, the proponent of development must fund and/or cost-share the study.
2022/06/14	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.33 a)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.33 a) be modified to provide clear policy direction that where conflict exists, the Urban Growth Centre policies of the plan in terms of building height and development density shall prevail.	Comment addressed - the implementation through the overlays will help to deliver the flexibility and mix of uses/heights. The Urban Growth Centre is captured through the relevant Centres/Boulevards policies of the Plan.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	2.1.33 a)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.33 a) be modified to provide clear policy direction that where conflict exists, the Urban Growth Centre policies of the plan in terms of building height and development density shall prevail.	Comment addressed - the implementation through the overlays will help to deliver the flexibility and mix of uses/heights. The Urban Growth Centre is captured through the relevant Centres/Boulevards policies of the Plan.
2022/06/14	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.33 a)	Requires Clarification	It is our understanding based on policy 2.1.33b of the DCBOP that the City is undertaking studies where Employment Areas overlap or are within an MTSAs, such as the Bramaalee GO MTSAs, to support the integration of non-employment uses and include permissions related to building typologies. However, the process and timing for the MTSAs studies are unclear, as well as their relation to existing and in-effect Secondary Plans. We request that City Staff clarify the process and timing for preparing, reviewing, commenting on, and completing such studies and their relationship to existing Secondary Plans	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Jenina Thibault on behalf of 110 East Drive (owner)	2.1.33 b)	Requires Clarification		Comment received.

03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.1.33.c)	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.33(c) terminates since "where a city-initiated study or a major transit station area has not been initiated or approved by way of an amendment to Brampton Plan, the City may require the coordination of development applications between applicants, by way of a Secondary Plan and/or Precinct Plan at the cost of the applicant. The Secondary Plan and/or Precinct Plan will be subject to the applicable policies of the overlying Centre or Boulevard, or other similar approaches that are orderly, coordinated, and phased approach to the provision of Civic Infrastructure prior to or coincident with development." Secondary Plans, Block Plans and/or MTSAs Plans, where required by the City of Brampton, should not necessarily be a cost which is to be shouldered by individual or groups of development proponents. The size and scope of the aforementioned planning exercises, within the Urban Built-up Area can involve a great many individual landowners and as such the cost should be borne by the City of Brampton. It may be appropriate, subject to further consideration, to require individual proponents to absorb the costs when pre-existing plans are being amended on a site-specific basis. The majority of the lands located within the City's Primary and Planned MTSAs, Centres and the Urban Growth Centre do not currently have Precinct Plans in place and as such it could be an onerous financial responsibility to require individual stakeholders to fund their preparation, assuming that they are actually required (something which is debatable). We recommend that Section 2.1.33.c) be modified to delete the reference to the cost of 'new' Secondary Plans, Block Plans, Precinct Plans and/or MTSAs Plans, as being something, which needs to be borne by individual and/or a group of development proponents.	Comment received- should a proponent want to proceed ahead of a city-initiated study, the proponent of development must fund and/or cost-share the study.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	2.1.33	Revision Requested	2.1.33 - Each Major Transit Station Area is unique with its own growth potential. The City will study Major Transit Station Areas in accordance with the implementation policies of Chapter 3 of this Plan based on local context and conditions to facilitate intensification. a Where a Major Transit Station Area is also within a Centre, the density and height policies governing Centres will prevail. b Where Employment Areas are within or overlap with a Major Transit Station Area, the City will initiate a study, in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan and Part 2.2 of Brampton Plan, to support the integration of specific portions Employment Areas with non-employment uses to develop vibrant, mixed-use areas, and innovation hubs.	Comment received- should a proponent want to proceed ahead of a city-initiated study, the proponent of development must fund and/or cost-share the study.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	2.1.33	Revision Requested	2.1.33 - Each Major Transit Station Area is unique with its own growth potential. The City will study Major Transit Station Areas in accordance with the implementation policies of Chapter 3 of this Plan based on local context and conditions to facilitate intensification. a Where a Major Transit Station Area is also within a Centre, the density and height policies governing Centres will prevail. b Where Employment Areas are within or overlap with a Major Transit Station Area, the City will initiate a study, in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan and Part 2.2 of Brampton Plan, to support the integration of specific portions Employment Areas with non-employment uses to develop vibrant, mixed-use areas, and innovation hubs.	Comment received- should a proponent want to proceed ahead of a city-initiated study, the proponent of development must fund and/or cost-share the study.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.33.c)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.33.c) be modified to delete reference to the cost of new Secondary Plans and Precinct Plans being borne by the applicant.	Comment received- should a proponent want to proceed ahead of a city-initiated study, the proponent of development must fund and/or cost-share the study.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	2.1.33.e)	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.33(e) requires Regional Official Plan Amendment for those 'planned' Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) that becomes Primary Major Transit Station Areas. We do not feel that this is appropriate or necessary. The inclusion of the new Primary Major Transit Station Areas should be updated as part of the Region's next Official Plan Review as part of its housekeeping process. One such 'planned' Major Transit Station Area is designated in the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan area. We look forward to working with the City through the Heritage Heights Precinct Planning process, where refinements to the policies around planned MTSAs are determined and implemented through further amendment to the City's Official Plan.	Comment received- legal has provided confirmation to staff that any "housekeeping" change to Brampton Plan requires notice. No change required. This approach is consistent with the City's existing Block Planning approach. Necessary Cost Sharing Agreements will be required should a proponent of development want to proceed in advance of a City initiated process.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Mr. Mario Matteo Silvestro, Mr. Guido D'Alesio and 2088205 Ontario Ltd., the Registered Owners of 22, 24, 26, 28 and 32 John Street	2.1.33c	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.33.c) should be modified to encourage the coordination of development applications between applicants. Applicants should not be required to advance a Secondary Plan and/or Precinct Plan at their cost.	No change required. This approach is consistent with the City's existing Block Planning approach. Necessary Cost Sharing Agreements will be required should a proponent of development want to proceed in advance of a City initiated process.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	2.1.33c	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.33.c) be modified to delete reference to the cost of new Secondary Plans and Precinct Plans being borne by the applicant.	No change required. This approach is consistent with the City's existing Block Planning approach. Necessary Cost Sharing Agreements will be required should a proponent of development want to proceed in advance of a City initiated process.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.1.44	Requires Clarification	Section 2.1.44 speaks to the preparation of Secondary Plans, and more specifically identifies the order of priority for areas where 'new' or 'updated' Secondary Plans are contemplated. Planning Staff have initiated the review of the Bram West Secondary Plan, and more specifically, Block Plan Area 40-5. The City of Brampton recently retained a consultant to undertake the review. Given that the update to the Secondary Plan is referenced in subsection 1), we request clarification from City Staff that the policy in Section 2.1.44 will not have the effect of delaying the Block Plan Area 40-5 review which has just been initiated. The policy as currently proposed does not include any provisions or exceptions for areas that are already being studied.	Comment addressed- Bram West Secondary Plan review is moving forward as planned.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.1.49	Requires Clarification	The wording of the policy in Section 2.1.49 does not clearly indicate how the limits of a Precinct Plan are to be determined in specific instances, including, where the Secondary Plan does not include/identify the location of Precincts). The policy directs that Precinct Plans will be required with the submission of, among others, a 'significant' Zoning By-Law Amendment, but does not specify what the threshold is for determining if a Zoning By-Law Amendment is 'significant'. It is recommended that the policy be revised to include criteria as to what the threshold of 'significant' is; the objective is to ensure that the policy is objective as opposed to subjective.	Comment addressed - Precinct Plan policy revised
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.1.49	Delete Policy	1.19 Where a Secondary Plan does not yet identify the location of Precincts, Precinct Plans will be required with the submission of any Draft Plan of Subdivision and/or significant Zoning By Law Amendment application within Ge4+es-Bol4es+er- and with to-A+age onto Corridors to the satisfaction of the City and Region of Peel before approval of the application, in accordance with the policies of Part 2.2 and-Chapter-3.	Comment received
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.1.49	Requires Clarification	The wording of the policy in Section 2.1.49 does not clearly indicate how the limits of a Precinct Plan are to be determined in specific instances, including, where the Secondary Plan does not include/identify the location of Precincts). The policy directs that Precinct Plans will be required with the submission of, among others, a 'significant' Zoning By-Law Amendment, but does not specify what the threshold is for determining if a Zoning By-Law Amendment is 'significant'. It is recommended that the policy be revised to include criteria as to what the threshold of 'significant' is; the objective is to ensure that the policy is objective as opposed to subjective.	Comment addressed.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Mr. Mario Matteo Silvestro, Mr. Guido D'Alesio and 2088205 Ontario Ltd., the Registered Owners of 22, 24, 26, 28 and 32 John Street	2.1.49	Requires Clarification	The majority of lands located within the City's Primary and Planned MTSAs, Centres, and Urban Growth Centre do not currently have Precinct Plans. Section 2.1.49 does not clearly indicate how the limits of a Precinct Plan are to be determined in specific instances, including, where the Secondary Plan does not include/identify the location of Precincts). The policy directs that Precinct Plans will be required with the submission of, among others, a 'significant' Zoning By-Law Amendment, but does not specify what the threshold is for determining if a Zoning By-Law Amendment is 'significant'. It is recommended that the policy be revised to include criteria as to what the threshold of 'significant' is; the objective is to ensure that the policy is objective as opposed to subjective.	Comment addressed- significant to be defined in the glossary for clarification.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.1.49	Delete Policy	1.19 Where a Secondary Plan does not yet identify the location of Precincts, Precinct Plans will be required with the submission of Centres, Boulevards, and with frontage onto Corridors to the satisfaction of the City and 44394GR-GF-P-4949-1-13494Gre-aply-G44-GF-the application, in aGGG-re-a-Rae-w44e-paIG+e-s-ef 2.2-an-d-G-14aptec-3	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Clareville Holdings Limited (owner)	2.1.49	Revision Requested	The wording of Section 2.1.49 does not clearly indicate how the limits of a Precinct Plan are to be determined in specific instances, including, where the Secondary Plan does not include/identify the location of Precincts). The policy directs that Precincts Plans will be required with the submission of, among others, a 'significant' Zoning By-Law Amendment, but does not specify what the threshold is for determining if a Zoning By-Law Amendment is 'significant'. It is recommended that the policy be revised to include criteria as to what the threshold of 'significant' is; the objective is to ensure that the policy is objective as opposed to subjective.	Comment received - policy revised.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2/24		2-24 Provincial requirements dictate that transit must be #1 priority. Furthermore, if you want to make the city walkable, you have to push transit first to enable pedestrian friendly development patterns.	Comment received- this framework was determined through the Vision, to prioritize transit, this requires enabling the active transit system first as all transit starts with walking or biking.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.56		2.1.56(c) We need to not just imagine different mobility needs in 2051, but how to achieve getting from where we are, to where we want to be.	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.57		2.1.56(b) Improving snow clearing needs to be a priority, many seniors who get around on foot and by transit are shut in for weeks in the winter because of how awful the snow clearing is. 2.1.57 Reliable and efficient transit doesn't support the growth areas, they enable them to be real places that things happen in.	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.63		2.1.63 Zum is needed to be a separate category of transit, between rapid transit and local transit routes.	Comment Received, Brampton Transit and Transportation Staff have advised that Zum is considered Rapid Transit, and will continue to be reflected as such.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.65		2.1.65(b) Zum is definitionally not BRT, from the Metrolinx 2041 RTP (Italics mine) Bus rapid transit (BRT): Transit infrastructure and service with buses running in their own exclusive right-of-way, fully separated from traffic, typically with signal priority measures in place and longer spacing between stops than conventional bus routes (typically 500 metres to 1 kilometre) to maintain higher average speeds and ensure reliability of the service. May include additional features to improve operational efficiency and enhance the customer experience, such as off-board fare collection, platform-level boarding, and real-time passenger information.	Comment received - please review updated Mobility Network section with revised terminology/definitions.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.71		2.1.71 The City needs to plan for urban delivery such as parcels, mail, and grocery delivery, and consider how to accommodate this where the City is also planning on road cycling.	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.72		2.1.72 Should there be policies explicitly protecting industrial spur lines?	Comment addressed

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Section 2.2)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
03-Jun-22	BILD	Sophie Lin	Prescriptive Policies		In all cases, we suggest that the City review these policies to include room for flexibility by including terms such as "generally" or "mainly." Certain policies employ the use of terms that may result in being overly prescriptive. These policies fail to provide the necessary room for appropriate deviation from the policy when the individual context of a site may require it. As a reminder, Official Plans are to provide interpretive flexibility in order to implement them successfully. Unless changed, the nature of these prescriptive policies will inevitably lead to recurring Official Plan Amendment applications to accompany future development proposals. We see this as an effort that can be eliminated through clearer less prescriptive policies. Examples where policies were found to be overly prescriptive include the following: Section 2.2.24: "Standalone above-grade parking structures will be prohibited in Centres." Section 2.2.36: "Standalone above-grade parking garages will not be permitted." Section 2.2.24b: "Where a recreational trail is proposed within an ecological buffer an additional 5 meters in width will be provided to the buffer to mitigate the impact of the trail."	Comment received - 2.2.4 and 2.2.36 revised to remove the prohibition of stand alone above grade parking structures. Comment Received for 2.2.24b- as a general approach, 5 metres provides the necessary buffer for full vegetation function and accounts for a variety of contexts
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.1	Needs Discussion		Comment received
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.2	Requires Clarification	In the context of the various designations, we request clarification that warehouse uses are permitted in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO, since the Lands are within both a Mixed Use District and Employment Designation on Schedule 5 (there are no Mixed-Use Districts shown on Schedule 2).	Comment Addressed - MZO currently has no standing and will not be reflected in current iteration of Brampton Plan. Revised Mixed-Use Employment policy section identifies the permissions for MTSAs that are located in PSEZ, subject to further planning studies.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.2 a	Requires Clarification	In the context of the various designations, we request clarification as to the uses permitted in these designations and if the more flexible range of permitted uses in the Mixed-use Districts prevail over the uses permitted in Employment Areas. We also request clarification that warehouse/industrial uses are permitted since the lands at 379 Orenda Road are within both a Mixed-Use District and Mixed Use Employment Designation on Schedule 5 (there are no Mixed-Use Districts shown on Schedule 2).	Comment Addressed - this second draft has clarified that where there is employment lands where an MTA is delineated, the Mixed Use Employment designation may introduce additional uses subject to the outcomes of the MTA studies. This sets the framework that the underlying employment uses should be the predominant use
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.2.2a)	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.2 a) speaks to higher density development within Mixed-Use Districts that are identified as Primary Major Transit Station Areas. Table 5 lists building types in the aforementioned areas to Mid-Rise only with the opportunity to pursue a Tall or Tall Plus building only through a site-specific assessment. We recommend that the policy be revised to facilitate greater flexibility, without the need to undertake a site-specific assessment; especially in situations where as in the case of the subject site, the property in question is located on a BRT Lane.	Comment addressed- Policy revised to reflect all areas where the mixed use designation can be applied. Table 5, provides general a general framework for heights, to be explored further through Secondary and Precinct Planning
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.2(a)	Revision Requested		Comment addressed- updated draft Brampton Plan helps to identify how the overlays will be implemented through the Mixed Use Area designation. For review.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.2.2 b)	Requires Clarification	It is noted in Section 2.2.2 b) that the intensity of development and range of uses that may be permitted in Neighbourhoods varies depending on the street typology that a property fronts onto. This policy is a good example of a policy with flexibility for taller building typologies and increased density in appropriate locations within the Neighbourhood	Comment received - It is important to note that Brampton Plan concerns itself more with height than density, and prescribes general heights and minimum density
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Sumner Mall (owner), 3407 Countryside Drive	2.2.2 b)	Revision Requested	It is noted in Section 2.2.2 b) that the intensity of development and range of uses that may be permitted in Neighbourhoods varies depending on the street typology that a property fronts onto. This policy is a good example of a policy with flexibility for taller building typologies and increased density in appropriate locations within the Neighbourhood.	Comment received - It is important to note that Brampton Plan concerns itself more with height than density, and prescribes general heights and minimum density
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.3	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.3 states "Overlays, which are shown on Schedule 5, then apply to one or more of the underlying designations. The following provides a summary of each overlay which forms Our Strategy for Building an Urban City: ...", however the overlays as referenced (i.e., Urban Centre, Town Centre, etc.) are not shown on Schedule 5 and clarification is requested.	Comment addressed - Policy updated
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.3	Requires Clarification	However the overlays as referenced (i.e., Urban Centre, Town Centre, etc.) are not shown on Schedule 5 and clarification is requested.	Comment Addressed - Overlays are shown on updated draft Schedule 1
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DQ Group (owners)	2.2.3	Revision Requested	This policy references overlays shown on Schedule 5, yet Schedule 5 does not include any overlays. Furthermore, much of the policies relate to overlays and yet the schedule does not refer to overlays at all. Perhaps the schedule should be amended to reflect the intent of the policy.	Comment Addressed - Overlays are shown on Schedule 1
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.3	Revision Requested	2.2.3.1 don't see these overlays on Schedule 5, do you mean Schedule 2? 2.2.3.a - The Urban Centre and Town Centres are conceptual overlays which in addition to the Urban Growth Centre indicate the City's principal locations for growth, accommodate important regional amenities, and provide for the greatest intensity, form, and scale in Brampton. 2.2.3.b - New development within Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will have regard for the existing character and built form of adjacent Neighbourhoods, where they are located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, and provide transition in accordance with the design policies of this Plan. 2.2.54 - The minimum density for residential and mixed-use development within the Mixed-Use District designation will be the minimum density established in the corresponding Major Transit Station Area identified in Part 2.1 of Brampton Plan and consider the minimum density target for the Urban Growth Centre.	Comment Addressed - Overlays are shown on Schedule 1
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 261 and 263 Queen Street East	2.2.3 a)	Revision Requested		Comment received- updated to include the density target for the UGC.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.3	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.3 states "Overlays, which are shown on Schedule 5, then apply to one or more of the underlying designations. The following provides a summary of each overlay which forms Our Strategy for Building an Urban City: ...", however the overlays as referenced (i.e., Urban Centre, Town Centre, etc.) are not shown on Schedule 5 and clarification is requested	Comment Addressed - Overlays are shown on Schedule 1
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.5 (b)	Revision Requested	2.2.5(b) disallow new gas bars (gasoline & diesel) outside of employment areas.	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.7	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.7 states "The following uses may be permitted within ... Town Centres as shown on Schedule 2: a. A broad range of residential, retail, personal services, office, cultural, institutional, hospitality, entertainment, recreational and other related uses may be permitted. b. Mixed-use buildings with active uses, such as cafes, restaurants, local-serving retail and person service uses, at-grade will be encouraged. c. New surface accessory parking lots and surface commercial parking lots are not permitted." We request clarification that employment uses, including industrial / warehouse uses with associated surface parking would continue to be permitted (in relation to Policy 2.2.112 that states "Employment and Mixed-Use Employment areas are important places for business and economic activities and comprise the City's "Employment Areas" as identified in the Region of Peel Official Plan. Employment areas will be protected and reserved for employment uses including manufacturing, warehousing, logistics, office, and associated commercial, retail and ancillary uses further described in this section" and Policy 2.2.113 "The Mixed-Use Employment designation may permit a broader range of uses on lands that provide a land use buffer as well as transition between Employment areas and Neighbourhoods. Development in Mixed-use Employment areas will front onto and provide address on arterial roads and Rapid Transit corridors to support the transit function of these corridors", whereby flexibility and clarity should be added as to permissions for employment uses.	Comment Addressed - existing permissions will continue. However, if they are within an overlay, redevelopment will require conformity with Brampton Plan. If lands are within an MTA in an employment area, the Mixed use Employment designation will prevail and continue to permit employment uses. The Mixed Use Employment has been updated as part of the second draft release, please review and provide comments if further clarity is required.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Voddan Street East (Centennial Mall)	2.2.7 c)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.7.c) directs that new surface accessory parking lots and surface commercial parking lots are not permitted on lands within Town Centres. In the case of the subject site it will contain surface parking in the interim and potentially long term development scenario, particularly if a grocery store is ultimately permitted on the lands. Proposed Policy Modification: Policy 2.2.7.c) to be modified to maintain new surface parking areas on a case-by-case basis when screened from a Corridor or Boulevard.	Comment received- Policy updated and modified to address the transition of mall sites.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.7	Requires Clarification	We request clarification that employment uses, including warehouse uses with associated surface parking (including trailer parking) in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO would continue to be permitted (in relation to Policy 2.2.112 that states "Employment and Mixed-Use Employment areas are important places for business and economic activities and comprise the City's "Employment Areas" as identified in the Region of Peel Official Plan. Employment areas will be protected and reserved for employment uses including manufacturing, warehousing, logistics, office, and associated commercial, retail and ancillary uses further described in this section" and Policy 2.2.113 "The Mixed-Use Employment designation may permit a broader range of uses on lands that provide a land use buffer as well as transition between Employment areas and Neighbourhoods. Development in Mixed-use Employment areas will front onto and provide address on arterial roads and Rapid Transit corridors to support the transit function of these corridors", whereby flexibility and clarity should be added as to permissions for employment uses.	Comment received- The Official Plan will not rezone sites
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Thielser on behalf of Horsgard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.7 (b)	Revision Requested	under the "Permitted Uses" section may create confusion and result in an interpretation that only mixed use buildings are permitted within Urban Centres given that single use buildings are not also listed as a permitted use. Note that Policy 2.2.26.b for Primary Urban Boulevards has similar language but specifically clarifies that single use buildings are permitted. We request clarification that single use buildings are permitted in Urban Centres and that Policy 2.2.7.b be updated to reflect same. Policies 2.2.26.b and 2.2.27.d indicate that single use buildings are not permitted along Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards within Urban Centres. BCC has a number of single use out-parcel buildings along Queen Street and Dote Road which are identified as Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards (respectively). These uses serve an important commercial function and are expected to operate for the foreseeable future. To ensure these uses can be reconfigured, upgraded and expanded, as needed we request that these policies be modified to be applicable to "new" single use buildings. It should also be clarified that, for large land holdings, only the portions of the property abutting the Boulevards are subject to the mixed use requirement. BCC is a 33 ha contiguous property. Only the portions of the property abutting the Boulevards should be subject to this policy as opposed to the entirety of the land holding.	Comment Addressed - Boulevards are contingent on MTSAs based on transit investment. The intent of the policy is that transportation uses will be directed to this area. Will have exceptions for areas similar to BCC based on the context. Staff reviewed section to create flexibility in this section in relation to Mixed Use Areas. Please review the updated draft for more information.

03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.7 (c)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.7.c indicates that new surface accessory parking lots and surface commercial lots are not permitted. Although the general reduction in the amount of surface parking in areas designated for intensification is common, there needs to be some flexibility in this policy to accommodate small accessory surface lots for new uses and to ensure existing operators of surface parking lots, such as BCC, can continue to operate and modify their sites as needed while they transition into more intensified areas over the long term. Small accessory surface lots serve an important function for commercial, office and residential development by providing convenient areas for short term customer parking and visitor parking. Although most parking for such uses can be located below grade or in a parking structure over time in order to use land efficiently, small surface lots provide an important function as short term parking.	Comment Addressed - Accessory parking is fundamental to parking associated to principle use of the site. To be improved through list of defined terms in glossary.
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.7 (c)	Revision Requested	More specifically, BCC also requires the flexibility to modify, relocate and replace buildings and parking areas on site. The BCC lands are approximately 33 ha in area with over 1.5 million square feet of commercial and office space. Flexibility is required to ensure that these uses can continue to function appropriately as the area redevelops into an intensified urban centre over the long term. Provision of sufficient and convenient parking is a critical consideration of bricks and mortar commercial and office tenants and thus the OP needs to ensure that surface parking at BCC can be configured as needed over time. The following policy should be added for BCC: "Notwithstanding Policy 2.2.7.c, on lands known as the Bramalea City Centre, bound by Queen Street East, Team Canada Way, Clark Boulevard and Dixie Road, new surface parking lots shall be permitted where they are the result of new development that requires the relocation, modification or re configuration of existing surface parking areas."	Comment addressed- Policy modified to recognize mall sites added.
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.9 indicates that "High-Rise / High-Rise Plus" are only permitted in the Urban Centres where they achieve a high level of design excellence and conformity with Urban Design policies. Table 4 indicates that "Tall / Tall Plus" may be permitted in Urban Centres subject to a "Precinct Plan study". We understand that the effect of Policy 2.2.9 and Table 4 is to prohibit any building greater than 12 storeys in Urban Centres until a Precinct Plan study has been completed. This is an overly restrictive policy for development within an intensification area. The OP should be revised to permit buildings greater than 12 storeys within Urban Centres with accompanying policies regarding a high standard of design and general conformity with urban design principles.	Comment Addressed - Removal of Tall Plus and keeping High-Rise and High-Rise Plus. The OP provides flexibility regarding heights and is not overly restrictive in its approach. The updated Table 4 identifies that High Rise buildings are allowed in Urban Centres
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.10	Requires Clarification	2.2.10 View corridors of what?	Comment received - What the view corridor terminates at is context sensitive, but generally anything significant within the community, including but not limited, heritage resources, amenity space/parks/ architecturally significant buildings, etc.
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.10	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.10 indicates that the evaluation of building height and form in Urban Centres will consider, among other things, visual impacts on lower scale Neighbourhoods. It is unclear what a visual impact on a lower scale Neighbourhood would constitute and whether this is indeed a relevant planning goal when considering a designation that is planned to achieve the highest level of density in the City. Policy 2.2.10 already lists relevant height and form-related criteria like access to sunlight, wind impacts and impacts on public spaces and heritage properties. Therefore, visual impact on a lower scale Neighbourhood should be removed as a criteria in the evaluation of building height and form.	Comment Addressed - Policy would only be applied to areas of transition - key word is lower scale neighbourhood. Staff to review and clarify language.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Guff Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.12	Requires Clarification	In our submission, flexibility should be added to the policy since recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community services may not be appropriate or applicable for employment uses within Centres.	In the long term, MTSAs may enable other uses within existing employment areas, as such the adequate provision of amenities will be required to accommodate residential and employment growth. Employment policy will prevail, until which time MTSAs studies are conducted.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.12	Requires Clarification	In our submission, flexibility should be added to the policy since recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community services may not be appropriate or applicable for employment uses within Centres.	In the long term, MTSAs may enable other uses within existing employment areas, as such the adequate provision of amenities will be required to accommodate residential and employment growth. Employment policy will prevail, until which time MTSAs studies are conducted.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaws Companies Limited (owner), 65 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 65 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.12	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.12 states "Growth and development will contribute to excitement, vibrancy, and a high quality of urban living within Centres by: ... c Offering a variety of formal and informal gathering spaces through the provision of recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community-led services." In our submission, flexibility should be added to the policy since recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community-led services may not be appropriate or applicable for all uses within Centres.	In the long term, MTSAs may enable other uses within existing employment areas, as such the adequate provision of amenities will be required to accommodate residential and employment growth. Employment policy will prevail, until which time MTSAs studies are conducted and will help to determine what is appropriate
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.15	Revision Requested	In our submission, flexibility should be added to the policy since a grid-pattern of public or private streets may not be appropriate in all circumstances, including for employment lands such as the Canadian Tire Lands where large warehouse buildings can be accommodated.	Comment received- Policy does not trump existing zoning permissions that enable a site plan application for employment lands.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.18	Requires Clarification	We request clarification that urban agriculture and green roofs will be encouraged and not required as part of the assessment of opportunities.	Comment received - Green roofs and urban agriculture are encouraged not required.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaws Companies Limited (owner), 65 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 65 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.18	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.18 states "Each Urban Centre and Town Centre will have a Secondary Plan that will: ... j Assess opportunities for green infrastructure including tree planting, stormwater management, urban agriculture, and green roofs." We request clarification that urban agriculture and green roofs will be encouraged and not required.	Comment received - Green roofs and urban agriculture are encouraged not required.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Guff Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.18 f	Requires Clarification	We request clarification that urban agriculture and green roofs will be encouraged and not required.	Comment received- Green roofs and urban agriculture are encouraged not required.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 2-38	Revision Requested	2-38 Town Centres should also be considered at Highway 10 & Bovard, and Airport and Bovard. At minimum Highway 10 & Bovard should be added immediately. In the long term, Higher Order Transit will be necessary on Bovard, and planning Town Centres at those nodes will help build up the relationship and intensification necessary to facilitate it. The City also needs to figure out what to do with Heart Lake Town Centre in the long term owing to its large size, and that it is at the intersection of two future Zum routes.	Comment received - The City of Brampton is bound by growth provisions allocated by the Region, and the investment of transit infrastructure by Metrolinx and the Province. At which time growth is allocated and investments in transit are made, MTSAs will be examined along these corridors to accommodate higher densities.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 2-39	Revision Requested	2-39 24/7 transit service is necessary to make Downtown Brampton a cultural, entertainment, and tourism hub. Poor evening and weekend transit service is hobbling the ability of those sectors to develop in Brampton, as they rely upon young people with discretionary income, young people with cars generally lack discretionary income, and young people who rely upon transit lack the means to get their car effectively (it is cheaper to take GO into Toronto than take an Uber/Lyft both ways within Brampton)	Comment received- transit investment is planned for both Queen St. and Main St and will help to support the creation of Downtown as a cultural hub.
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.23	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.23 indicates that new automobile-oriented uses are prohibited in Urban Centres. The term "automobile-oriented uses" should be clarified. This term should not include uses that require a significant amount of parking like large-format commercial uses such as the BCC shopping centre and its various outparcel buildings. If the City intends to consider such uses as "automobile-oriented uses", we request that an exception be added for BCC lands. BCC is a successful and thriving commercial centre and it is imperative that the OP provides a flexible policy framework so that BCC can continue to evolve with changes in commercial real estate and shopping trends. This is an especially important consideration given the impact of covid-19 on bricks and mortar shopping as well as the broader proliferation of online shopping.	Comment Addressed - Automobile-oriented uses are related to drive-throughs, etc. Secondary Plan level may allow for drive-through facilities in certain areas
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	2.2.23 (and 2.2.35)	Requires Clarification	Sections 2.2.23 and 2.2.35 speak to prohibiting new automobile-oriented uses and development in Centres and Boulevards. It is not clear what is meant by "new automobile-oriented" uses and development. This needs to be clarified before further comments on this section is provided	Comment addressed
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Guff Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.23	Requires Clarification	As "automobile-oriented uses" is not defined, we request clarification that employment uses such as warehousing are not considered "automobile-oriented uses"	Comment addressed
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Guff Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.23	Requires Clarification	Policies 2.2.23 states "New automobile-oriented uses and development forms are prohibited in Centres" and Policy 2.2.3.5 states "Along Boulevards, the Zoning By-law will prohibit new automobile-oriented land uses and development forms." We request clarification as to what is intended by "automobile-oriented uses"	Comment addressed- clarification as to how automobile-oriented is defined integrated into the policy. Existing permissions provided under the current ZBL and 2006 OP will continue if approval already provided.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.23	Requires Clarification	We request clarification as to what is intended by "automobile-oriented uses" as the term is not defined.	Comment addressed- policy updated
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaws Companies Limited (owner), 65 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 65 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.23	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.23 states "New automobile-oriented uses and development forms are prohibited in Centres" and Policy 2.2.3.5 states "Along Boulevards, the Zoning By-law will prohibit new automobile-oriented land uses and development forms." We request clarification as to what is intended by "automobile-oriented uses"	Comment addressed- policy updated
03-Jun-22	BILD	Sophie Lin	2.2.23	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.23 states "New automobile-oriented uses and development forms are prohibited in Centres" and Policy 2.2.3.5 states "Along Boulevards, the Zoning By-law will prohibit new automobile-oriented land uses and development forms." We request clarification as to what is intended by "automobile-oriented uses"	Comment addressed- policy updated
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.24	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.24 indicates that new surface accessory parking in new development will be prohibited above grade structures parking that doesn't face the street. Additionally, standstalls above grade parking structures will be prohibited. BCC currently contains two above grade parking structures which form an important part of the parking supply. Above grade parking structures will form an even more important part of the parking supply as BCC intensifies over the long term and there becomes an ever greater need to balance parking requirements for existing commercial uses with the redevelopment of existing surface lots for higher density uses. Public transit will play an increasingly important role in moving people to and from BCC over time. However, the automobile will continue to be an important transportation mode for people accessing BCC from the surrounding neighbourhoods and beyond and thus we request that BCC be exempt from this prohibition in order to facilitate its long term redevelopment. Should the City not provide such exemption, Policy 2.2.24 should be amended to prohibit "new" standstall parking structures which would allow existing structures to be reconfigured, upgraded and expanded as needed.	Comment Addressed - Staff working through changes based on comments from other stakeholders
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	2.2.24 (and 2.2.36)	Revision Requested	Sections 2.2.24 and 2.2.36 restrict all surface parking in Centres and Boulevards. We feel that this is very restrictive and difficult to implement since some surface parking is required (such as retail parking, lay-by parking, delivery/service parking). This section should be revised to state that parking will "mainly" be located underground.	Comment addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-46	Needs Discussion	2-46 Main Street between Downtown and Williams Parkway seems more suitably designated as a Primary Urban Boulevard than a Secondary one. What about the Bram West Parkway?	Comment received - The designation may change when there is more information regarding the LRT extension North of the Downtown. Bramwest Parkway will become designated pending the outcomes of the BramWest Secondary Plan review and the outcomes of the GTA West Corridor Study.

03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Menage (Queer) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.2.26 and 2.2.26 e)		Sections 2.2.26 e) and 2.2.36 restrict all surface parking in Boulevards (including within Primary Urban Boulevards). This is a restrictive policy and we believe that it may be difficult to implement, since there are instances where surface parking may be required (i.e., serving retail/commercial developments with parking, lay-by parking and delivery/service parking). We recommend that this section be revised to state that parking will "mainly be located underground."	Comment addressed
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.26	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.26 states "The following applies Primary Urban Boulevards shown on Schedule 2: ... b Single use buildings are permitted on portions of the Primary Urban Boulevard that are not within designated Centres. Mixed-use buildings will be encouraged." In our submission, "New" should be added before "Single Use" in order to clarify that existing single use buildings continue to be permitted. The same comment would be applicable to Policy 2.2.27 d. In addition, clarity should be provided that modestly sized single-use infill buildings should be permitted as interim development prior to long-term redevelopment. We note the introduction to Large-Scale Non-Residential Uses that states "Over time, existing large-scale non-residential uses will evolve to become mixed-use areas along Corridors and within Mixed-Use Districts", whereby there is a recognition that the short, medium and long-term must be considered.	Comment addressed to add "new". Comment received
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melaine Drive	2.2.27	Requires Clarification	In our submission, in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO, for part a, employment uses should be referenced and we request clarification that a warehouse building with an office component is not considered a "single use building" under part d. In our opinion, Policy 2.2.29 is concerning since it identifies considerations related to the evaluation to height and built form. Specifically, identifying "visual impacts on the Natural Heritage System" is concerning, since it does not identify how or what criteria would be used to address it. In our opinion, Policy 2.2.32 is overly prescriptive and gives additional authority to the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. In this regard, conformity with the guidelines should not be a requirement, since it is overly restrictive and does not provide flexibility, which is what guidelines are intended to do. In our opinion, a strict interpretation of the policy would require conformity with the guidelines and any variation would require an official plan amendment. In our opinion, this is overly prescriptive and does not allow for the intent of the guidelines to be maintained, which includes, in some circumstances, variations from the guidelines.	Comment received - The policy would not adversely affect the existing uses of the Site, or the underlying employment designation of the site.
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Mustafa Ghassan on behalf of Lark Investments Inc. (10 and 25 Victoria Crescent, 376, 387 and 391 Orenda Road, and 24 Bramalea Road)	2.2.29-2.2.32	Revision Requested	2.2.30 Some of the transition between the Boulevards and Neighbourhoods should happen in the Neighbourhoods, for example the transition between the Kennedy Road Boulevard and Peel Village can happen between the Boulevard and Bartley Bull. The angular plane Toronto requires has major negative impacts on the cost of housing and environmental performance.	Comment received- this transition through support corridor policies that allow up to 4 storeys will help to build in this transition within Neighbourhoods.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.30	Revision Requested	2.2.30 - New development within Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will have regard for the existing character and built form of adjacent Neighbourhoods, where they are located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, and provide transition in accordance with the design policies of this Plan.	Words "lower density" added before neighbourhoods - regardless of whether a Neighbourhood is in within a Centre or an MTA, development should have regard for transitions and character of stable areas. Stable Neighbourhoods will be identified through the respective Secondary and precinct plans.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amazon Development Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	2.2.30	Revision Requested	2.30 - New development within Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will have regard for the existing character and built form of adjacent Neighbourhoods, where they are located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, and provide transition in accordance with the design policies of this Plan.	Words "lower density" added before neighbourhoods - regardless of whether a Neighbourhood is in within a Centre or an MTA, development should have regard for transitions and character of stable areas. Stable Neighbourhoods will be identified through the respective Secondary and precinct plans.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amazon Development Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.2.30	Revision Requested	2.2.30 - New development within Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will have regard for the existing character and built form of adjacent Neighbourhoods, where they are located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, and provide transition in accordance with the design policies of this Plan.	Words "lower density" added before neighbourhoods - regardless of whether a Neighbourhood is in within a Centre or an MTA, development should have regard for transitions and character of stable areas. Stable Neighbourhoods will be identified through the respective Secondary and precinct plans.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amazon Development Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.2.30	Revision Requested	2.2.30 - New development within Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will have regard for the existing character and built form of adjacent Neighbourhoods, where they are located outside of the Urban Growth Centre, Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, and provide transition in accordance with the design policies of this Plan.	Words "lower density" added before neighbourhoods - regardless of whether a Neighbourhood is in within a Centre or an MTA, development should have regard for transitions and character of stable areas. Stable Neighbourhoods will be identified through the respective Secondary and precinct plans.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.32	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.32 states "Development along either side of Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will achieve a high level of design excellence ... to ... b Define the distinct character of the street and street edge. ... i Offer a variety of formal and informal gathering spaces through the provision of recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community-led spaces." In our submission, for part b, flexibility should be added to account for site context, grades and operational aspects as it relates to defining the street edge; for part i, flexibility should be added since the provision of recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community-led services may not be appropriate or applicable for retail uses.	Comment received - Items to be addressed through secondary planning. B has been removed, with i remaining. Clarification on how additional flexibility is required.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melaine Drive	2.2.32	Revision Requested	In our submission, in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO, for part a, employment uses should be referenced and we request clarification that a warehouse building with an office component is not considered a "single use building" under part d.	The policy would not adversely affect the existing uses of the Site, or the underlying employment designation of the site.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.34	Revision Requested	2.2.34 What about Accessible Parking?	Comment addressed
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.35		Policy 2.2.35 states "Along Boulevards, the Zoning By-law will prohibit new automobile-oriented land uses and development forms." We request clarification as to what is intended by "automobile-oriented land uses and development forms" and in our submission, modestly sized infill buildings should be permitted as interim development prior to long-term redevelopment.	Comment addressed- Automobile oriented land uses refers to drive throughs and gas bars. Definition provided in glossary
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.35	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.35 states "Along Boulevards, the Zoning By-law will prohibit new automobile-oriented land uses and development forms." We request clarification as to what is intended by "automobile-oriented land uses and development forms" and in our submission, modestly sized infill buildings should be permitted as interim development prior to long-term redevelopment.	Comment addressed- Automobile oriented land uses refers to drive throughs and gas bars. Definition provided in glossary
03-Jun-22	BILD	Sophie Lin	2.2.35	Requires Clarification	Section 2.2.35: The term "automobile-oriented uses" is not a defined term; it is unclear which types of uses are encompassed within it.	Comment addressed- Automobile oriented land uses refers to drive throughs and gas bars. Definition provided in glossary
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.36	2.2.36	Policy 2.2.36 for Boulevards states "Where new development includes parking as an accessory use, such parking will be located underground or, if within the principal building, not fronting a public street. Stand alone above-grade parking garages will not be permitted." In our submission, flexibility should be added for uses that are not conducive operationally for parking underground or within the principal building and to accommodate modestly sized infill buildings and expansions to existing buildings prior to long-term redevelopment.	Comment addressed - flexibility has been added to the policy.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melaine Drive	2.2.36	Revision Requested	In our submission, flexibility should be added for lands with an employment designation along Boulevards, where uses such as manufacturing and warehousing are not conducive operationally for parking underground or within the principal building. We note Policy 2.2.131 for Employment Areas that speaks to integrating development into the Mobility Network to help minimize the need for surface parking as opposed to removing permissions for surface parking completely.	Comment received- The policy would not adversely affect the existing uses of the site, or the underlying employment designation of the site. The policy identifies this is applicable for new development.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.36	Requires Clarification	In our submission, flexibility should be added for lands with an employment designation, where uses such as manufacturing and warehousing are not conducive operationally for parking underground or within the principal building and to accommodate modestly sized infill buildings and expansions to existing buildings prior to long-term redevelopment.	Comment received- The policy would not adversely affect the existing uses of the site, or the underlying employment designation of the site.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-53		2.53 Zum is not rapid transit. "And Steeles?" seems like a sentence fragment left over from a draft, but yes, we absolutely need to be planning rapid transit along Steeles, the 511 will in within 5 years connect 2 GO Stations on two different GO lines, one of which will have frequent all day train service, two Post Secondary Institutions with over 10k students each, and two LRTs.	Comment received- Brampton Transportation staff have supported the updating of definitions in alignment with provincial definitions
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.39(b)	Requires Clarification	2.2.39(b) Frequent transit can and should be provisioned across the city, and development not just limited to Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors should have regard for this.	Comment received - Schedule 3b provides additional support to ensure that where frequent transit routes have been identified, transit service development has been encouraged along these corridors
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.40		Policy 2.2.40 states "Where development is proposed within a Corridor, provided that ... d Where a Secondary Plan or Precinct Plan defines a Corridor differently, the boundaries in the Secondary Plan will prevail. e Where the Corridor overlay applies to a Boulevard, the Boulevard policies will prevail" and Policy 2.2.41 states "All underlying Neighbourhood or Employment designations will be permitted along Corridors." Policy 2.2.42 states "Where development is proposed within a Mixed-Use District, the permitted For the Canadian Tire Lands shown on Schedule 2 as Employment, in proximity to a Town Centre, with the Steeles Avenue East frontage shown as Corridors and Secondary Urban Boulevard, where the lands are within the boundary of the Primary Major Transit Station Area (with the exception of the lands known municipally as 10 and 12 Melaine Drive) in our submission, the layers of designations, overlays and policies should be simplified in order to ease interpretation of the applicable policies in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO.	Comment Addressed - Removal of overlapping corridor designations to provide clarity
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melaine Drive	2.2.40	Revision Requested	In our submission, flexibility should be added for lands with an employment designation along Boulevards, where uses such as manufacturing and warehousing are not conducive operationally for parking underground or within the principal building. We note Policy 2.2.131 for Employment Areas that speaks to integrating development into the Mobility Network to help minimize the need for surface parking as opposed to removing permissions for surface parking completely.	Comment Addressed - Underlying designation (Employment) stands. The Overlays signal the opportunity to move in a different land use direction and would assist in integrating non-employment uses, subject to the outcome of the MTA study. MTA section outlines process for conversions and City's intention to protect employment lands.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.40	Requires Clarification	In our submission, flexibility should be added for lands with an employment designation, where uses such as manufacturing and warehousing are not conducive operationally for parking underground or within the principal building and to accommodate modestly sized infill buildings and expansions to existing buildings prior to long-term redevelopment.	Comment Addressed - Removal of overlapping corridor designations to provide clarity
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.40(c)	Requires Clarification	2.2.40(c) wording is ambiguous on how it will affect a parallel street, if a lot has dual frontage.	Comment addressed
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.45		Policy 2.2.45 states "Within the Corridor overlay, development will ... d Ensure that mixed-use development is established from the Corridor to nearby streets. e Where the site is a large lot: i Establish an enhanced circulation network through the site that prioritizes the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. ii Build phases closest to the Corridor prior to the development of phases located at the rear of the site. iii Be prohibited from including functions or uses likely to cause nuisance due to noise, odour, dust, fumes, vibration, radiation, glare, or high levels of truck traffic." In our submission, flexibility should be provided in the policy by adding "where appropriate" after "development will" in order to account for site context and operational aspects.	Comment addressed
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melaine Drive	2.2.45	Revision Requested	In our submission, in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO, flexibility should be provided in the policy by adding "where appropriate" after "development will" in order to account for site context, operational aspects and the need to accommodate employment uses such as warehouses along corridors that are part of the goods movement network (where truck traffic is anticipated).	Comment addressed
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.45	Requires Clarification	In our submission, flexibility should be provided in the policy by adding "where appropriate" after "development will" in order to account for site context, operational aspects and the need to accommodate employment and retail uses such as warehouses and large commercial retail stores along corridors.	Comment addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.48	Revision Requested	2.2.48 Repease to "Reduced or eliminated" to clarify that the parking requirements being reduced to zero are explicitly considered as part of the OP?	Comment addressed
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melaine Drive	2.2.49 and 2.2.50	Revision Requested	In our submission, in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO, clarity should be provided for Mixed-Use Districts with Employment Designations on Schedule 5 that employment uses are permitted.	Comment Addressed - MZO currently has no standing and will not be reflected in current iteration of Brampton Plan. Revised Mixed-Use Employment policies identify the permission of Employment uses in Mixed-Use Areas.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.49	Requires Clarification	In our submission, clarity should be provided for Mixed-Use Districts and Employment Designations on Schedule 5 that employment uses are permitted.	Comment addressed- revisions have been made to clarify Schedule 5 and how the designations and overlays work. Please review second draft for more information.

2022/06/03	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of Bovard Commercial Centre Ltd. Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountanash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	Schedule 5 – Designations, of the draft Official Plan, designates the subject property as "Mixed-Use Districts" which is governed by proposed policy 2.2.50. This policy states that Mixed-Use Districts permit a "broad range of residential, retail, service, office, cultural, institutional, hospitality, recreational and other related uses." b Mixed-use buildings, with retail and service uses at-grade, with residential and non-service office uses directed to the rear of buildings and upper floors. We request that the development of a multi-unit residential building that provides for a mix of commercial and office uses exclusively, at grade and on upper floors, not be precluded from development in this land use designation. There needs to be flexibility incorporated into this policy such that retail and service uses are also permitted on upper floors and non-service office uses are also permitted at-grade.	Comment addressed- please review the updated Mixed-use Area policy section for review.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Loblaws Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.50	Requires Clarification	In our submission, for a clarity should be provided for Mixed-Use Districts with Employment Designations on Schedule 5 that employment uses are permitted, while for 'b' generally' should be added before 'directed to' in order to provide flexibility to accommodate site context and operational needs.	Comment addressed - please review updated draft policies.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd		2.2.50		Policy 2.2.50 states "Within Mixed-Use Districts as shown on Schedule 5, the following range of uses may be permitted: b Mixed-Use Buildings, with retail and service uses at grade, with residential and non-service office uses directed to the rear of buildings and to upper floors." In our submission, for 'b' generally' should be added before 'directed to' in order to provide flexibility to accommodate site context and operational needs.	Revised Comment received- please review updated draft with relevant definitions that help to clarify the categorization of transit in Brampton.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-58	Revision Requested	2-58 ZUM is not BRT	Comment received- please review updated draft with relevant definitions that help to clarify the categorization of transit in Brampton.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.59	Requires Clarification	2.2.59 This says that new Primary MTSAs may only be added via MCR by the Region of Peel. does this mean the City of Brampton may add Planned MTSAs to the OP personally, instead of implementing it on behalf of the Region of the Peel? If this is intended, that is good, there are several locations where the City marking and beginning to plan for MTSAs is good, such as along the Primary Urban Boulevard for Steeles. Additional points at the Heart Lake Town Centre (Kennedy & Sandalwood), Highway 10 & Bovard, and Main & Voddon also make sense	Comment received. MTSAs will be added through the MCR Process by the Region of Peel.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Musque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.62 a.	Requires Clarification	This policy is also reflected in many other policies however we are unclear how exactly a 15-minute community will work. As an example, in many instances in large communities a school is used as a focal point within that community. In some cases, the school board after ten years decides not to pick up the option on the school block and it becomes developed for other purposes, typically residential uses. In this example, the intent of the 15-minute community was created and yet ultimately the end result is typically out of the developer's hands if these public uses ultimately are constructed. In addition, it would be unfair for the City to require the developer to construct the school block for something other than residential uses if the school board decides not to purchase the school block. This is just one example of how, in some cases the 15-minute community will be difficult to achieve.	Comment received. Secondary plans and precinct plans will endeavour to achieve the 15min neighbourhood, however in these instances, where it not feasible to create a focal point to achieve the 15min neighbourhood, there would be no obligation. This is an aspiration to achieve this within the 2051 planning horizon. Neighbourhood Centres, identified through subsequent planning studies will also help to deliver these 15-minute neighbourhoods.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 7927959 Canada Corp. (9610 McLaughlin Road)	2.2.64	Revision Requested	It appears that the policy at the bottom of Page 2-33 and Section 2.2.64 are not complete policies. It seems that both are missing the list of designations/overlays and criteria for development in 'new' Neighbourhoods. Both policies need to be corrected and reissued to the public for review and comment before they can be advanced to Council for approval	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga Queen Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	2.2.64	Revision Requested	The policy at the bottom of Page 2-33 as well as Section 2.2.64 are not complete policies. It seems that both are missing the list of designations/overlays and criteria for development in 'new' Neighbourhoods. Both policies need to be corrected and reissued to the public for review and comment before they can be advanced to Council for approval	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.2.64	Requires Clarification	It appears that the policy at the bottom of Page 2-33 and Section 2.2.64 are not complete policies. It seems that both are missing the list of designations/overlays and criteria for development in 'new' Neighbourhoods. Both policies need to be corrected and reissued to the public for review and comment before they can be advanced to Council for approval	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 2765321 Ontario Inc. (11860 and 0 Bramalea Road)	2.2.64	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.64 does not appear to be a complete policy. It is missing the list of designation/overlays and criteria for development of 'new' Neighbourhoods. The policy needs to be corrected and re-issued for public review and comment before it can be advanced to Council for approval	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of Rotary Club of Brampton Glen Community Centre (1857 Queen Street West)	2.2.64	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.64 does not appear to be a complete policy. It is missing the list of designation/overlays and criteria for development of 'new' Neighbourhoods. The policy needs to be corrected and re-issued for public review and comment before it can be advanced to Council for approval.	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of 1905372 Ontario Inc. (10785, 10799, 10807, 10817 McLaughlin Road North)	2.2.64	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.64 does not appear to be a complete policy. It is missing the list of designation/overlays and criteria for development of 'new' Neighbourhoods. The policy needs to be corrected and re-issued for public review and comment before it can be advanced to Council for approval.	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Creditview 4 P Holding Inc. (Owner of 7614, 7624, 7650 and 7662 Creditview Road)	2.2.64	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.64 does not appear to be a complete policy. It is missing the list of designation/overlays and criteria for development of 'new' Neighbourhoods. The policy needs to be corrected and re-issued for public review and comment before it can be advanced to Council for approval.	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd and GSAL	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	2.2.64	Requires Clarification	Section 2.2.64 is not a complete policy that seems to be missing the list of criteria for development in new Neighbourhoods. This needs to be corrected before further comments on this section is provided.	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Claireville Holdings Limited (owner)	2.2.64	Revision Requested	It appears that the policy at the bottom of Page 2-33 and Section 2.2.64 are not complete policies. It seems that both are missing the list of designations/overlays and criteria for development in 'new' Neighbourhoods. Both policies need to be corrected and reissued to the public for review and comment before they can be advanced to Council for approval.	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Surinder Math (owner), 3407 Courtyards Drive	2.2.64 and Page 2-33	Revision Requested	It appears that the policy at the bottom of Page 2-33 and Section 2.2.64 are not complete policies. It seems that both are missing the list of designations/overlays and criteria for development in 'new' Neighbourhoods. Both policies need to be corrected and reissued to the public for review and comment before they can be advanced to Council for approval.	Comment addressed - please see revised policies.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaws Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands tot he south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.68		Policy 2.2.68 states "Where development is being considered at the intersection of two streets of different typologies, development will be oriented toward the higher-order street. Access may be provided from the lower-order street." We request clarification that access may be provided by both the higher-order and lower-order streets.	Comment received- updated language to clarify intent that access should be provided from the lower-order street
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd		2.2.68	Requires Clarification	We request clarification that access may be provided by both the higher-order and lower-order streets.	Comment received- updated language to clarify intent that access should be provided from the lower-order street
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-69	Revision Requested	2-69 I have no idea why it is labelled as 1.3.181. c) 26 Smea Ave. and 33 Erlesmere Ave are fine actually, even though they clearly have notable differences in height, massing, etc., that is what is needed if we want to address our housing crisis. f) A bunch of this is bad, for example, many areas have the building set back a significant distance from the road in order to allow a lot of cars to be parked, that is bad and buildings should be allowed to be brought much closer to the street.	Comment received - formatting labels updated. Heights have been identified through Table 4 to clarify intentions for how to best integrate density into the city. Gentle densification in the city will be promoted in neighbourhoods, based on the existing physical context.
03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Katie Plandy on behalf of 375 Clark LTD (owners), 375 Clark Blvd	2.2.85	Revision Requested	Proposed policy 2.2.85 indicates that permitted densities will be primarily determined through policies regulating the built form of buildings permitted on the site. These regulations will be implemented through the City of Brampton's comprehensive zoning by-law, which is expected to be released in draft form in Q1 of 2023. Proposed policy 2.2.87 indicates that the primary building type permitted within neighbourhoods will be that which is supportive of ground-oriented dwelling forms, with the exception of those locations which are located within mixed-use districts and corridors. As the subject property is located along Bramalea Road, which is a corridor, the subject property is not subject to this provision. We kindly request that stronger policies be included within the Official Plan to indicate that high-density uses shall be permitted along corridors.	Comment received - the location of this property looks to be located on a Secondary urban boulevard. Through the heights framework outlined in Brampton Plan, higher densities are permitted than the Neighbourhoods section. Please refer to the opening section of 2.2/ Table 4.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon, Richard Domes and Nikhal Dawan on behalf of Zia Mohammad and Shamyia Hameed (8671 Heritage Road)	2.2.87	Revision Requested	2.2.87 - Predominantly ground-oriented dwelling forms will be directed to locations in Neighbourhoods outside of Mixed-Use Districts and Corridors, however, Mid-Rise dwelling forms will be permitted at select locations.	Comment received - the general heights framework outlined through Table 4 identify key locations for mid-rise developments to support the urban form outlined in the City Structure. Appropriate locations will be evaluated, as this framework provides a general heights approach across the city to provide flexibility.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon, Richard Domes and Nikhal Dawan on behalf of Zia Mohammad and Shamyia Hameed (8671 Heritage Road)	2.2.88	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.88 identifies that "Rear lotting will be prohibited in new Neighbourhoods. Noise walls that are required to protect amenity areas, as defined by Provincial guidelines, will be avoided in the design of new Neighbourhoods." Proposed Policy Modification: Policy 2.2.88 should be deleted as this is a detailed design matter that is inflexible and shall be determined on a case by case basis as part of a Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Approval	Comment received- maintain as this is limited to new community areas, which should not be designed in this manner.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.89	Needs Discussion	2.2.89 If affordability is actually a priority, you are going to need to accept that a redeveloped building having 2-3x the floor space of nearby buildings is fine.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.93	Revision Requested	2.2.93(e) specify that this may include zero additional off street motor vehicle parking, in infill tower development in areas with good transit, there may not be a need to include any additional parking spaces.	Comment received.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Loblaws Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands tot he south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.102		Policy 2.2.102 states "Secondary Plans will identify appropriate locations for large-scale non-residential uses." In our submission, "new" should be added before "large-scale non-residential uses" in order to clarify that existing uses are permitted"	Comment addressed.

03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountannah Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.102	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.102 states "Secondary Plans will identify appropriate locations for largescale non-residential uses." In our submission, "new" should be added before "large-scale non-residential uses" in order to clarify that existing uses are permitted.	Comment addressed
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountannah Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.103	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.103 states "Where a new large-scale non-residential use is proposed within the Neighbourhood designation, the following criteria will apply: ... The use is suitable to be located in the Neighbourhood designation and does not otherwise belong within a Mixed-Use District or Mixed-Use Employment designation or along a Corridor. New large-scale residential uses will not be permitted within Centres and Primary Urban Boulevards." We request clarification as to what is intended by "suitable" and "does not otherwise belong", as well as to whether large retail stores such as food stores within mixed-use developments would be interpreted as "large-scale non-residential" uses.	Comment addressed - suitable has been clarified. Food stores/grocery is able to be in mixed-use developments, but would need to comply with the form based policies in accordance with Centres and Boulevards.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.2.103	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.103 states "Where a new large-scale non-residential use is proposed within the Neighbourhood designation, the following criteria will apply: ... a Use is suitable to be located in the Neighbourhood designation and does not otherwise belong within a Mixed-Use District or Mixed-Use Employment designation or along a Corridor. New large-scale residential uses will not be permitted within Centres and Primary Urban Boulevards." We request clarification as to what is intended by "suitable" and "does not otherwise belong", as well as to whether large retail stores such as food stores within mixed-use developments would be interpreted as "large-scale non-residential" uses.	Clarify terminology 'new vs 'non' residential uses. Grocery stores will not be interpreted as large-scale non-res uses'
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.104(b)		2.2.104(b) compatibility of religious buildings with the surrounding neighbourhood is a problematic concept, because traditionally, outside of a CBD, places of worship are the largest things in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, there should also be specific provision for something such as a tower to be significantly taller, as this is a feature of traditional religious architecture in North America. You should be able to build something like St. Paul's United Church (across from City Hall) under the new rules, otherwise, we are creating a de facto discriminatory system where faiths and denominations which are more typical among newcomers are disadvantaged compared to those that have been present for a long time, and have existing excess of worship.	Comment received- this will be considered through the co-design process between the applicant and planning staff. Consideration for equity and inclusion is integral to ensuring planning in Brampton is not discriminatory.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group	2.2.115	Revision Requested	"th" before "intended" should be removed. In addition, what is a "copy shop"?	Comment addressed - removed wording and clarified print shop to support readability
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonit Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.2.117	Revision Requested	2.2.117 - Existing clusters of office are designated Employment in this Plan, reflecting City, Regional and Provincial objectives to retain these areas as places of business while developing and intensifying job growth, especially when these areas are supported by transit. Where office uses are located within a Major Transit Station Area and are designated Mixed-Use Districts, the implementing planning framework will seek to retain existing office in support of creating complete, walkable communities centered around transit.	Comment received - the reference to "existing" in the policy is referring to the current office clusters and how they are designated in Brampton Plan. In the 2006 OP, there was a major office designation, and this "existing clusters..." section helps to identify what we are referring to in relation to the previous OP.
June 2/22	Dentons Canada LLP	Katryna Verga-Mayo on behalf of CNR Company (owner)	2.2.119 and 2.2.120	Revision Requested	Suggest moving current policies from the Permitted Employment Uses section to Land Use Compatibility section (beginning at Policy 2.2.103).	Comment received - the designations and permitted uses for specific areas in the city are located in Chapter 2 of draft Brampton Plan. The policies in the Building Blocks are more general policies that apply city-wide. Permitted uses will remain in the same location in Chapter 2 to reflect the same formatting as other sections in Brampton Plan.
07-Jun-22	MHBC	Debra Walker and Mariusz Jastrzebski on behalf of Patel Land and Development Limited, 5333 Mississauga Road, Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.122-2.2.124	Revision Requested	That the Mixed-Use Employment policies of Section 2.2.122-2.124 be revised to make it explicitly clear that major office uses are a permitted use within this designation along a Corridor, where such uses are permitted by current designations policies. Major office uses, with retail on the ground floor, are appropriate land uses within the proposed Mixed-Use Employment designation along a Corridor given their ability to support the City's higher order transit corridors and as an appropriate transitional use to adjacent Neighbourhood designations uses.	Comment addressed - the Mixed Use Employment Section has been updated to make it clear that Major Office is the predominant use in these locations.
30-May-22	KLM	Gerry Tchalar on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.122	Requires Clarification	Mixed Use Employment areas do not include residential uses as a permitted use, yet the designation along the east side of Mississauga Road has mixed use development (commercial on the ground floor with residential above) along with residential uses. This should be included as a permitted use.	Comment received - Mixed-Use Employment, where it is located in an MTA, will be subject to further planning studies to determine if sensitive land uses are permitted. Existing subjects, if already granted, will continue for a site under the new OP.
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchalar on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.123	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.123 indicates that new retail developments that include one or more stores totaling 3,000 square metres or more of retail gross floor or 1,000 square metres for individual units may only be permitted in the Mixed-Use Employment designation through an amendment to the OP and subject to certain criteria. The 410 /Steeles Lands contain an existing shopping centre which is almost fully built out. A policy should be added that recognizes existing shopping centres and ensures their ability to expand and evolve subject to Policy 2.2.123.	Comment Addressed - intent is to attract more mixed use development for particular area. Staff to review policies for policy
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountannah Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr	2.2.126	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.126 states "Within areas of the Mixed-Use Employment designation where a Major Transit Station Area Study has been completed and approved through an amendment to this Plan, in accordance with the policies of Chapter 3 of Brampton Plan, compatible new residential uses that do not conflict with the main employment use may be permitted outside of a subsequent Municipal Comprehensive Review process, and subject to other relevant policies of this Plan." In our submission clarity should be provided as to what is intended by "main employment use".	Comment received - Mixed-Use Employment Areas are key locations in the city where employment has been the predominant use. It is the intent that in these location stay predominantly employment (50% or more), with the potential that non-employment uses only be introduced subject to the findings of the MTA study.
20-Jun-22	Altus Group	Danyel Keleher on behalf of KLM Planning	2.2.126-2.2.127	Revision Requested	Steeles MTA: - Based on the MTA size of 53.7 hectares, and a planned minimum density of 160 persons and jobs per hectare, the area would require at least 8,055 persons and jobs; - A 50/50 split would mean 4,028 persons and 4,028 jobs; - Assuming a PPU of 1.94 persons per unit (based on the City's 2019 DC Study), this would equate to 1,933 residential units being required; - Assuming that the mix of jobs is 50% office-sector and 10% retail/commercial, and based on the Floor Space per Worker (FSW) factors of 248 square feet (sf) per office job and 538 sf per retail job, this would equate to approximately 897,400 square feet of office space and approximately 216,800 square feet of retail space; The language of the policy that the 50% employment share is to be identified and maintained' may give cause to limit residential development until such time that the necessary quantum of non-residential development is ready to proceed with more residential development. However, as will be discussed later, the market for non-residential uses may be limited and tying residential development to prospective nonresidential development may slow the development of the area as a whole unnecessarily. Tying the development of much-needed new housing to the ability of the office market and retail market to absorb the amount of space required to generate the needed jobs to meet the minimum 50% share that jobs are to comprise of total persons and jobs in the MTA is extremely problematic. Given the uncertainty within the office market in particular, if increased work from home obviates the need for significant amount of office development, the City's overly rigid draft policy may needlessly stifle residential development from proceeding. For context, at the minimum densities (160 persons and jobs per hectare), and the 50/50 split, with 90% of jobs being office would require 957,200 square feet of office space. As of 2022, the City of Brampton as a whole (as per Altus Group data) had roughly 3.3 million square feet of office space. The amount being planned for in the MTA alone would equate to a nearly 25% increase in the City's office market alone. Given that many other MTAs in the City will have similar requirements for office space, and other general City goals to add office spaces in places such as Downtown Brampton, the Hurontario corridor, GO stations, and employment areas, the Mississauga Road MTA will be competing against numerous other	Comment received- the policy has been updated as part of the second draft revisions of Brampton Plan. Please review updated numbers. To clarify, the City is undertaking precinct plan studies of each of the delineated MTAs in Brampton to determine the appropriate permitted uses and planned function for the geographic area. Brampton Plan sets high-level directions for these locations, with further analysis and studies determining specific appropriate permissions. Identification of how this target is to be achieved to be identified as part of the MTA study.
20-Jun-22	Altus Group	Danyel Keleher on behalf of KLM Planning	2.2.126-2.2.127	Revision Requested	The City of Brampton's draft Official Plan, policy 2.2.127 states that Mixed-Use Employment Areas within a Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) are to be planned to contribute to 15-minute neighbourhoods by maintaining a minimum ratio of 50% employment and 50% population.	Comment received- the policy has been updated as part of the second draft revisions of Brampton Plan. Please review updated numbers. To clarify, the City is undertaking precinct plan studies of each of the delineated MTAs in Brampton to determine the appropriate permitted uses and planned function for the geographic area. Brampton Plan sets high-level directions for these locations, with further analysis and studies determining specific appropriate permissions. Identification of how this target is to be achieved to be identified as part of the MTA study.
20-Jun-22	Altus Group	Danyel Keleher on behalf of KLM Planning	2.2.126-2.2.127	Requires Clarification	Beyond the poorly worded policy provision (what is meant by 'identified' or what is meant by 'maintained?'), it is also unclear whether the policy applies only to MUEs that require a Major Transit Station Area Study. The City needs to rationalize the 50/50 target and ensure that what is being asked in this and the other DGA MTAs (such as Mount Pleasant and Heritage Heights), as well as anticipated growth in other office nodes in the City's designated greenfield area don't lead to unrealistic expectations about the office and retail markets to absorb the quantity of space being planned for (including infrastructure planning) so that urbanized lands with services and higher-order transit services are unnecessarily left vacant over the longterm waiting for market demand to catch-up with the scale of jobs baked into City policies. Contributing infrastructure (including transit) to lands that may take 1+ years to build-out (optimistically) is not an efficient use of existing and planned public investments in infrastructure. The City's recommended minimum share of employment in the Mixed-Use Employment MTAs should be right-sized to ensure that the minimum density targets are achieved through a mix of persons and jobs that reflect the City's planning forecasts, to ensure that the planning amount of population and employment is achievable in a timely manner so as to optimize the use of and (help provide capital and operational funding to pay for) planned infrastructure investments in the subject MTA, but also other affected MTAs and elsewhere in the City.	Comment received- the policy has been updated as part of the second draft revisions of Brampton Plan. Please review updated numbers. To clarify, the City is undertaking precinct plan studies of each of the delineated MTAs in Brampton to determine the appropriate permitted uses and planned function for the geographic area. Brampton Plan sets high-level directions for these locations, with further analysis and studies determining specific appropriate permissions. Identification of how this target is to be achieved to be identified as part of the MTA study. Sensitive uses, such as residential will only be to be integrated into employment areas subject to the findings of a MTA study. The policy only applies to the target in Mixed Use Employment Areas that are in a delineated MTA.
20-Jun-22	Altus Group	Danyel Keleher on behalf of KLM Planning	2.2.126-2.2.127	Requires Clarification		

2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonel Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.2.126	Needs Discussion	We note our understanding that the mixed-use Employment designation on the draft Brampton Plan (which is separate to the Mixed-Use Districts designation) permits a broad range of non-residential uses as well as limited opportunities for residential uses within MTSA's subject to the adjacent context and applicable policy for the MTSA area (Page 2-80). More specifically Policy 2.2.126 of the draft Brampton Plan directs that lands designated Mixed-Use Employment and located within an MTSA may permit compatible residential uses. Subject to consultation with the City of Brampton and/or Region of Peel, Sonel reserves the right to make additional comments regarding the draft schedules and policies of the Brampton Plan as they relate to the Mixed-Use Employment	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrille Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Boward Dr	2.2.127	Requires Clarification	In order to provide for additional flexibility for site context and operational needs, we suggest that "where possible" be moved to before "Parking is integrated"	Comment received- the where possible is referring to the parking underground, otherwise it should be located behind or at the side of the new building
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.127 f	Requires Clarification	In the context of our comment for Policy 2.2.126 for Boulevards as noted above, we note the flexibility under Policy 2.2.127.f with the "where possible" language. In order to provide for additional flexibility for site context and operational needs, we suggest that "where possible" be moved to before "Parking is integrated"	Comment received- the where possible is referring to the parking underground, otherwise it should be located behind or at the side of the new building
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.129	Requires Clarification	We request clarification that service commercial uses are permitted where there is no abutting neighbourhood and that service commercial uses are not required with the "will" language.	Comment Addressed - clarify the "will" with the requirement of service commercial uses. Updated to make general in intent
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrille Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Boward Dr	2.2.129	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.129 states "Service commercial uses will be located along the edge of the Mixed-Use Employment designation abutting Neighbourhoods." We request clarification that service commercial uses are permitted where there is no abutting neighbourhood and that service commercial uses are not required with the "will" language.	Comment Addressed - clarify the "will" with the requirement of service commercial uses Updated to make general in intent
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.131	Requires Clarification	In our submission: for part f, "where possible" should be added before "avoiding parking between" in order to provide for flexibility to account for site context and operational needs, for part o, flexibility should be added for open storage (including trailer parking) for warehousing uses by adding "As appropriate," before "limited in extent"	Comment received - where possible is already in the policy. The second caveat has been updated and added to the policy.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrille Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Boward Dr	2.2.131	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.131 states "Development will contribute to the creation of competitive, attractive, highly functional Employment and Mixed-Use Employment Areas by: ... If providing adequate parking and loading on-site where appropriate and avoiding parking between the building and sidewalk" In our submission: for part f, "where possible" should be added before "avoiding parking between" in order to provide for flexibility to account for site context and operational needs.	Comment received - where possible is already in the policy.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.2.141	Requires Clarification	In our submission "will be considered" should be changed to "may be considered" in order to clarify that the practices are not requirements.	Comment Addressed
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Hary Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrille Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Boward Dr	2.2.141	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.2.141 states "Green development practices that will be considered in the design of developments in Employment Areas include: ...". In our submission "will be considered" should be changed to "may be considered" in order to clarify that the practices are not requirements.	Comment Addressed
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.141	Revision Requested	This policy is very prescriptive and should encourage green development initiatives instead of prescribing it.	Comment received - ensuring green development practices are incorporated into new development/development is a key priority. How this is accomplished has been updated to provide flexibility for implementation.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.144(a)	Revision Requested	2.2.144(a) Industrial uses would significantly benefit from improved transit service in the evening, facilitating afternoon and night shifts, however economic development benefits are assessed as worthless by Brampton Transit	Comment received - this comment has been shared with Brampton Transit.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 1327959 Canada Corp. (9610 McLaughlin Road)	2.2.146	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.146 speaks to the determination of the precise boundaries of the Natural Heritage System on a site-specific basis in consultation with the Conservation Authorities. Refinements to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) should not require an OPA if refined through a Subwatershed Study, an area-specific Environmental Impact Study/Assessment, or other forms of site/area-specific analysis. The policy should be amended accordingly.	Comment received
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Surinder Mahi (owner), 3407 Countryside Drive	2.2.146	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.146 speaks to the determination of the precise boundaries of the Natural Heritage System on a site-specific basis in consultation with the Conservation Authorities. Refinements to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) should not require an OPA if refined through a Subwatershed Study, an area-specific Environmental Impact Study/Assessment, or other forms of site/area-specific analysis. The policy should be amended accordingly.	Comment received
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.2.146	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.146 speaks to the determination of the precise boundaries of the Natural Heritage System on a site-specific basis in consultation with the Conservation Authorities. Refinements to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) should not require an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) if refined through a Subwatershed Study, an area-specific Environmental Impact Study/Assessment, or other forms of site/area-specific analysis. The policy should be amended accordingly.	Comment received
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Clarendelle Holdings Limited (owner)	2.2.146	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.146 speaks to the determination of the precise boundaries of the Natural Heritage System on a site-specific basis in consultation with the Conservation Authorities. Refinements to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) should not require an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) if refined through a Subwatershed Study, an area-specific Environmental Impact Study/Assessment, or other forms of site/area-specific analysis. The policy should be amended accordingly.	Comment received
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.146 d)	Revision Requested	This policy should also recognize the removal of features, if appropriate reports identify it is possible, without an amendment to the plan.	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.146	Revision Requested	2.2.146 Do you mean Schedule 6?	Comment addressed
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.148 d) and 2.2.153	Revision Requested	This should specify the compensation component. As an example, a simple hedgerow should not be subject to compensation.	Comment received
2022/05/30	KLM	Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.152 c) and 2.2.153	Revision Requested	No net loss is not a reasonable test, especially in the context of dealing with simple hedgerows which are not typically preserved.	Comment received
2022/05/30	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-104	Revision Requested	2-104 "the" Humber River	Comment received
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.163	Revision Requested	Low Impact Development SWM techniques should be included as a permitted use.	Comment received
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.163 d)	Revision Requested	As noted above, how is no net loss is not a reasonable test to include in the Official Plan.	Comment received
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.164 b)	Revision Requested	As noted above, no net loss along with a net ecological gain are not reasonable tests.	Comment received
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.174	Requires Clarification	What is a Wetland Management Plan?	Comment received - to be identified through Glossary

2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.179	Revision Requested	How was 30 metres decided as the maximum separation distance to have two separate woodlands classified as one?	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBGLG et al)	2.2.249	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.249 requires additional 5 metres for trails adjacent to or within the ecological buffer. This policy is very explicit and inflexible that removes the opportunity to explore recreational trails that may not warrant additional 5 metres or part of the trail could be within the ecological buffer. As such, we suggest that this policy state that recreational trails proposed within the ecological buffer will generally require additional 5 metres.	Comment Received- as a general approach, 5 metres provides the necessary buffer for full vegetation function and accounts for a variety of contexts
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.2.249	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.249 requires an additional 5 metres of buffer for trails located adjacent to or within an ecological buffer. This policy is prescriptive and rigid. It does not allow for the opportunity to explore recreational trails that may not require an additional 5 metres of buffer or where part of the trail could be within the ecological buffer. We recommend that the policy be revised to note that recreational trails proposed within an ecological buffer will generally require an additional 5 metres of buffer, subject to a site/area-specific analysis.	Comment Received- as a general approach, 5 metres provides the necessary buffer for full vegetation function and accounts for a variety of contexts.
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.272	Requires Clarification	Continues to use net ecological gain as a test, which is not consistent with Provincial Policy.	Comment received
2022/05/30	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group	2.2.276	Requires Clarification	Whats Adaptive Environmental Monitoring (AEM)? Why is this being required now?	Comment received - This is a requirement of the EIR within the Terms of Reference for the City. The goal of Adaptive Environmental Management is to monitor the environmental features and functions (i.e. existing woodlots, new restoration areas) and to observe the success of site design and mitigation measures (e.g. buffers, LIDs, etc.) in the protection of them, (e.g. fish habitat, wetland creation and water quality).
07-Jun-22	MHBC	Debra Walker and Mariusz Jasztobski on behalf of 'Petal Land and Development Limited' (owner), 8383 Mississauga Road	2.2.122-2.2.124	Revision Requested	That the Mixed-Use Employment policies of Section 2.2.122-2.2.124 be revised to make it explicitly clear that major office uses are a permitted use within this designation along a Corridor, where such uses are permitted by current designation permissions. Major office uses, with retail on the ground floor, are appropriate land uses within the proposed Mixed-Use Employment designation along a Corridor given their ability to support the City's higher order transit corridors and as an appropriate transitional use to adjacent Neighbourhood designation uses.	Comment addressed- policies have been updated to identify that major office should be the predominant use in Mixed Use Employment Areas. Please review updated draft policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Pulls Investment Group (owner) of 507 Balmoral Drive	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4	Revision Requested	Section 2.1.6 and Table 4 should be revised to provide greater flexibility to permit increases in building height in strategic locations where appropriate. In the case of the subject site the abutting lands and greater area context is established and a new Secondary Plan is unwarranted. The subject site is already designated High Density with the current Secondary Plan. An amendment to the Secondary Plan to guide the re-development of the property is more appropriate.	Comment received - Table 4 provides a general heights framework, providing flexibility. If the subject site has been designated, no permissions will be taken away through Brampton Plan that have already been provided.
04-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Pulls Investment Group (owner) of 507 Balmoral Drive	Section 2.2.64	Revision Requested	Section 2.2.64 does not appear to be a complete policy. It is missing the list of designation/overlays and criteria for development of 'new Neighbourhoods'. The policy needs to be corrected and re-issued for public review and comment before it can be advanced to Council for approval.	Comment addressed- policy has been updated and a second draft release is planned.
05-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Pulls Investment Group (owner) of 507 Balmoral Drive	Section 2.1.21c	Revision Requested	should be modified to state that appropriate intensification should be promoted in Neighbourhoods located outside of Centres, Major Transit Station Areas and Corridors.	Comment received- key areas where intensification is appropriate have been identified through the City Structure. Neighbourhoods will have gentle densification over the planning horizon of this Plan.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Building Blocks)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
Nurturing Strong and Connected Communities						
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Mustafa Ghassan on behalf of Lark Investments Inc. (10 and 26 Victoria Crescent; 376, 387 and 391 Orenda Road; and 24 Bramalea Road)	2.3.18	Revision Requested	In our opinion, Policy 2.3.18 provides additional authority to the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines, which can be altered at any time and not subject to Planning Act requirements for public consultation, approval or appeal. In our opinion, if there is a desire to preserve key landmarks, views and vistas in the City, they should specifically be identified in the Official Plan, where they can be vetted by the public through a formal Planning Act process.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.27	Requires Clarification	2.3.27 Reminder, steps up into the building make it hard to be wheelchair accessible, and as such, to require things like front porches to match neighbouring buildings hinders accessibility.	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Mustafa Ghassan on behalf of Lark Investments Inc. (10 and 26 Victoria Crescent; 376, 387 and 391 Orenda Road; and 24 Bramalea Road)	2.3.30-2.3.31	Revision Requested	Policies 2.3.30 (Mid-rise Buildings) and 2.3.31 (Tall and Tall Plus Buildings) include policies that require these building typologies to be designed to attain near net-zero greenhouse gas emissions. In our opinion, this policy is overly restrictive and may create challenges in implementation. In this regard, we would suggest that you contact a building sciences consultant to confirm the City's current requirements in this regard and how far these proposed policies would push the net-zero requirements. In our opinion, these policies should provide additional flexibility and specify what the minimum requirements are.	Comment received - the CEERP target to attain near net zero GHG emissions for new communities in Heritage heights and new buildings in Town Centres, and major Urban Growth Areas. CEERP 12.2.93 says planned and designed (communities)
30-May-22	KLM	of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.30	Revision Requested	Designing mid-rise buildings to attain near net-zero greenhouse gas emissions is not reasonable. This policy should encourage the design of net zero instead of prescribing it.	Comment received - the CEERP target to attain near net zero GHG emissions for new communities in Heritage heights and new buildings in Town Centres, and major Urban Growth Areas. CEERP 12.2.93 says planned and designed (communities)
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	2.3.36	Revision Requested	2.3.36 - Tall Buildings and Tall Plus Buildings have three primary components in design — a base or podium; a middle or lower, and a top... b) The middle or lower should be clearly separate from the podium, through stepbacks and/or material changes to lighten their appearance. Tower floorplates should be no larger than 800 meters square. A minimum of 25 meters will be provided between towers to allow for privacy, light and sky views, however deviations to the tower separation distance will be considered on a case by case basis without an amendment to this Plan. Responsibilities for providing separation distances will be shared equally between owners of all properties where tall buildings are permitted. Maximum separation distances will be achieved through appropriate floorplate sizes and tower orientation.	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Mustafa Ghassan on behalf of Lark Investments Inc. (10 and 26 Victoria Crescent; 376, 387 and 391 Orenda Road; and 24 Bramalea Road)	2.3.34 and 2.3.36		In our opinion, Policies 2.3.34 and 2.3.36 are overly prescriptive and should not establish rigid measures for sunlight and built form placement, since not conformity to this policy will require an amendment, even in circumstances where the intent of the policy is being maintained. In our opinion, these requirements are more appropriately provided in urban design guidelines, since these criteria cannot capture every circumstance, nor do they provide the specific detail required to be perfectly measured. For example, Policy 2.3.34 is unclear as to when the 5 hours is measured (during the equinoxes and does it include the winter). Also, Policy 2.3.36 does not indicate if balconies can project into the minimum 25 metre tower separation and office towers tend to have floor plate sizes larger than 800 square metres. In our opinion, these policies should be removed from the Draft OP and included in the City's Urban Design Guidelines, which provide additional detail regarding the intent of each guideline and criteria.	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	2.3.36	Revision Requested	Policy 2.3.36 sets out built form policy for tall buildings including the requirement that a minimum of 25 metres be provided between towers. This policy elevates urban design considerations to Official Plan policy which does not provide sufficient flexibility to allow for deviations to the minimum tower separation distance where deemed appropriate. Final tower separation distances should be included within site specific zoning by-laws.	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2566830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	2.3.36	Revision Requested	Proposed Policy Modification: Modify Policy 2.3.36 to encourage a 25 metre separation distance between towers and/or allow deviations on a case-by-case basis without the need for an amendment to the Brampton Plan	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.3.37	Delete Policy	Policy 2.3.37 be deleted	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	2.3.37		2.3.37 Tall Buildings Plus will only be permitted where they are identified in a City	Comment received.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakeville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.3.37	Delete Policy	Policy 2.3.37 be deleted	Comment received.
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaws Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.3.46		Policy 2.3.46 states "To achieve design excellence in the city's built-form and public realm, and to encourage successful implementation, the City will: ... g Utilize the Sustainable New Communities Program to ensure planning and development applications for new development to achieve a minimum level of sustainability performance." In our submission, "Where appropriate," should be added before "Utilize the" since the utilization of the Sustainable New Communities Program may not be applicable under all circumstances, such as for minor expansions or additions to existing buildings.	Comment received.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.3.46	Requires Clarification	In our submission, "Where appropriate," should be added before "Utilize the" since the utilization of the Sustainable New Communities Program may not be applicable under all circumstances, such as for minor expansions or additions to existing buildings.	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrille Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountbush Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovaird Dr	2.3.46	Requires Clarification	In our submission, "Where appropriate," should be added before "Utilize the" since the utilization of the Sustainable New Communities Program may not be applicable under all circumstances, such as for minor expansions or additions to existing buildings.	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	2.3.48	Revision Requested	Policy 2.3.48 directs that the "Review for all Design Priority Areas and Tall Building developments by the Urban Design Review Panel is required for compliance with the Brampton Plan and City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines..." The City's Urban Design Review Panel are neither the approval authority, elected municipal officials or City employees. The role of the Urban Design Review Panel, and its members, is to provide design opinion and guidance to municipal Staff in review of development applications. Compliance of a tall building proposal with the Brampton Plan and/or City-wide Urban Design Guidelines is not to be determined by the City's Urban Design Review Panel, but rather is the role and responsibility of City Staff and ultimately City Council.	Comment received.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakeville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.3.48	Delete Policy	Propose delete policy	Comment received.
2022/06/14	Domes Ltd.	Richard Domes on behalf of	2.3.48	Delete Policy	Propose delete policy	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	2.3.48	Delete Policy	Policy 2.3.48 directs that the "Review for all Design Priority Areas and Tall Building developments by the Urban Design Review Panel is required for compliance with the Brampton Plan and City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines..." The City's Urban Design Review Panel are neither the approval authority, elected municipal officials or City employees. The role of the Urban Design Review Panel, and its members, is to provide design opinion and guidance to municipal Staff in review of development applications. Compliance of a tall building proposal with the Brampton Plan and/or City-wide Urban Design Guidelines is not to be determined by the City's Urban Design Review Panel, but rather is the role and responsibility of City Staff and ultimately City Council.	Comment received.

30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustang Development Inc., Penold Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.181	Requires Clarification	What is the definition of "large scale development" and how will this be applied?	Comment addressed- definition added to the glossary
May 4th, 2022	MHBC	Tamara Tannis on behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Ltd (owner)	2.3.202	Delete and Replace	TransCanada Pipelines is regulated by the Canadian Energy Regulator (CER) which has a number of requirements regulating development in proximity to its pipelines. This includes approval requirements for activities within 30 metres of the pipeline centreline, such as conducting a ground disturbance, constructing or installing a facility across, on, or along the pipeline right-of-way, driving a vehicle, mobile equipment or machinery across the right-of-way, and the use of explosives.	Comment Addressed
May 4th, 2022	MHBC	Tamara Tannis on behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Ltd (owner)	2.3.203	Delete and Replace	Development resulting in increased population density in proximity to TCPL's right-of-way and facilities may result in TransCanada being required to replace its pipeline(s) to comply with CSA Code Z662. Early consultation with TCPL or its designated representative, for any development proposals within 200 metres of its pipelines, should be undertaken to ensure TCPL can assess potential impacts and provide recommendations to avoid adverse impacts to its facilities.	Comment Addressed
May 4th, 2022	MHBC	Tamara Tannis on behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Ltd (owner)	2.3.204	Delete and Replace	Deleted current policy 2.3.204 that states gas regulator facilities may be permitted in any designation except the Natural Heritage System or the Parkway Belt West subject to the Zoning By-law. As federally regulated facilities, these types of land use permissions are not applicable to TCPL's pipelines and facilities.	Comment Addressed
May 4th, 2022	MHBC	Tamara Tannis on behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Ltd (owner)	2.3.205	Delete and Replace	A minimum setback of 7 metres shall be provided from the edge of the right-of-way for all permanent buildings and structures. Accessory buildings and structures shall have a minimum setback of at least 3 metres from the edge of the right-of-way.	Comment Addressed
May 4th, 2022	MHBC	Tamara Tannis on behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Ltd (owner)	2.3.206	Delete and Replace	In addition to the requirements for the above setbacks, a minimum of 7 metres from the edge of the pipeline right-of-way shall be provided for: a) road rights-of-way (paralleling pipeline rights-of-way), private driveways, parking spaces and parking areas; and, b) stormwater management facilities.	Comment Addressed
May 4th, 2022	MHBC	Tamara Tannis on behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Ltd (owner)	Page 2-191	Addition	Notwithstanding other policies in this Plan, throughout any built up areas, the TCPL's right-of-way is encouraged to be designated as passive parkland or open space subject to TransCanada's easement rights and Federal regulations.	Comment Addressed
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	Housing & Social Matters	Needs Discussion	2.3.257 - Development applications may be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report/Housing Analysis, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan. A Housing Assessment Report was not requested by the City or Region in the Pre-Application Consultation checklist provided by the City of Brampton. The submission of a Housing Assessment Report shall not apply to the Sonell Amendment Application that is being finalized and scheduled to be submitted to the City of Brampton in early June 2022. Notwithstanding, it is recommended that these policies provide flexibility to exempt development proposals from the requirement of a Housing Assessment Report/Housing Analysis, where deemed appropriate. In the consideration of the location, scale and type of application being filed and where sufficient information is available to inform its purpose. Proposed Policy Modification: Replace the word "will" with "may" in reference to the preparation of a Housing Assessment Report/Housing analysis to provide flexibility to only require it to be provided when necessary and appropriate.	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	2.3.257	Revision Requested	2.3.257 - Development applications may be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan, which:...	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	p. 2-195	Revision Requested	Housing and Social Matters Chapter (Pages 2-195), Sections 2.3.226 and 2.3.244 reference the implementation of annual minimum 'new' housing unit targets. In particular, it notes that 25% of all 'new' housing units are to be rental in tenure. It is not clear whether the implications of this from a market demand and cost perspective was considered. In addition, it can be interpreted that from an implementation perspective, 25% of every Secondary Plan Area, Precinct Plan Area or individual Draft Plan is required to provide rental units. In regards to rental units, we note for the record that many condominium units are purchased as investments which are rented out; thereby adding to the inventory of available rental units. The very prescriptive policies as currently drafted may result in unintended consequences or reactions within the housing market. We recommend that the policy be revised to use more progressive language, such as 'encourage' and 'strive to provide'.	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement to the Regional Official Plan Amendment and the targets provided in their policies.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., OIA Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	Housing and Social Matters (Section 2.3.257 and 3.1.85)	Requires Clarification	It is recommended that these policies provide flexibility to exempt development proposals from the requirement of a Housing Assessment Report/Housing Analysis, where deemed appropriate in the consideration of the location, scale and type of application being filed and where sufficient information is available to inform its purpose. Replace the word "will" with "may" in reference to the preparation of a Housing Assessment Report/Housing analysis to provide flexibility to only require it to be provided when necessary and appropriate.	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc. (249 Queen Street East)	p. 2-195	Needs Discussion	Similarly, Housing and Social Matters Chapter (Pages 2-195), Sections 2.3.226 and 2.3.244 contain minimum housing targets in terms of affordability and density. With regard to density, it is not clear if the requirement that 50% of all affordable housing is to be provided for/available for low-income residents. Toward this end, are these units considered to be a component of the requirement that 30% of all new housing units are to be affordable housing. If the targets are too high, it can create a false expectation associated with addressing the problem of insufficient affordable housing. This may create other unintended problems. With regard to density, the policies indicate that 50% of all 'new' housing units are to be in forms other than single-detached and semi-detached. These targets seem high. The targets do not appear to take into account market demand which play a significant role in dictating unit types and densities. The prescriptive nature of the policy, combined with the targets, make this policy far too ambitious. Care and caution should be exercised so as to avoid unintended consequences within the housing market. We recommend that these targets be reconsidered to better reflect the reality of the market place and realities associated with implementation. Without financial support and affordable housing development initiatives, and investment by all levels of government, these targets, (if maintained) are not achievable.	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement to the Regional Official Plan Amendment and the targets provided in their policies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 7927999 Canada Corp.(9610 McLaughlin Road)	p. 2-195	Revision Requested	Housing and Social Matters Chapter (Pages 2-195), Section 2.3.226 and 2.3.244 reference the implementation of annual minimum 'new' housing unit targets. In particular, it notes that 25% of all 'new' housing units are to be rental in tenure. It is not clear whether the implications of this from a market demand and cost perspective was considered. In addition, it can be interpreted that from an implementation perspective, 25% of every Secondary Plan Area, Precinct Plan Area or individual Draft Plan is required to provide rental units. In regards to rental units, we note for the record that many condominium units are purchased as investments which are rented out; thereby adding to the inventory of available rental units. The very prescriptive policies as currently drafted may result in unintended consequences or reactions within the housing market. We recommend that the policy be revised to use more progressive language such as 'encourage' and 'strive to provide'.	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement to the Regional Official Plan Amendment and the targets provided in their policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 7927999 Canada Corp.(9610 McLaughlin Road)	p. 2-195	Revision Requested	Similarly, Housing and Social Matters Chapter (Pages 2-195), Section 2.3.226 and 2.3.244 contain minimum housing targets in terms of affordability and density. With regard to density, it is not clear if the requirement that 50% of all affordable housing is to be provided for/available for low-income residents. Toward this end, are these units considered to be a component of the requirement that 30% of all new housing units are to be affordable housing. If the targets are too high, it can create a false expectation associated with addressing the problem of insufficient affordable housing. This may create other unintended problems. With regard to density, the policies indicate that 50% of all 'new' units housing units are to be in forms other than single-detached and semi-detached. These targets seem high. The targets do not appear to take into account market demand which play a significant role in dictating unit types and densities. The prescriptive nature of the policy, combined with the targets, make this policy far too ambitious. Care and caution should be exercised so as to avoid unintended consequences within the housing market. We recommend that these targets be reconsidered to better reflect the reality of the market place and realities associated with implementation. Without financial support and affordable housing development initiatives, and investment by all levels of government, these targets, (if maintained) are not achievable.	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement to the Regional Official Plan Amendment and the targets provided in their policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 3407 Countryside Drive increase height and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2566830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Housing and Social Matters (Section 2.3.226 and 2.3.244)	Revision Requested	Housing and Social Matters Chapter (Pages 2-195), Section 2.3.226 and 2.3.244 reference the implementation of annual minimum 'new' housing unit targets. In particular, it notes that 25% of all 'new' housing units are to be rental in tenure. It is not clear whether the implications of this from a market demand and cost perspective was considered. In addition, it can be interpreted that from an implementation perspective, 25% of every Secondary Plan Area, Precinct Plan Area or individual Draft Plan is required to provide rental units. In regards to rental units, we note for the record that many condominium units are purchased as investments which are rented out; thereby adding to the inventory of available rental units. The very prescriptive policies as currently drafted may result in unintended consequences or reactions within the housing market. We recommend that the policy be revised to use more progressive language such as 'encourage' and 'strive to provide'.	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement to the Regional Official Plan Amendment and the targets provided in their policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	Housing and Social Matters (Section 2.3.226 and 2.3.244)	Revision Requested	Replace the word "will" with "may" in reference to the preparation of a Housing Assessment Report/Housing analysis to provide flexibility to only require it to be provided when necessary and appropriate. In particular, it notes that 25% of all 'new' housing units are to be rental in tenure. It is not clear whether the implications of this from a market demand and cost perspective was considered. In addition, it can be interpreted that from an implementation perspective, 25% of every Secondary Plan Area, Precinct Plan Area or individual Draft Plan is required to provide rental units. In regards to rental units, we note for the record that many	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement to the Regional Official Plan Amendment and the targets provided in their policies.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-195	Needs Discussion	2-195 Literally all three of your headline targets are severely flawed, either because the target is flawed or outside of your control. How we got the 30% number is that in the 19th century the rule of thumb was a week's wages for a month's rent, which then got adopted by the US government in 1969 for the Housing and Urban Development Act, and later got moved up to 30% in the 1980's, there is not actually empirical evidence behind it.	Comment received- The City is aligning the targets with the Region of Peel's Official Plan. In addition, action item 8.4 of Council-endorsed Housing Brampton identifies that Brampton identify housing targets that build off of the growth forecast.

					<p>Housing Targets</p> <p>Sections 2.3.224 to 2.3.230 speak to housing targets and specifically, affordable housing. BILD is concerned with the targets that are being proposed within the current draft Brampton Plan under section 2.3.226 and especially subsection a, which requires 30% of all new housing units in Brampton be affordable and additionally, that 50% of those affordable units be affordable to those with low income.</p> <p>BILD has the following questions for clarification for this policy requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What basis does the City have to require minimum of 30% affordable housing target across the entire City (and outside of delineated Major Transit Station Areas)? • The draft policy contemplates a partnership between only the City and the Region of Peel. Will the City consider a partnership model with the key stakeholders such as private developers, as well as housing providers, agencies, community groups? How will these groups be involved and engaged? • For the affordable housing that is proposed to be achieved purely through the means of the housing market, kindly please clarify how a developer is going to be able to fulfill the requirement or be able to assess the financial burden at the front-end of the planning approvals process? • Although it is illustrated within the table, the policy does not make it clear which levels of housing affordability are to be provided by whom. For example, the housing that is to be affordable to those with low income (under the ownership tenure) is identified to be achieved through means that are not within the private housing sector. If the targets are to be achieved through different means, please clarify this within the written policy. • How is the stewardship of these affordable units going to be maintained into the future? How will the City ensure these units remain in neighbourhoods for their intended purpose rather than being flipped in short order at market prices? 	2.3.266 - 2.3.267, 2.3.268, 2.3.269, 2.3.270, 2.3.271, 2.3.274 -- administration of units/protection of affordability are not addressed in the Official Plan and will be addressed through subsequent work.
03-Jun-22	BILD	Sophie Lin	Housing Targets		Currently the language in the Official Plan allows for flexibility for both the developer and the municipality by citing that the City "may require an applicant to provide an appropriate amount of affordable housing. Specific details of the methods to provide affordable housing may be the subject of development, site plan or subdivision agreements, as appropriate." The current policy provides interpretive flexibility for agreements between the City and the developer. No one site is the same and as such, a minimum housing target of 30% is a one-size-fits-all approach that will not allow for these targets to be achieved. Instead, we recommend the City use language like "strive-towards" or "encouraged to."	Comment received - the targets are a city-wide goal that help to identify how we are performing and meeting housing needs. There needs to be a demonstration of contribution to these targets.
03-Jun-22	BILD	Sophie Lin			2.3.226 There is no particular reason the housing for Affordable Housing needs to be new, new housing is almost always more expensive, due to construction costs, unless there are major subsidies involved. The 50% of new housing units provided through forms other than detached and semi-detached units is low, this should be more like 50% of greenfield units being other than detached and semis. Singles and semis are simply unaffordable due to the very high serviced land costs and construction costs, townhouses are still quite expensive to build due to the high construction costs, but are closer to affordable. Brampton's population growth is also from a fundamentally different demographic, it is mostly coming from young people, who will need a ton of SRO and lodging house beds which don't really count under new units even if they are new housing. Tenure is mostly out of the hands of the City as tax policy has the largest influence on it, next is federal money like loan programs, and a much smaller portion is social housing funding.	Comment received- this is conforming to the Regional Official Plan. Conversion of existing homes to affordable units is permitted. The City has policies in this section addressing SROs and lodging house beds.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.226			
		Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.226	Revision Requested	Requiring 30% of all new housing units to be affordable is not achievable or realistic. In our opinion, this metric should be no higher than 10%. Not requiring 50% of all units being in other forms than single and semi-detached dwellings and requiring 25% of all new housing units to be rental. These figures are not obtainable. In our opinion the City should not be mandating housing typology or tenure in an Official Plan and these elements should be removed.	Comment received- the City is aligning the targets with the Region of Peel's Official Plan. In addition, action item 8.4 of Council-endorsed Housing Brampton identifies that Brampton identify housing targets that build off of the growth forecast.
2022/05/30	KLM		2.3.226	Revision Requested	are targets, to state that the City working with the Region will "require" these targets is very onerous and is not reflective of changing market conditions. As such, we recommend that the word "require" be changed to "strive towards" so that there is an opportunity and flexibility in how these targets are achieved.	Comment received- the City is aligning the targets with the Region of Peel's Official Plan. In addition, action item 8.4 of Council-endorsed Housing Brampton identifies that Brampton identify housing targets that build off of the growth forecast.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	2.3.226	Revision Requested	Furthermore, it is our opinion that the housing targets are very optimistic and untenable. It is very difficult to achieve these targets given the current and anticipated future market conditions. In our previous discussions on this matter, we repeatedly expressed and advised City and Regional staff of this and as such, we strongly recommend that these targets be reconsidered to reflect the reality of the market conditions and effective implementation. Without financial support and affordable housing development initiative/investment from all levels of government, these targets, if maintained as is, are	Comment received- the City is aligning the targets with the Region of Peel's Official Plan. In addition, action item 8.4 of Council-endorsed Housing Brampton identifies that Brampton identify housing targets that build off of the growth forecast.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.228		2.3.228 Where is the evidence that microtargeting housing is productive?	Comment received - This is a way of monitoring growth and help to guide the Growth Management program to deliver on a Council commitment. This will help to deliver on Council's endorsed Housing Strategy. This will help to provide relevant data to develop policies that address housing needs.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.231		2.3.231 Large scale upzoning is necessary to increase the availability of land for development without increasing land costs.	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.232(b)		2.3.232(b) Good	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.233		2.3.233 At current house prices, the City needs to have fairly generous envelopes allowed to enable buildings to be redeveloped and have the new units be affordable	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.240		2.3.240 This would work if Brampton was experiencing population decline, but the population is growing rapidly, so adaptive reuse is a hindrance, we need to increase the housing stock.	Comment received - adaptive reuse is another way to provide affordable housing and is identified in the Housing Strategy (policy 8.2.4- support adaptive reuse for housing)
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.241		2.3.241 Force greenfield to shift towards predominantly townhouses for single family housing, it will reduce the land cost per unit, helping bring down costs.	Comment received - the City are encouraging various forms of missing middle housing types.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.243		2.3.243 Currently this year the average resale price of a condo/townhouse exceeds the ability of Decile 9's affordable housing budget, cease rezoning for new single and semi construction except where site geography makes towns and apartments impractical.	Comment received - a variety of housing types are required.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.244		2.3.244 Exempt townhouses from the ADU requirements, and permit ADU doors to exit out the front.	Comment received - it is permitted subject to access egress permissions of the Building Code.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.245		2.3.245 Good	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.249		2.3.249 Rent to own has a sordid history in the US. Community Land Trusts and Co-ops require major subsidies, and shared equity means that the programs are financially hurt if housing becomes more affordable	Comment received
30-May-22	KLM		2.3.253	Requires Clarification	The City has always required an open house to occur on the same evening and before the public meeting begins. The introduction of a further non statutory neighbourhood meeting is not necessary. The current process works well and should be maintained.	Comment received - this is being reviewed as a part of Bill 109 and in alignment with policy 9.1.2 of the Housing Strategy.
June 3, 2022	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	2.3.257		<p>Policies 2.3.257 and 3.1.85 direct that development applications will be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report/Housing Analysis, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan.</p> <p>A Housing Assessment Report was not required by the City or Region in the Pre-Application Consultation checklist provided by the City of Brampton. The submission of a Housing Assessment Report shall not apply to the 2556830 Ontario Inc. Amendment Application.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, it is recommended that these policies provide flexibility to exempt development proposals from the requirement of a Housing Assessment Report/ Housing Analysis, where deemed appropriate in the consideration of the location, scale and type of application being filed and where sufficient information is available to inform its purpose.</p> <p>Proposed Policy Modification: Replace the word "will" with "may" in reference to the preparation of a Housing Assessment Report/Housing analysis to provide flexibility to only require it to be provided when necessary and appropriate.</p>	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of (21 Queen Street East)	2.3.257		<p>Policies 2.3.257 and 3.1.85 direct that development applications will be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report/Housing Analysis, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan.</p> <p>It is recommended that these policies provide flexibility to exempt development proposals from the requirement of a Housing Assessment Report/ Housing Analysis, where deemed appropriate in the consideration of the location, scale and type of application being filed and where sufficient information is available to inform its purpose.</p> <p>Proposed Policy Modification: Replace the word "will" with "may" in reference to the preparation of a Housing Assessment Report/Housing analysis to provide flexibility to only require it to be provided when necessary and appropriate.</p>	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.257	Requires Clarification	A Planning Justification Report is always asked by City staff as part of a complete application and now to add a House Assessment Report is unnecessary. Some of the items mentioned in this section are typically covered in a PJR. Therefore this policy is not required and should be removed.	Comment received- 2.3.257, 2.3.258, 2.3.259, 3.1.82, 3.1.85- policies address this comment and clarify the difference between the two.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Mr. Mario Matteo Silvestro, Mr. Guido D'Alesio and 2088205 Ontario Ltd., the Registered Owners of 22, 24, 26, 28 and 32 John Street	2.3.257	Revision Requested	Section 2.3.257 should be modified to state that Development applications may be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan. The Policy should be flexible to exempt development proposals from the requirement of a Housing Assessment/Analysis where deemed appropriate, in the consideration of the location, scale, and type of application being filed and where sufficient information is available to inform its purpose.	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.257(d)		2.3.257(d) In order for this to work, it requires developers to charge even more for housing in order to fund the gratuitous conveyance of land, you are literally going to require housing to become less affordable to build affordable housing?	Comment received - conformity requirement with the Regional Official Plan.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.257(e)(i)		2.3.257(e)(i) Who is going to buy the purpose built rental buildings? Someone has to provide financing for those to get built.	Comment received - Brampton Plan seeks to support the development of purpose-built rental buildings and the City can support these developments through a variety of means to meet the big move area 1st Housing Brampton. 2.3.281 policy also addresses this comment.

03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of 2766321 Ontario Inc. (11860 and 0 Bramalea Road)	2.3.257	Revision Requested	Section 2.3.257 should be modified to state that Development applications may be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan. A Housing Report was not requested by the City or the Region in the Pre-Application Consultation checklist provided by the City of Brampton. The Policy should be flexible to exempt development proposals from the requirement of a Housing Assessment/Analysis where deemed appropriate, in the consideration of the location, scale, and type of application being filed and where sufficient information is available to inform its purpose.	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	2.3.57	Revision Requested	2.3.257 - Development applications will be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan, which: 3.1.57 - The City may enact Zoning By-laws and approve Site Plan Applications without a Precinct Plan process for uses that the City deems are in the City and the Region's interest, such as a Provincial facilities, Civic Infrastructure, or transit facilities, and significant private development proposals, provided that such proposals meet all applicable policies and legislation, and provided the proposed development: a Can be supported by existing servicing infrastructure; b Protects, preserves, enhances and restores natural heritage features; c Protects, preserves, enhances and conserves places and/or landscapes of cultural heritage value; d Protects for the future right-of-way of Centres and Boulevards and any planned Transit Network facilities; e Meets the intent and purpose of the Urban Design Guidelines; and, f Implements the policies and directions of the Secondary Plan.	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. o/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.258	Requires Clarification	This policy is not reasonable. To suggest that developers gratuitously convey land with appropriate zoning to the Region of Peel or a non-profit housing provider is not reasonable. This policy should be removed.	Comment received- conformity requirement to the Regional Official Plan.
3.1.57 - The	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.258		2.3.258 These requirements make housing less affordable, because someone else has to foot the cost	Comment received - conformity requirement with the Regional Official Plan
b Protects, pr	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. o/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.260 - 2.3.263	Revision Requested	The draft OP already sets out affordable housing targets (which we do not agree with, as noted above), why is this section even necessary? In our opinion, this section should be removed.	Comment received - this section is important to further describe and build upon the targets.
c Protects, pr	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Mr. Mario Matteo Silvestro, Mr. Guido D'Alesio and 2088205 Ontario Ltd., the Registered Owners of 22, 24, 26, 28 and 32 John Street	2.3.263	Revision Requested	Section 2.3.263 speaks to the inclusionary zoning in Major Transit Station Areas to support the development of affordable housing units through a subsequent amendment to the Brampton Plan, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1.76 to 3.1.76 address its implementation. We recommend that the future amendment specify scenarios where exemptions are permitted including: - Rezoning Applications and associated Plans of Subdivision or Condominiums received on or before the date of adoption of the Inclusionary Zoning Official Plan Amendment; and - Student/Staff residences, retirement buildings, hospices, long-term care buildings, and group homes.	Comment received - transitional policies and exemptions will be addressed through the IZ OPA and Bylaw.
d Protects for	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of Maebrook Scott Inc. (owner), 80 Scott Street	2.3.263		Section 2.3.263 speaks to the inclusionary zoning in Major Transit Station Areas to support the development of affordable housing units through a subsequent amendment to the Brampton Plan, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1.76 to 3.1.76 address its implementation. We recommend that the future amendment specify scenarios where exemptions are permitted including: - Rezoning Applications and associated Plans of Subdivision or Condominiums received on or before the date of adoption of the Inclusionary Zoning Official Plan Amendment; and - Student/Staff residences, retirement buildings, hospices, long-term care buildings, and group homes.	Comment received - transitional policies and exemptions will be addressed through the IZ OPA and Bylaw.
e Meets the it	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.263		2.3.263 Brampton has low land prices for commercial land to be redeveloped for housing, basically all of the cost difference of IZ units is being paid for by the market rate units. Furthermore, Brampton's floor plate rules for high rise make it difficult to make units larger than one bedroom, if you want more of the larger units, you need to allow for chunkier floor plates.	Comment received - the assessment report conducted through NBLC explores some of these elements, particularly that the Residual Land Value absorbs the cost of the affordable units. Staff are conducting technical working sessions where these elements can be explored.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. o/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.265	Requires Clarification	How does the City intend to ensure 30 years of affordable housing? This is unreasonable.	Comment received - administration will be addressed through relevant legal agreements and implementation plans. This is addressed through other mechanisms and not in Brampton Plan.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.269		2.3.269 Spending CBC on improving transit is actually far more effective at improving housing affordability for residents, as the savings on transportation costs make it much easier to pay for housing.	Comment received- the CBC bylaw is being developed and transit is one key element being explored.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.270		2.3.270 Schedule 3B, 3C, 3A. There should be zero resident parking requirements within 400 metres of Support Corridor Transit routes, 800 metres of the intersection of two of the transit route categories, or within 800 metres of the Rapid Transit Network, and this goes for all unit types. ¼ mile/800 metres from two frequent bus routes being exempt from minimum parking requirements is increasingly standard. Minimum parking requirements do enormous harm to housing affordability; minimum parking delenda est	Comment addressed for Schedule 3B. The parking strategy and zoning bylaw will further explore parking requirements.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.274		2.3.274 Delays in planning add significant cost to market housing.	Comment received.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Teach Development Inc. o/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.275	Revision Requested	How can residential vacancy rates be controlled through the development process. Again, a policy that is not realistic and should be removed.	Comment received - vacancy rate is used for monitoring and not controlled. This is a conformity requirement with the Regional Official Plan.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.275		2.3.275 Attacking short term rentals in Brampton is extremely unwise, first, it isn't much of an issue compared to core cities like the City of Toronto, and second, a significant portion of the short term rentals are actually utilized by newcomers as medium term rentals, who would be adversely affected.	Comment received - the OPA has been approved.
06-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Pulus Investment Group (owner) of 507 Balmoral Drive	Section 2.3.277 to 2.3.281	Revision Requested	4. Section 2.3.277 to 2.3.281 addresses conversion and/or demolition of a residential rental building with six (6) or more dwellings units if the City's average rental vacancy rate is below 3%. On June 22, 2020 Council directed City Staff to undertake the development of a rental protection policy to address residential rental conversions and demolitions. On October 18, 2021 a Statutory Public Meeting was held. Pursuant to consultation with Senior Planning Staff in early February 2022 a transition policy was to be included exempting projects that are already in process. It is our understanding that as of March 2022 the exercise was put on hold in order to assess options prior to advancing a Recommendation Report. The Draft Official Plan includes rental conversion and demolition policy that does not speak to exemptions. Introducing this new policy prior to the completion of the City exercise is not appropriate. The consultation process with interested stakeholders is ongoing. We recommend that policy be removed from the Draft Official Plan and deferred to a future amendment. We also recommend that the policy specify scenarios where exemptions are permitted including: - Development, Site Plan Approval, Plan of Subdivision, Plan of Condominium, or Building Permit Applications received on or before the date of adoption of the amendment to the Brampton Plan.	Comment received- relevant transition policies will be included in the by-law.
07-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Pulus Investment Group (owner) of 507 Balmoral Drive	Section 2.3.257	Revision Requested	should be modified to state that Development applications may be required to submit a Housing Assessment Report, to be approved prior to approval of any Secondary Plan, and any Secondary Plan amendment, Precinct Plan or Phasing Plan. A Housing Report was not requested by the City or the Region in the Pre-Application Consultation checklist provided by the City of Brampton. The Policy should be flexible to exempt development proposals from the requirement of a Housing Assessment/Analysis where deemed appropriate, in the consideration of the location, scale, and type of application being filed and where sufficient information is available to inform its purpose.	Comment received- this will be a requirement to provide to the City to show conformity with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and show contribution to housing targets. Chapter 3 provides specifics around when a housing assessment and/or housing analysis is required. Please review the updated policies.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of Maebrook Scott Inc. (owner), 80 Scott Street	2.3.277		Section 2.3.277 to 2.3.281 addresses conversion and/or demolition of a residential rental building with six (6) or more dwellings units if the City's average rental vacancy rate is below 3%. On June 22, 2020 Council directed City Staff to undertake the development of a rental protection policy to address residential rental conversions and demolitions. On October 18, 2021 a Statutory Public Meeting was held. Our Client, through their Legal Counsel submitted a Public Input Letter on November 1, 2021 (Appendix "2"). Pursuant to consultation with Senior Planning Staff in early February 2022 a transition policy was to be included exempting projects that are already in process. It is our understanding that as of March 2022 the exercise was put on hold in order to assess options prior to advancing a Recommendation Report. The Draft Official Plan includes rental conversion and demolition policy that does not speak to exemptions. Introducing this new policy prior to the completion of the City exercise is not appropriate. The consultation process with interested stakeholders is ongoing. We recommend that policy be removed from the Draft Official Plan and deferred to a future amendment. We also recommend that the policy specify scenarios where exemptions are permitted including: - Site Plan Approval, Plan of Subdivision, Plan of Condominium, or Building Permit Applications received on or before the date of adoption of the amendment to the Brampton Plan.	Comment received - please refer to clause c that says that these policies are not in effect until the section 99.1 bylaw is passed.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.282-284		2.3.282-284 Good	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.285		2.3.285 Reminder- SRs compete against rentals of bedrooms. If they are of a comparable price, they are an improvement in quality of housing stock, especially if they are on good transit.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.287		2.3.287 ARUs should not have minimum parking requirements.	Comment received - consultation for ARUs has been completed and will be reflected in the Recommendation Report.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.293		2.3.293 Streamlining is good	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.294		2.3.294 It mentions Schedule 3A regarding transit, schedule doc shows this as 3B. It isn't that the development there improves transit, it is that the transit access improves affordability because it saves people a ton on transportation costs.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.295		2.3.295 Will explore, and furthermore will consider partnering with other municipalities to support a broader array of models to lower costs. If you want larger units, this is a necessary policy	Comment received and updated text in the policy.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.298		2.3.298 Also 3A, 3B issue regarding transit	Comment addressed.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.300		2.3.300 No, don't require a certain portion to be affordable units, the first priority needs to be building enough housing that we no longer see dire overcrowding. The high costs are a result of extremely high demand and low supply	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.305		2.3.305 Brampton has a dire need for apartments of all sizes, especially for single people, the priority should be on delivering more units, not of unit sizes, a focus on unit sizes is going to cause harm to the city. With high rise construction costs, a new 3 bedroom apartment unit that is properly family sized is going to be similar in cost to a condo townhouse, perhaps even more. Brampton's floor plate rules for tall buildings directly conflict with the desire to build more larger units	Comment received - The City wants to encourage a mix of unit sizes in high-density developments.

		Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.305			Once again, how is this appropriate that an Official Plan sets out minimum requirements in the built form, in this instance as it relates to percentage of bedrooms per dwelling unit. This is not reasonable and should be removed.	Comment received- the wording has been modified to be focused on encouraging larger-size units. The benchmarking exercise conducted has identified that a number of municipalities do include this in policies.
30-May-22	KLM			Revision Requested			
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-218			-218 Don't engage in euphemisms such as "diverse users", call us what we are, disabled.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.316			accessible, they need to have larger unit counts, or only the ground floor can be made accessible.	Comment received- policy does not mandate elevators in all buildings.
			2.3.320(a)			2.3.320(a) you don't need to study this because basic math says this is an incredibly bad idea. The savings for the public are far greater by expanding transit service than cutting fares, because car ownership is several times more expensive than taking transit. For people who can't afford transit, it is worth looking at increasing the number of subsidized passes available from the Region.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.321			2.3.321 Increasing overall transit service hours does not cause displacement, while providing significant benefits to low income people	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.324-2.3.329			2.3.324-2.3.329 These don't actually help with food security	Comment received.
Mobility & Connectivity							
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-222			2-222 25% transit mode share is weak, large swathes of Scarborough are over 30%, even north of the 401, target 30% for transit.	comment received
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.3.348			The introduction text under for Goods Movement states "Goods movement is closely integrated with the location and distribution of industry and commerce across Brampton." Policy 2.3.348 states "The City will work with the Region of Peel, other levels of government, and industry stakeholders to develop and support a comprehensive, integrated, and effective multimodal goods movement system for the safe movement of goods by road, rail, or air." As a Goods Movement industry stakeholder, Canadian Tire supports the development and support of a goods movement system as it relates to the Canadian Tire lands	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.352	Needs Discussion		2.3.352 This also needs to consider railway spurs	comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.369			2.3.369(c) While bicycles take up much less space than cars, they are still sufficiently large that even securing 5% of bicycles at major rapid transit stops will take up far too much space	Comment Received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-236			2-236 Completion, not compliment	Comment Addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.371			2.3.371 The City has to date failed when it comes to efficient and seamless connections between transit and the improved GO service under the current government, because improving connections is not a core metric, only farebox recovery and area coverage of the City are.	comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.373			2.3.373 Bramalea GO represents one of the best places in the City of Brampton to build major office, especially given the planned frequency of GO train service, to have it be mostly residential would be tremendously injurious to the City's plans of increasing employment activity rate	comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.377			2.3.377 The City ought to have a goal related to increasing the number and share of people getting to the GO station by means other than driving.	Such metrics will be established through the City's update to the Transportation Master Plan, and reflected in the OP through a future amendment
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.379			2.3.379 The City ought to protect and plan for rapid transit along Mayfield Road and Airport Road in the long term. Mayfield Road will be needed to transport the significant number of people moving to Caledon by 2051, and Airport Road to better link Brampton with the Airport and the major transit hub that will be at Pearson. We could also justify BRT along Highway 10 into Caledon	
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.281			2.3.281 I am surprised the OP talks about frequent transit on Derry Road when it isn't in Brampton, at all. The City has short term plans to build Zum lines along Chinguacousy and Bramalea Road (within 5 years) and has longer term plans to build Zum lines along Kennedy and Sandalwood	Policy revised
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 2-238			2-238 Schedule 3B, not 3A	Comment addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.386			2.3.386 Change this from "will" to "will endeavour to", while I agree with the goal, there are a number of places where this may not be feasible, necessitating the removal of useful transit stops.	revised
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.387			2.3.387 Complement, not compliment	revised
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.388-389			2.3.388-389 GTAFA needs 24/7 service from Brampton, they literally mentioned this publicly to the City in February 2020, they have a ton of workers start at 3 am to get ready for the early morning flights, and currently they can't take transit.	comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.392(d)			2.3.392(d) transit pass incentives are a problem, because most residents don't work in Brampton, we need something like a Peel Transit Pass which works for both MWay and Brampton Transit, in order for a transit pass program to work well.	comment received - to be shared with Transit Planning
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.395			2.3.395 The City should also target GO stations, most of them have parking problems, and people frustrated with how early they need to drive there to get a spot might be interested in transit, freeing up spaces for other people.	comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.397			2.3.397 Reminder, structured parking is exorbitantly expensive, and for a new development, interim parking to be removed at a later date may be the most cost effective way to development, and lead to less parking in the long term.	comment received
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands tot he south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.3.397			Policy 2.3.397 states "Minimum parking requirements may be reduced or eliminated, and maximum parking limits and shared parking requirements may be established by the Zoning By-law, in Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors and other areas determined by Council." In our submission, the determination of any maximum parking limits should include consideration as to operational requirements for uses, including commercial uses.	comment received - to be evaluated on a case by case basis, through the Zoning by-law
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.3.397	Requires Clarification		Policy 2.3.397 states "Minimum parking requirements may be reduced or eliminated, and maximum parking limits and shared parking requirements may be established by the Zoning By-law, in Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors and other areas determined by Council." In our submission, the determination of any maximum parking limits should include consideration as to operational requirements for uses, including commercial uses as well as employment uses such as warehouses.	comment received - to be evaluated on a case by case basis, through the Zoning by-law
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.3.397	Requires Clarification		Policy 2.3.397 states "Minimum parking requirements may be reduced or eliminated, and maximum parking limits and shared parking requirements may be established by the Zoning By-law, in Centres, Boulevards, and Corridors and other areas determined by Council." In our submission, the determination of any maximum parking limits should include consideration as to operational requirements for uses, including commercial uses as well as employment uses.	comment received - to be evaluated on a case by case basis, through the Zoning by-law
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.401			2.3.401 Buffalo NY found that removing minimum parking requirements organically led to shared parking provision reducing the overall number of parking garages and curb cuts	comment received
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands tot he south of 85 Steeles Ave West, 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	2.3.402			Policy 2.3.402 states "Surface parking lots, where permitted, should be designed to meet all of the following: a Minimize the number and width of vehicle entrances that interrupt pedestrian movement by consolidating accesses with adjacent developments/properties and providing internal access easements with adjacent properties. ... g Support the installation of solar canopies over surface parking lots." In our submission, "where appropriate" should be added after "should be designed" in order to provide flexibility for where the consolidation of accesses is not possible due to grades or operational reasons and where the installation of solar canopies is not anticipated due to operational needs.	revised
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.3.402	Requires Clarification		Policy 2.3.402 states "Surface parking lots, where permitted, should be designed to meet all of the following: ... d Be designed to anticipate redevelopment of the site over time and facilitate future intensification, severance, and infill. ... g Support the installation of solar canopies over surface parking lots." In our submission, "where appropriate" should be added after "should be designed" in order to provide flexibility for employment lands where future severance is not anticipated under part d and where the installation of solar canopies is not anticipated due to operational needs.	revised
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.3.402	Requires Clarification		Policy 2.3.402 states "Surface parking lots, where permitted, should be designed to meet all of the following: a Minimize the number and width of vehicle entrances that interrupt pedestrian movement by consolidating accesses with adjacent developments/properties and providing internal access easements with adjacent properties. ... g Support the installation of solar canopies over surface parking lots." In our submission, "where appropriate" should be added after "should be designed" in order to provide flexibility for where the consolidation of accesses is not possible due to grades or operational reasons and where the installation of solar canopies is not anticipated due to operational needs.	revised
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	2.3.403	Requires Clarification		2.3.403 states "The City will explore a strategy and options for the short and long-term parking of trucks." We request clarification as to the intent of the policy as it relates to trailer parking associated with warehouse uses	Comment Addressed - policy is related to standalone (illegal) truck parking facilities
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.404			2.3.404 The City needs to explicitly commit to increasing transit service hours in order to increase ridership, to transition people away from cars	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-241			2-241 The Planning department moves too slowly, and can't actually get the data to be able to right size parking requirements. If you have minimum car parking requirements, by the nature of the planning department, it will lead to overprovision of parking, unless they are so low as to be irrelevant, in which case why have them?	comment received
Health and Wellness							
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-249			2-249 If you want 1.6 hectares per 1k people, you need to acquire the Brampton Golf Club on Kennedy Road to ensure Uptown will have adequate parkland	Comment Received
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.419	Revision Requested		Low impact development techniques should be permitted within parks, without penalizing the developer for parkland credit.	Comment Received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.419			2.3.419 Incorporating a way to block urbanization of the Brampton Golf Club will reduce the land value, making it easier to acquire, even in the US with constitutional property rights that isn't considered a taking	Comment Received

30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.3.421	Revision Requested	Permitting LID's in parks is important however developers should continue to receive full credit for the park with or without LID's	Comment Received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-256		2-256 You should probably have a map of all the parkland and public greenspace, including the valleyland with it displayed together	Comment Received
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.427	Requires Clarification	This policy is counter to the above noted policies that seek to have LID's within parks.	Comment received- noted for review.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.428	Requires Clarification	Will private amenity spaces be provided with parkland credit? If not, the private amenity space should only be available to the residents that pay to maintain it.	Comment received - the parkland dedication by-law review is being undertaken and will evaluate this further.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	2.2.429	Requires Clarification	What does the value of an offsite park have to do with whether the park location is suitable or not? This should be removed as it is irrelevant.	Comment received - this ensures that enough parkland has been provided to serve the surrounding community.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-266		2-266 Brampton needs a Catholic cemetery, since the City wants to develop where the Archdiocese of Toronto had acquired land for one, where is it going to be?	Comment Received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p.2-267		2-267 I don't see a number of golf courses shown on Schedule 10	Comment Received - Golf Courses currently shown as 'City Park' layer but will be identified on updated Schedule 10 (now Schedule 8)
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.463		2.3.463 The City needs to prepare for opening facilities such as splash pads earlier in the year as weather dictates, to ensure people can stay cool.	Comment Received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.464		2.3.464 We need the heating by-law to be temperature dependent and also include a cooling bylaw component. We also need to do retrofitting of older private buildings with heat pumps to ensure residents can stay cool in the summer	Comment Received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.465		2.3.465 What steps are you taking to help get medical office space built?	Comment received - the major institutional section has been updated with specific policies related to hospitals/ideal locations for medical office space due to proximity to hospitals
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.466		2.3.466 If you want that to happen, we need to significantly increase service hours for transit. Transit allows people to get to work without needing a car, allowing them to reduce or eliminate the number of cars they own. When they eliminate cars from the household, they tend to specifically patronize businesses they can walk or take transit to because it is convenient	Comment received
June 3, 2022	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Maple Lodge Farms Ltd (owner) 8301 and 8175 Winston Churchill Blvd	Section 2.3.470 to 2	Needs Discussion	Lands situated within the City of Brampton east of Winston Churchill Boulevard, west of Heritage Road, north of Highway 407, and south of Embleton Road are predominately planned and designated for industrial land use. Similarly lands within the Town of Halton Hills west of Winston Churchill Boulevard are designated employment and/or are located within future strategic employment lands. Over the last two decades both municipalities have experienced significant growth. Greenfield development in the form of industrial warehousing, commercial centres, and residential plans of subdivision are now in close proximity to MLF landholdings and more specifically their Processing Facility Area of Influence (A01). Section 2.3.470 to 2.3.476 addresses land use compatibility. MLF wishes to express its general support for sensitive land uses where permitted or proposed outside of and adjacent to or near Employment Areas or within the A01 of major facilities to be planned to ensure that they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated as appropriate from Employment Areas and/or major facilities. Requiring the proponent of an application proposing sensitive land uses in proximity to an Employment Area to submit a Compatibility/Mitigation Study is appropriate.	Noted
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountinash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.3.472	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.3.472 states "Where permitted uses are in proximity to and potentially have adverse impacts on sensitive uses either within the same designation or an adjacent designation, amendments and minor variances to the Zoning By-law will consider building setbacks to maximize the separation distance from sensitive use(s). Site plan control will consider the siting of structures and/or outdoor operations to minimize potential adverse impacts to sensitive use(s)". In our submission we suggest that ", or other measures", should be added after "building setbacks" to protect employment uses from neighbouring sensitive land uses.	Comment Addressed
June 2/2022	Dentons Canada LLP	Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55	2.3.474	Revision Requested	needs and alternatives tests, as outlined in the PPS, they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated as adjacent to or near to Employment Areas or within the influence area of major facilities, should be planned to ensure they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated as appropriate from Employment Areas and/or major facilities to e Permit Employment Areas to be developed for their intended purpose". In our submission we suggest that "should" be replaced with "shall" or "will" to protect employment uses from neighbouring sensitive land uses. We also ask that	Comment Addressed
03-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Choice Properties REIT (owner), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55	2.3.474	Requires Clarification	Add b. Identify and evaluate options, in accordance with the PPS land use compatibility test, to achieve appropriate design, buffering and/or separation distances between the proposed sensitive land uses, including residential uses and nearby Employment Areas and/or major facilities; and,	Comment Addressed
June 2/2022	Dentons Canada LLP	Katryna Vergis-Mayo on behalf of CNR Company (owner)	2.3.475	Revision Requested	After c. In order to ensure the long-term economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures.	Comment Addressed
June 2/2022	Dentons Canada LLP	Katryna Vergis-Mayo on behalf of CNR Company (owner)	2.3.485	Revision Requested	Amend to recognize that the Class 4 classification does not apply to federally-regulated uses, including CN Rail.	Comment Addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.486		2.3.486 separation from OBRV should still be planned as if it were an active railway, in order to enable it to be reactivated in the future.	Comment received.
June 2/2022	Dentons Canada LLP	Katryna Vergis-Mayo on behalf of CNR Company (owner)	2.3.486-2.3.492	Revision Requested	Strengthen policies with addition of references to air quality and a requirement for air quality studies in relation to rail yards	Comment received - please identify specific policies to strengthen. These policies need to be read in coordination with the Sustainability and Climate Change policies, which references to air quality
Jobs and Living Centres						
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.495		2.3.495 How often is it going to be updated, once? Regularly? Set a time frame, such as updating it every five years.	Comment received - to be determined through the Master Plan exercise
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.498		2.3.498 support the expansion how? As detailed in the Economic Development Master Plan? Any measurement metrics?	Comment received - to be determined through the Master Plan exercise.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.499		2.3.499 Does this include collaboration with Post Secondary Educational institutions?	Comment addressed- yes, engagement and collaboration with post-secondary institutions is ongoing and is supported through Brampton's Town and Gown Advisory Committee.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.500		2.3.500 If it is the focus, what does this mean for the Sheridan campus? Do you plan to decline to invest in the Sheridan campus in order to ensure innovation happens Downtown? Manufacturing innovation might be better suited to office/industrial space in an industrial area	Comment received- further investment will be a component of the Uptown Centre planning, including recognizing the important role that Sheridan has in Brampton.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.506		2.3.506 The Queen Street Corridor close to Highway 410 is the optimal location	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.521		2.3.521 The biggest thing you can do for improving Brampton's culinary scene is improving transit on evenings and weekends, and naking minimum parking requires. We also need to fix the sign by-law in order to make loading zones for delivery vastly easier to do.	Comment received.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.585		2.3.585 Precinct Plans, not Block Plans	Comment addressed

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 4)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
30-May	Member of Public	Vito Ditaranto	Special Policy Area 2	Revision Requested	Add McVean Drive to the name of roads in Special Policy Area 2 c)	Comment addressed.
06-Jun-22	KIM Planning Partners Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc (owner) - 4320 Queen Street East	Special Policy Area 15	New Policy	Modify text to reflect the Special Land Use Policy Area language established via OPA 129 and OPA 208.	Comment received - following up on it being integrated into Brampton Plan
June 3, 2022	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Lodge Farms Ltd (owner) 8301 and 8175 Winston Churchill Blvd	Section 2.3.470 to 2.3.476	Revision Requested	2.MLF acknowledges and appreciates the inclusion of the Corridor Protection policy exemption within Chapter 4 Site and Area Specific Policies. Section 1 b) iii) permits the expansion of the main Processing Plant and ancillary uses located at 8301 Winston Churchill Boulevard, subject to standard conditions of development approval. As noted earlier in this correspondence MLF is planning to commence the next phase of its facility expansion and site improvements in the very near future	Noted
June 3, 2022	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)			<p>Policy to exempt the subject site from additional Secondary Plan review and the approval of a Precinct Plan, MTSA Plan and Area Plan. Alternatively, Policies 2.1.33.c), 2.1.49, 2.3.37, 3.1.52, 3.1.54, 3.1.57, 3.1.63, 3.1.64, be deleted or amended as set out in Appendix 1 of this letter.</p> <p>Policy 2.3.37 directs that Tall Plus buildings (buildings over 25 storeys) will only be permitted where they are identified in a City-initiated Secondary Plan and/or Precinct Plan.</p> <p>Policies 3.1.52 through 3.1.58 deal with the requirement and context of Precinct Plans as part of submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and/or Zoning By-law Amendment Applications.</p> <p>Policies 3.1.59 through 3.1.65 deal with the requirement and context of Area Plans as part of complete planning applications.</p> <p>Policy 3.1.66 deals with the requirement and context of a Primary Major Transit Station Study, Secondary Plans, Block Plans and/or MTSA Plans, where required by the City of Brampton, should not be at the cost of development proponents. The scope of these exercises within the urban Built-up Area, which may involve many landowners, should be borne by the City of Brampton, unless these pre-existing plans are being amended on a site specific basis through individual Amendment Applications.</p> <p>Draft Brampton Plan Policy 2.2.53 directs that existing Secondary Plans, or MTSA Plan studies will provide more specific direction for each distinct Mixed-Use District. In the case of the subject site, it is our opinion that the existing Downtown Brampton Secondary Plan provides sufficient land use policy direction to advance a residential and mixed use redevelopment on the subject site without the need for additional Secondary Plan, Precinct Plan, MTSA Plan and Area Plan approvals.</p> <p>The majority of the lands located within the City's Primary and Planned MTSAs, Centres and the Urban Growth Centre do not currently have Precinct Plans.</p> <p>Further, it is our opinion that the proposed multi-faceted approval process for the redevelopment of sites within the City's Strategic Growth Areas, which may include upwards of four (4) additional studies/plans to be approved through a public consultation process prior to Site Plan Approval, is excessive and unnecessary and will severely delay the facilitation of residential uses in the midst of an identified Housing Crisis as well as postpone the delivery of new jobs.</p>	Comment received - Brampton Plan does not preclude site specific applications to be processed. Brampton Plan provides flexibility to consider such applications.
June 3, 2022	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Voddan Street East (Centennial Mall)	Chapter 4	Revision Requested	<p>Secondary Plans, Block Plans and/or MTSA Plans, where required by the City of Brampton, should not be at the cost of development proponents. The scope of these exercises within the urban Built-up Area, which may involve many landowners, should be borne by the City of Brampton, unless these pre-existing plans are being amended on a site specific basis through individual Amendment Applications.</p> <p>The majority of the lands located within the City's Primary and Planned MTSAs, Centres and the Urban Growth Centre do not currently have Precinct Plans.</p> <p>Further, it is our opinion that the proposed multi-faceted approval process for the redevelopment of sites within the City's Strategic Growth Areas, which may include upwards of four (4) additional studies/plans to be approved through a public consultation process prior to Site Plan Approval, is excessive and unnecessary and will severely delay the facilitation of residential uses in the midst of an identified Housing Crisis as well as postpone the delivery of new jobs.</p> <p>OProposed Policy Modification: Chapter 4 be modified to include a new Site and Area Specific Policy to exempt the subject site from additional Secondary Plan review and the approval of a Precinct Plan, MTSA Plan and Area Plan. Alternatively, Policies 2.1.33.c), 2.1.49, 2.3.37, 3.1.52, 3.1.54, 3.1.57, 3.1.63, 3.1.64, be deleted or amended as set out in Appendix 1 of this letter.</p> <p>X.1 - Notwithstanding the policies of this Plan, the redevelopment of the lands municipally known in 2022 as 227 Voddan Street East, for residential and non-residential uses, may be approved through a site specific amendment to the Brampton Flowertown Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law in advance of any additional Secondary Plan review, and Precinct Plan, Major Transit Station Area Plan and Area Plan.</p>	Comment received - Brampton Plan does not preclude site specific applications to be processed. Brampton Plan provides flexibility to consider such applications.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Chapter 4	Revision Requested	<p>Chapter 4 be modified to include a new Site and Area Specific Policy to exempt the subject site from additional Secondary Plan review and the approval of a Precinct Plan, MTSA Plan and Area Plan. Alternatively, Policies 2.1.33.c), 2.1.49, 2.3.37, 3.1.52, 3.1.54, 3.1.57, 3.1.63, 3.1.64, be deleted or amended as set out in Appendix 1 of this letter.</p>	Comment received - Brampton Plan does not preclude site specific applications to be processed. Brampton Plan provides flexibility to consider such applications.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Mississauga Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 261 and Soneil Oakeville Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 263 (261 and 263	Chapter 4	Revision Requested	<p>Chapter 4 be modified to include a new Site and Area Specific Policy to exempt the subject site from additional Secondary Plan review and the approval of a Precinct Plan, MTSA Plan and Area Plan. Alternatively, Policies 2.1.33.c), 2.1.49, 2.3.37, 3.1.52, 3.1.54, 3.1.57, 3.1.63, 3.1.64, be deleted or amended as set out in Appendix 1 of this letter.</p>	Comment received - Brampton Plan does not preclude site specific applications to be processed. Brampton Plan provides flexibility to consider such applications.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	Chapter 4	Revision Requested	<p>OProposed Policy Modification: Chapter 4 be modified to include a new Site and Area Specific Policy to exempt the subject site from additional Secondary Plan review and the approval of a Precinct Plan, MTSA Plan and Area Plan. Alternatively, Policies 2.1.33.c), 2.1.49, 2.2.126, 3.1.52, 3.1.54, 3.1.57, 3.1.63, 3.1.64, be deleted or amended as set out in Appendix 1 of this letter</p> <p>New Site and Area Specific Policy Area be included, as follows:</p> <p>X.1 - Notwithstanding the policies of this Plan, the redevelopment of the lands municipally known in 2022 as 2 County Court Boulevard, for residential and non-residential uses, including office, may be approved through a site specific amendment to the Hurontario - Main Corridor Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law in advance of any additional Secondary Plan review, and Precinct Plan, Major Transit Station Area Plan and Area Plan.</p>	Comment received - Brampton Plan does not preclude site specific applications to be processed. Brampton Plan provides flexibility to consider such applications.
June 3, 2022	Malone Given Parsons	Lauren Caplongo on behalf of Alpha Stone Inc (owner), 0 Humbewest Parkway	Special Policy 19		<p>Revised Special Land Use Policy Area 19 to conform to OPA 2006-195 and Clarify Medium Density: Secondly, we note that Policy Area 19 includes subsection (e) which states "The balance of the residential uses at the southeast quadrant of The Gore and Focal Roads will be developed with a range of medium density housing types". The current OP contains a description of Medium Density (which permits a density of up to 50 units per hectare and includes singles, semi-detached and townhouses) which is not carried forward in the Draft OP. As such, we would suggest that the City revise subsection (e) to clarify the definition of Medium density.</p>	Comment received- additional work is being undertaken to clarify intentions/ define densities in a manner that updates the original tables in the 2006 OP for any lands in the Neighbourhood policy section. In the context of Special Policy 19, the densities would be subject to the MTSA study.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Mississauga Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 261 and Soneil Oakeville Inc., O/A Soneil Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	Special Policy Area	New Policy	<p>Chapter 4 — Site and Area Specific Policies New Site and Area Specific Policy Area be included, as follows:</p> <p>X.1 - Notwithstanding the policies of this Plan, the redevelopment of the lands municipally known in 2022 as 261 & 263 Queen Street East, for residential and non-residential uses, may be approved through a site specific amendment to the Queen Street Corridor Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law in advance of any additional Secondary Plan review, and Precinct Plan, Major Transit Station Area Plan and Area Plan.</p>	Comment received - Brampton Plan does not preclude site specific applications to be processed. Brampton Plan provides flexibility to consider such applications.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 5)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2022/06/03	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of Bovaird Commercial Centre Ltd.	General		identified as being within a Primary Major Transit Station Area, Schedule 13 – Secondary Plan and Precinct Plan Areas, of the draft Official Plan, also shows the subject property as being within a "precinct plan area", specifically area 51-1. Chapter 3 of the draft Official Plan provides direction related to precinct plans. It is our understanding that a block plan was established for area 51-1 and was approved by the City of Brampton in May of 2011. This block plan established land uses, features and community infrastructure for this area and related Community Urban Design Guidelines were also developed. It is our understanding that this block plan serves as a precinct plan for this area and development applications for the subject property would be able to proceed through the planning process to approval in accordance with this plan. We seek clarification of this understanding.	Comment addressed - Precinct Plan is the new term to refer to Block Plans.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.3(b)		3.1.3(b) What are the implications of priority levels?	Comment addressed- updated to clarify intent. Please review the updated draft and confirm intention is better covered.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tech Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	3.1.11	Requires Clarification	What is a phasing agreement and why is it assumed they may be necessary? This policy should be removed.	Comment received - this is an existing policy in the 2006 Official Plan.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.17		3.1.17 Does transportation improvement phasing include Brampton Transit service hours and building Zum lines? Brampton Transit has had serious issues with inadequate transit service hours for the growth being added. In order to meet transit targets, Brampton Transit is going to be need to given blocks of hours to increase ridership in the existing population, and additional service hours to meet needs for population growth. The costs of increased population are not equal, the farebox recovery is extremely high on routes like the 501 Queen, while routes servicing greenfield expansion often have much higher costs due to low farebox recovery until the area fills out.	Comment received - discussed this with Sylvia over the phone. Advised would provide this comment to the Transportation Planning team and advise to consider as part of the TMP update.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.18		3.1.18 What specific steps is the City of Brampton going to take in the Brampton Plan to ensure sufficient medical office space is built to accommodate family practice needs?	Comment received - this policy is focused on supporting the growing need for more hospitals in Brampton. With these locations, there are the relevant supplemental medical spaces needed in close proximity to these hospitals. Through the Major Institutional Areas policies (Health Care Facilities) in the Mixed Use Area section, hospitals and the necessary supporting medical office space is addressed.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.19		3.1.19 Ironically, the Draft Official Plan doesn't comply with accessibility requirements that we were required to follow in 2014, you have a lot of headers that are words, that are images, not text, that a screen reader might be unable to process	Comment to be addressed- in finalizing the document, a review for AODA compliance has been identified as a key next step to ensure accessibility requirements are met. Staff are seeking to support a screen reader reading through the next draft of Brampton Plan by providing ALT text for graphics.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.40	Revision Requested	3.1.40 Map 13, do you mean Schedule 13?	Confirmed and completed update
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.43	Revision Requested	Schedule 13	Comment addressed - Confirmed and completed update
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.44	Revision Requested	Schedule 13	Comment addressed - confirmed and completed update
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.53	Revision Requested	Schedule 2	Comment addressed
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	3.1.57		3.1.57 - The City may enact Zoning By-laws and approve Site Plan Applications without a Precinct Plan process for uses that the City deems are in the City and the Region's interest, such as a Provincial facilities, Civic Infrastructure, or transit facilities, and significant private development proposals, provided that such proposals meet all applicable policies and legislation, and provided the proposed development...	Comment received- in the cases where this policy would apply for private development proposals would be in the case fo public-private partnerships. Please review updated policy.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	3.1.57	Revision Requested	OProposed Policy Modification: Policy 3.1.57 be modified to include private development proposals as part of the list of appropriate projects that may proceed to Zoning By-Law Amendment and Site Plan Approval without an approved Precinct Plan.	Comment received- in the cases where this policy would apply for private development proposals would be in the case fo public-private partnerships. Please review updated policy.
2022/06/03	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Mr. Mario Matteo Silvestro, Mr. Guido D'Alesio and 2086205 Ontario Ltd., the Registered Owners of 22, 24, 26, 28 and 32 John Street	3.1.57	Revision Requested	Section 3.1.57 addresses circumstances where the City may enact Zoning By-law and approve Site Plan Applications without a Precinct Plan process for uses that the City deems are in the City and the Region's interest. The list of uses should be expanded to include significant private development proposals	Comment received- in the cases where this policy would apply for private development proposals would be in the case fo public-private partnerships. Please review updated policy.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and 263 Queen Street East	3.1.57	Revision Requested	3.1.57 - The City may enact Zoning By-laws and approve Site Plan Applications without a Precinct Plan process for uses that the City deems are in the City and the Region's interest, such as a Provincial facilities, Civic Infrastructure, or transit facilities, and significant private development proposals, provided that such proposals meet all applicable policies and legislation, and provided the proposed development: a Can be supported by existing servicing infrastructure; b Protects, preserves, enhances and restores natural heritage features; c Protects, preserves, enhances and conserves places and/or landscapes of cultural heritage value; d Protects for the future right-of-way of Centres and Boulevards and any planned Transit Network facilities;	Comment received- in the cases where this policy would apply for private development proposals would be in the case fo public-private partnerships. Please review updated policy.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	3.1.57	Revision Requested	Potential language change: " Xi - Notwithstanding the policies of this Plan, the redevelopment of the lands municipally known in 2022 as 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue, for residential and non-residential uses, may be approved through a site specific amendment to the Queen Street Corridor Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law in advance of any additional Secondary Plan review, and Precinct Plan, Major Transit Station Area Plan and Area Plan."	Comment received- in the cases where this policy would apply for private development proposals would be in the case fo public-private partnerships. Please review updated policy.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and 263 Queen Street East	3.1.57	Revision Requested	Potential language change: " Xi - Notwithstanding the policies of this Plan, the redevelopment of the lands municipally known in 2022 as 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue, for residential and non-residential uses, may be approved through a site specific amendment to the Queen Street Corridor Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law in advance of any additional Secondary Plan review, and Precinct Plan, Major Transit Station Area Plan and Area Plan."	Comment to be addressed- provided wording and direction to the consultant to add this section.
2022/06/03	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of Bovaird Commercial Centre Ltd.	3.1.66	Requires Clarification	We request clarification of this policy as it relates to the subject property and confirmation that a study of this nature, if it were to be undertaken, would not delay or prevent the approval of a site plan application for a proposal that is permitted by the zoning by-law and developed in accordance with the existing secondary plan and block plan	Comment addressed- the City is currently working through the relevant MTSAs studies to complete this work in conformity with Regional direction. Updated wording to reflect the ROPA policy by adding "...to the satisfaction of the Region."

30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.66	Revision Requested	Schedule 5	Comment addressed
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Investments Inc. (10 and 26 Victoria	3.1.66	Revision Requested	study for each of the designated Primary MTSAs, which will result in a secondary plan policy	Use Area
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	3.1.66	Requires Clarification	3.1.66 states "Through separate studies, the City will undertake a detailed comprehensive planning study for each designated Primary Major Transit Station Area shown on Map 5. The recommendations for each Primary Major Transit Station Area will be implemented through amendments to the applicable Secondary Plan, and will address... b) The detailed transit-supportive land uses in each Major Transit Station Area based on the permitted uses of the Urban Hub designation and the minimum density target listed in Table 1." For Part b, we request clarification as to the reference to an "Urban Hub designation", since such terminology is only found in Policy 3.1.130 in the draft Official Plan.	Comment addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.76	Revision Requested	Schedule 2	Comment addressed - To be addressed and added in Brampton Plan
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	3.1.77	Revision Requested	to satisfy the inclusionary zoning policies of the Brampton Plan. This policy is not sufficiently clear to identify that it will only apply to those developments of ten residential units or more where stipulated through a future inclusionary zoning amendment and By-law. Clarification should be provided in the policy. Additionally, the threshold for the applicability of this inclusionary zoning policy of ten residential units is inappropriately low and should be increased to a minimum of at least 50 residential units to reflect the limitations and financial challenges that small infill developments with less than 50 residential units are faced with. Proposed Policy Modification: Policy 3.1.77 be modified to increase the threshold for the applicability of inclusionary zoning to a minimum of 50 residential units and clarify that the policy is only applicable	Comment received- in discussing this with GWD, we advised that our policies are high level and conforming to Regional and Provincial language. As we work to review and update the policies, a higher threshold may be applied depending on the outcome of consultation to develop the policies. The current wording reflects the language identified in the Planning Act.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonel Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	3.1.77	Revision Requested	This policy is not sufficiently clear to identify that it will only apply to those developments of ten residential units or more where stipulated through a future inclusionary zoning amendment and By-law. Clarification should be provided in the policy. Additionally, the threshold for the applicability of this inclusionary zoning policy of ten residential units is inappropriately low and should be increased to a minimum of at least 50 residential units to reflect the financial challenges that small infill developments with less than 50 residential units are faced with. Proposed Policy Modification: Policy 3.1.77 be modified to increase the threshold for the applicability of inclusionary zoning to a minimum of 50 residential units and clarify that the policy is only applicable to new developments required to provide inclusionary zoning pursuant to the Planning Act.	Comment received- in discussing this with GWD, we advised that our policies are high level and conforming to Regional and Provincial language. As we work to review and update the policies, a higher threshold may be applied depending on the outcome of consultation to develop the policies. The current wording reflects the language identified in the Planning Act.
June 3, 2022	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Yodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	3.1.77	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.77 directs that new developments with a minimum of ten residential units may be required to satisfy the inclusionary zoning policies of the Brampton Plan. This policy is not sufficiently clear to identify that it will only apply to those developments of ten residential units or more where stipulated through a future inclusionary zoning amendment and By-law. Clarification should be provided in the policy. Proposed Policy Modification: Policy 3.1.77 be modified to clarify that the policy is only applicable to new developments required to provide inclusionary zoning pursuant to the Planning Act.	Comment received- in discussing this with GWD, we advised that our policies are high level and conforming to Regional and Provincial language. As we work to review and update the policies, a higher threshold may be applied depending on the outcome of consultation to develop the policies. The current wording reflects the language identified in the Planning Act.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 225 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	3.1.77	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.77 directs that new developments with a minimum of ten residential units may be required to satisfy the inclusionary zoning policies of the Brampton Plan. This policy is not sufficiently clear to identify that it will only apply to those developments of ten residential units or more where stipulated through a future inclusionary zoning amendment and By-law. Clarification should be provided in the policy. Proposed Policy Modification: Policy 3.1.77 be modified to clarify that the policy is only applicable to new developments required to provide inclusionary zoning pursuant to the Planning Act.	Comment received- in discussing this with GWD, we advised that our policies are high level and conforming to Regional and Provincial language. As we work to review and update the policies, a higher threshold may be applied depending on the outcome of consultation to develop the policies. The current wording reflects the language identified in the Planning Act.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonel Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonel Queen 261 and Sonel Oakville Inc., O/A Sonel Queen 263 (261 and 263	3.1.77	Requires Clarification	Policy 3.1.77 be modified to increase the threshold for the applicability of inclusionary zoning and clarify that the policy is only applicable to new developments required to provide inclusionary zoning pursuant to the Planning Act.	Comment received- in discussing this with GWD, we advised that our policies are high level and conforming to Regional and Provincial language. As we work to review and update the policies, a higher threshold may be applied depending on the outcome of consultation to develop the policies. The current wording reflects the language identified in the Planning Act.
30-May-22	Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.77		apartment buildings, unless explicitly required to set this threshold by the Region, it should be more	Comment addressed
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonel Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonel Queen 261 and Sonel Oakville Inc., O/A Sonel Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	3.1.85	Revision Requested	3.1.85 - Planning and development applications may be required to submit a Housing Analysis as a complete application requirement for all rezoning, subdivision and site plan applications to demonstrate implementation of the results of a related Housing Assessment Report; unless such a Housing Assessment Report is not established, in which case a Housing Assessment Report will be required to be included within the proposed development application in lieu of a Housing Analysis.	Comment received - the information collected through the Housing analysis is required for tracking through the Growth Management program.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Yodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	3.1.85	Revision Requested	3.1.85 - Planning and development applications may be required to submit a Housing Analysis as a complete application requirement for all rezoning, subdivision and site plan applications to demonstrate implementation of the results of a related Housing Assessment Report; unless such a Housing Assessment Report is not established, in which case a Housing Assessment Report will be required to be included within the proposed development application in lieu of a Housing Analysis.	Comment received - the information collected through the Housing analysis is required for tracking through the Growth Management program.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonel Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	3.1.85	Revision Requested	3.1.85-Planninganddevelopment applications will be required to submit a Housing Analysis as a complete application requirement for all rezoning, subdivision and siteplanapplicationstodemonstrate implementation of the results of a related Housing Assessment Report; unless such a HousingAssessmentReportis not established, inwhichcaseaHousing Assessment Report will be required to be included within the proposed development application in lieu of a Housing Analysis	Comment received - the information collected through the Housing analysis is required for tracking through the Growth Management program.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonel Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	3.1.85	Revision Requested	3.1.85 - Planning and development applications w-H1 may be required to submit a Housing Analysis as a complete application requirement for all rezoning, subdivision and siteplanapplicationstodemonstrate implementation of the results of a related Housing Assessment Report; unless such a HousingAssessmentReportis not established, inwhichcaseaHousing Assessment Report will be required to be included within the proposed development application in lieu of a Housing Analysis.	Comment received - staff are evaluating how to support missing middle housing typologies as an element of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.85		3.1.85 I am concerned this could be an onerous requirement hurting Missing Middle Housing if you don't design the new zoning very loosely.	Comment addressed- updated wording
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonel Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	3.1.91	Policy Clarification	Required Policy Clarification: Please provide clarification of this policy including an explanation of how the City intends on addressing development applications that have been submitted to the City in advance of City Council approval of the new draft Brampton Plan and/or in advance of Region of Peel approval. The City should consider a transition clause(s) for those in-process development applications submitted prior to the final enactment of the Brampton Plan.	Comment received- the current 2006 OP remains in force and effect until it is adopted by Council and approved by the Region. Development applications submitted with the 2006 OP in effect will be subject to the 2006 provisions.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon, Richard Domes and Nikhal Dawan on behalf of Zia Mohammad and Shamyia Hameed (8671 Heritage Road)	3.1.91 and 1.1.7b	Revision Requested	The subject site should be identified in the new draft Brampton Plan as being an appropriate location for mid-rise seniors development in the City Structure as identified in the Amendment Application. The City should consider a transition clause(s) for those in-process development applications submitted prior to the final enactment of the Brampton Plan. Required Policy Clarification: Please provide clarification on the above noted policies including an explanation of how the City intends on addressing development applications that have been submitted to the City in advance of City Council approval of the new draft Brampton Plan and/or in advance of Region of Peel approval.	Comment received- the current 2006 OP remains in force and effect until it is adopted by Council and approved by the Region. Development applications submitted with the 2006 OP in effect will be subject to the 2006 provisions.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	3.1.91 and 1.1.7b	Revision Requested	Required Policy Clarification: Please provide clarification on the above noted policies including an explanation of how the City intends on addressing development applications that have been submitted to the City in advance of City Council approval of the new draft Brampton Plan and/or in advance of Region of Peel approval. Additional and/or revised comments may be provided depending on the municipal response to the above.	Comment received- the current 2006 OP remains in force and effect until it is adopted by Council and approved by the Region. Development applications submitted with the 2006 OP in effect will be subject to the 2006 provisions.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Yodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	3.1.91 and 1.1.7b	Revision Requested	The subject site should be identified in the new draft Brampton Plan as being an appropriate location for high density mixed use development in the City Structure as identified in the Davenport Amendment Application and Master Plan. The City should consider a transition clause(s) for those in-process development applications submitted prior to the final enactment of the Brampton Plan. Required Policy Clarification: Please provide clarification on the above noted policies including an explanation of how the City intends on addressing development applications that have been submitted to the City in advance of City Council approval of the new draft Brampton Plan and/or in advance of Region of Peel approval.	Comment received - the CBC strategy is currently being undertaken and will be shared with relevant City staff.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.93		3.1.93 If the impact on the transit network is larger than can be paid for with the transit DCS, the CBC revenue should go to transit.	Comment received
30-May-22	KLM	X Development Inc., Mustique	3.1.94	Requires Clarification	Brampton Plan are not reasonable and should be revised to a target of 10% of the units, City wide, on	Comment Addressed

30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.105		3.1.105 The City also needs to ensure certain items such as the parking by-law are regularly updated	Comment addressed
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.127		3.1.127 Having talked to people who build Missing Middle housing, 5 is rather low, and plenty of Missing Middle housing projects could be killed for that, 10 would make it easier to actually deliver affordable housing	Comment addressed - updated
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	2.2.123	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.130 requires that Area-Specific Urban Design Guidelines be submitted as part of a complete site plan application for any sites that area greater than 1 hectare or if the site is located in a Centre, Boulevard, Corridor or Hub. Good urban design is an important component of the development process. However, Policy 3.1.130 is a mandatory policy and does not allow room for consideration of a site's physical or policy context or the type of development being proposed in the determination of whether an Area Specific Urban Design Guideline must be prepared as part of the site plan process. This would suggest that such guidelines are required even when there is sufficient urban design policy in the existing OP, secondary plan, precinct plan or the city-wide guidelines. Policy 3.1.130 should be modified to state that and Area-Specific Urban Design Guidelines "may" be required to allow the flexibility and discretion in circumstances where there is sufficient urban design guidance	Comment received- updated language to defer to 41(7) of the Planning Act to govern, rather than paraphrasing
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.133		3.1.133 If possible this should include special consideration in order to make buildings more accessible	Comment addressed- updated language to match Matt's wording
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	3.1.152		3.1.152 If you want to make housing more affordable, the easiest way to do it is more transit, including Zum and buying regular buses, in addition to funding Rapid Transit	Comment Addressed
24-May-22	Stanford	Mara Samardzic on behalf of Greenvale Developments Ltd (owner)	3.1.152		Proposed policy to state that where the existing Zoning By-Law does not implement the Official Plan, the City will not apply Section 37 where new development plans and applications intend to conform to such. Consider the application of Section 37 where a proposed change of permitted use with respect to existing but unbuilt permitted density, results in a increase to that density and translates into the need for improved services not yet captured in existing policy or anticipated zoning.	Comment addressed- currently in existing 2006 Official Plan.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Figures & Tables)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Table 1	Requires Clarification	Is the City seriously suggesting household size is going to increase? Brampton's current large household size is the result of a housing shortage fueling overcrowding	Comment received - Table 1
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263)	Table 2		Location (Schedule 2): Urban Growth Centre Classification: Urban Growth Centre Minimum Density Target (Persons and Jobs Per Hectare): 200 Additional Policy Area (Schedule 4): Primary Major Transit Station Area	Comment received - the UGC density target is identified in the policies just before Table 2. Please review the updated draft Brampton Plan.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	Table 2	Revision Requested	Table 2 identifies the City's Centres and Corridors, including their individual minimum density target and additional policy area considerations. The subject site should be located along Secondary Boulevard and located within a new Vodden/Kennedy Town Centre. OProposed Policy Modification: Table 2 be modified to include a new Vodden/Kennedy Town Centre. Location: Schedule 2 (Vodden/Kennedy) Classification: Town Centre Minimum Density Target (Persons and Jobs Per Hectare): 160 Additional Policy Area (Schedule 4): Primary Major Transit Station Area	Comment received - discussed through meetings with the consultants from GWD.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Table 2	Revision Requested	The City's Urban Growth Centre was proposed to achieve a 200 person minimum density of 200 residents and jobs combined per hectare. Add is in the first row of Table 2 the following: Location (Schedule 2): Urban Growth Centre Classification: Urban Growth Centre Minimum Density Target (Persons and Jobs Per Hectare): 200 Additional Policy Area (Schedule 4): Primary Major Transit Station Area	Comment addressed - this is covered before Table 2 through policy
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	Table 3	Revision Requested	Table 3 identifies the City's Primary MTSAs, including their individual minimum density target and additional policy area considerations. However, the Kennedy MTSA does not include reference to the additional policies of a new Vodden/Kennedy Town Centre and Kennedy Road North Secondary Urban Boulevard. The subject site should be located along a Secondary Urban Boulevard and located within a new Vodden/Kennedy Town Centre. OProposed Policy Modification: Table 3 be modified to provide reference to the additional policy direction pertaining to the proposed Vodden/Kennedy Town Centre and Kennedy Road North Secondary Urban Boulevard for the Kennedy MTSA. Primary Major Transit Station Area (Schedule 2): Kennedy	Comment received - the City Structure was determined as an outcome of public engagement and have been approved by Council. Extending the Secondary Urban Boulevard to Vodden is contingent upon transit. Please review relevant schedules modifications.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Table 3	Revision Requested	Table 3 identifies the City's Primary MTSAs, including their individual minimum density target and additional policy area considerations. However, the Kennedy MTSA does not include reference to the additional applicable policies of the Urban Growth Centre or an appropriate reference to the additional policies of the Urban Centre. The subject site should be located in the Urban Centre. Policy 2.2.54 reads, "The minimum density for residential and mixed-use development within the Mixed-Use District designation will be the minimum density target established for the corresponding Major Transit Station Area identified in Part 2.1 of Brampton Plan." Table 3 and Policy 2.2.54 be modified to provide reference to the additional policy direction pertaining to the Urban Growth Centre and Urban Centre for the Kennedy MTSA. Subject to the City's response to the concerns above, Schedule 1-City Structure and Schedule 2-City-Wide Growth Management be modified to include the subject site within the limits of the Urban Centre that is centred in the City's Downtown.	Comment received - Table 3 identifies specific densities as a result of the MCR process. Schedule 1 has been modified to capture the boundaries of the UGC, but the UGC density is identified in policy just above Table 3.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	Table 3	Revision Requested	Table 3 and Policy 2.2.54 be modified to provide reference to the additional policy direction pertaining to the Urban Growth Centre and Urban Centre for the Rutherford MTSA. Subject to the City's response to the concerns above, Schedule 1-City Structure and Schedule 2-City-Wide Growth Management be modified to include the subject site within the limits of the Urban Centre. Table 3 Primary Major Transit Station Area (Schedule 2): Rutherford Rapid Transit Corridor: Queen St. BRT Minimum Density Target (Persons and Jobs Per Hectare): 160 Additional Policy Area: Urban Growth Centre, Urban Centre, Primary Urban Boulevard	Comment received - the policies ahead of Table 2 have been updated to reflect the density target for the UGC. The densities identified for each MTSA was determined through Peel Region's MCR process. 160 reflects the minimum density. Rutherford is not in the actual Centre, but the relevant additional policy areas is what is reflected in Schedule 2 (now Schedule 1), the UGC is not on this schedule.
2022/06/03	Delta Urban	Mustafa Ghassan on behalf of Lark Investments Inc. (10 and 26 Victoria Crescent, 376, 387 and 391 Orenda Road, and 24 Bramalea Road)	Table 4	Revision Requested	Table 4 of the Draft OP summarizes the range of built form typologies permitted within each designation and overlay. In this regard, the subject site falls within a Mixed-Use District (MTSA) and Town Centre, which are identified as a "Low-Rise" typology for the Mixed-Use District and "Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise" for the Town Centre. Additional permissions are also identified and the Draft OP states that MTSA studies may identify appropriate locations for Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise and Tall Buildings. Town Centres include additional permissions for Tall Buildings subject to a precinct plan and being located within an MTSA. Furthermore, Tall Plus buildings are only permitted in Urban Centres through additional permissions. Response: In our opinion, Table 4 is overly restrictive and does not fully implement the Growth Plan and the growth management policies of the Draft ROP and Draft OP, which seek to optimize density in strategic growth areas and MTSA's, which are well served by public infrastructure and especially public transit. Furthermore, the Draft ROP does not include any building height or density maximums, instead it states that municipalities may include maximum building heights as part of Secondary Plans. Overall, in a provincial and regional planning policy framework that requires the optimization of land and development in strategic growth areas and MTSA's, which is the case for the subject site, it is our opinion that prescribing maximum building heights does not conform to the PPS, Growth Plan and Draft ROP. We recommend a request to revise Table 4 to permit all forms of building typologies subject to detailed study and compatibility with existing and planned surrounding uses. If there is a desire to direct the tallest buildings to designated "Urban Centres", the policy framework should state this. It is our opinion that the Draft OP is overly prescriptive and should provide more flexibility. In this regard, the Draft OP should not provide a rigid maximum building height of 25 storeys in Mixed-Use Districts and Town Centres.	Comment received - Table 4 is a general framework and provides flexibility for approaching heights, not a rigid framework that must be followed but general guidance. It does not prescribe anything in a rigid manner but provides a general framework to ensure the intended urban form outlined through the City structure is realized.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	Table 4	Revision Requested	The determination of building heights for lands located within the Mixed-Use Districts designation should be determined on a case by case basis through the review of existing Secondary Plan Policy and site specific development applications. OProposed Policy Modification: Table 4 be modified to permit the full range of building typologies for the Mixed-Use District designation	Comment received - Table 4 provides a full range of permitted heights in mixed use areas, subject to the respective overlay, Brampton plan identifies that centres, boulevards and corridors will be mixed-use areas, but with the relevant heights provided through the overlay. It may be appropriate in some instances for a mid-rise form 400 m from a Support Corridor, but may not in other instances. As of right, low-rise plus is the form that generally would apply.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon, Richard Domes and Nikhal Dawan on behalf of Zia Mohammad and Shamyia Hameed (8671 Heritage Road)	Table 4	Revision Requested	THE Table 4 building typology permissions for lands designated Neighbourhoods is inconsistent with our Client's development proposal, which proposes a building height of 7 storeys. The determination of building heights for lands located within the Neighbourhoods designation should be determined on a case-by-case basis through the review of site specific development applications. Proposed Policy Modification: Table 4 should be modified to permit a midrise building typology in the Neighbourhoods designation where lands are within 400 metres of a Support Corridor.	Comment received - as Table 4 provides a general height basis, it may be appropriate in some instances for a mid-rise form 400 m from a Support Corridor, but may not in other instances. As of right, low-rise plus is the form that generally would apply.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	Table 4		The subject site is proposed to be designated 'Mixed-Use Districts' on Schedule 5 of the draft Brampton Plan. Lands designated Mixed-Use Districts are associated with those lands identified as Primary MTSAs on Schedule 2 of the Brampton Plan. The Mixed-Use Districts designation is intended to accommodate a diversity of functions, a higher density of development, a greater degree of mixed uses, and higher level of transit connectivity than those areas outside Mixed-Use Districts. Table 4 identifies the built form typologies permitted within the Mixed-Use District designation. More specifically, according to draft Table 4 lands designated Mixed-Use Districts are restricted to "Low-rise" buildings no higher than 3 storeys, unless a MTSA Study is conducted which identifies the permission for up to Tall Buildings (buildings no higher than 25 storeys). It is our position that this building height restriction is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and does not conform to the Growth Plan, which generally direct high intensity redevelopment and intensification to MTSA's. Further Table 4 is not consistent with the Davpart development proposal, which contemplates building heights up to 33 storeys in height. The determination of building heights for lands located within the Mixed-Use Districts designation should be determined on a case by case basis through the review of site specific development applications. OProposed Policy Modification: Table 4 be modified to permit the full range of building typologies for the Mixed-Use District designation. Designation: Mixed Use District Building Typology: Low-Rise, Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings.	Comment received - Table 4 provides a full range of permitted heights in mixed use areas, subject to the respective overlay, Brampton plan identifies that centres, boulevards and corridors will be mixed-use areas, but with the relevant heights provided through the overlay.

2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	Table 4	Revision Requested	Table 4 be modified to permit the full range of building typologies for the Mixed-Use District designation. Table 4 Designation: Mixed Use District -Building Typology: Low-Rise, Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Major Transit Station Studies may identify appropriate locations for Low Rise Plus, Mid Rise and Tall buildings Overlay: Urban Centre -Building Typology: Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Mid-Rise, Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Tall and permitted subject to a Precinct Plan study and other applicable policies in this Plan Overlay: Primary Urban Boulevard -Building Typology: Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Mid-Rise Plus Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Tall buildings may be permitted subject to a Precinct Plan and other applicable policies in this Plan, and w/e-r- toGale4-4-1-1,4444;1--s-n-M-T-SA	Comment received - Table 4 provides a full range of permitted heights in mixed use areas, subject to the respective overlay. Brampton plan identifies that centres, boulevards and corridors will be mixed-use areas, but with the relevant heights provided through the overlay.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	Table 4	Revision Requested	Table 4 Designation: Mixed Use District -Building Typology: Low-Rise, Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Major Transit Station Studies may identify appropriate locations for r Dice Pli is Mid Ricd Tall buildings Overlay: Urban Centre -Building Typology: Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Mid-Rise, Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Tall and Tall Plus buildings may be permitted subject to a Precinct Plan study and other applicable policies in this Plan Overlay: Primary Urban Boulevard -Building Typology: Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Mid-Rise Plus Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Tall buildings may be permitted subject to a Precinct Plan and other applicable policies in this Plan, and where	Comment received - Table 4 provides a full range of permitted heights in mixed use areas, subject to the respective overlay. Brampton plan identifies that centres, boulevards and corridors will be mixed-use areas, but with the relevant heights provided through the overlay.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Table 4	Revision Requested	Table 4 be modified to permit the full range of building typologies for the Mixed-Use District designation. Table 4: Designation: Mixed Use District -Building Typology: Low-Rise, Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Major Transit Station Studies may identify appropriate locations for r Dice Pli is Mid Ricd Tall buildings Overlay: Urban Centre -Building Typology: Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Mid-Rise, Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Tall and Tall Plus buildings may be permitted subject to a Precinct Plan study and other applicable policies in this Plan Overlay: Primary Urban Boulevard -Building Typology: Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, Mid-Rise Plus Tall buildings, and Tall Plus buildings. -Additional Permissions: Tall buildings may be permitted subject to a Precinct Plan and other applicable policies in this Plan, and where located in within an MTSA "	Comment received - Table 4 provides a full range of permitted heights in mixed use areas, subject to the respective overlay. Brampton plan identifies that centres, boulevards and corridors will be mixed-use areas, but with the relevant heights provided through the overlay.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	Table 4	Revision Requested	Proposed Policy Modification: Table 4 be modified to permit the full range of building typologies for the Mixed-Use District designation The built form restrictions of Table 4 are inconsistent with the existing built form permissions in the applicable Secondary Plan which permits tall buildings up to and beyond a density of 3.5 FSI. The proposed new building height restrictions of draft Table 4 represents a significant reduction to current as-of-right permissions and current built conditions. It is our position that this building height restriction is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and does not conform to the Growth Plan, which generally direct high intensity redevelopment and intensification to the Urban Growth Centre, and MTSAs along Priority Corridors. The determination of building heights for lands located within the Mixed-Use Districts designation should be determined on a case by case basis through the review of existing Secondary Plan Policy and site specific development applications.	Comment received - Table 4 provides a full range of permitted heights in mixed use areas, subject to the respective overlay. Brampton plan identifies that centres, boulevards and corridors will be mixed-use areas, but with the relevant heights provided through the overlay.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Table 4	Revision Requested	Table 4 Designation references Schedule 3C, should be Schedule 3B. Low-Rise Plus should be allowed within 800 metres of the intersection of at least two of Higher Order Transit, Frequent Transit, or Support Corridor where properties front onto Collector Roads. Transportation relies on network effects, and the intersection of two of these lines is greater than twice as useful. It would be rather wasteful of transit resources to not do so. The constraints on where Low-Rise Plus is permitted directly conflict with goals on affordable housing, you must decide whether keeping buildings short or housing affordability are more desirable goals. Low-Rise Plus needs to be enabled across the board in Mixed-Use Districts.	Comment addressed- schedule reference updated. The 400 m from a support corridor is integrated into policy. Additionally, the policies outline relevant transitions will be supported to ensure that taller buildings in Centres and boulevards will have transitional areas to surrounding Neighbourhoods. The Mixed-Use areas now have low-rise plus as of right, but taller buildings may be permitted by the overlay.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Table 4	Revision Requested	Table 4 Overlays If you want 15 minute neighbourhoods, then the areas around Urban and Town Centres need to be looser within 15 minute walksheds of the central point, preferably 20 by the Urban Centres.	Comment received - it may be a 15 minute walk or bike ride is an approximate time frame.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	Table 4	Requires Clarification	We note the 'Low-Rise' Building Typology for the Mixed-Use District, Town Centres and Secondary Urban Boulevards designations would have a height range of up to and including 3 full storeys, which would anticipate a one-storey warehouse use on the Lands.	Comment received- the height framework identified is a general framework that provides flexibility. Land use permissions are outlined in each section of Brampton Plan for review.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Table 7 & 8	Requires Clarification	We are concerned with the affordable housing percentages the City is seeking to achieve at a total of 30%, split evenly between moderate and low incomes.	Comment received- these represent targets and recognition that affordable housing needs to ensure greater depth of affordability to all deciles below the 6th income decile. This includes both low and moderate income households and this table seeks to recognize the need to plan for all income deciles below the 6th income decile.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Table 7	Revision Requested	Table 7 is false precision, it is no better than numbers you pulled out of your hat, but presented as detailed numbers. Meeting the targets for Affordable Ownership would require transferring a staggering amount of public money, literally hundreds of millions of dollars per year, into private hands. The construction costs, both in hard costs, and soft costs, are so high it isn't possible to build new housing that is affordable at those costs.	Comment received- these numbers represent targets that help to address the housing need of residents based on demographic data. These are targets that help to determine what kind of need is out there and set an aim for starting to address these challenges through the monitoring work of the City.
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Table 8	Revision Requested	Table 8 is about rental tenure which is largely outside of City control. Expect to see a burst of rentals from additional residential units for the next couple years, but we don't know how many are actually new units, and that will dry up soon, as we are starting to run out of basements to put apartments in most houses	Comment received

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Schedules)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Schedules	Requires Clarification	Subject to the City's response to the concern above, Schedule 1-City Structure and Schedule 2-City-Wide Growth Management be modified to include the subject site within the limits of the Urban Centre that is centred in the City's Downtown.	Comment received - New Schedule 1 has been updated and noted as communities, which encompass what is identified as the Mixed Use Area and Neighbourhoods on the Designations Map of Schedule 2. The relevant permissions are outlined by the designations shown on Schedule 2.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amexon Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	Remove subject site and area within 'Urban Growth Centre', 'Urban Centres' and 'MTSAs' from 'Neighbourhoods' Add 'Urban Growth Centre' Remove subject site and area within 'Urban Growth Centre', 'Urban Centres' and 'MTSAs' from 'Neighbourhoods' Add 'Urban Growth Centre'	Comment received - New Schedule 1 has been updated and noted as communities, which encompass what is identified as the Mixed Use Area and Neighbourhoods on the Designations Map of Schedule 2. The relevant permissions are outlined by the designations shown on Schedule 2.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Schedules 1 and 2	Requires Clarification	Schedules 1 and 1 be modified to include the limits of the City of Brampton Urban Growth Centre	Comment addressed - the Urban Growth Centre has been integrated into the new Schedule 2. The UGC is captured under Communities, which comprise of both Mixed Use Areas and Neighbourhoods.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	The above noted policies are contrary to the Brampton Plan's intended Growth Management Framework. More specifically, the City's various Major Transit Station Areas ("MTSAs") are delineated in the new Brampton Plan, within which the underlying Growth Management Hierarchy is substantially comprised of the City's Neighbourhoods. As a result, many of the Centres and MTSAs, where some of the tallest buildings in the City are to be directed, are also identified as being within the City's Neighbourhoods where "lower-scale" uses are to be reflected. ØProposed Schedule Modification: Schedules 1 and 2 be modified to remove Neighbourhoods from the delineated limits of the Urban Growth Centre, Urban Centres and MTSAs to remove this built form conflict within the City Structure and City-wide Growth Management Framework, and to clearly distinguish these areas based on their position as high intensity growth areas within the City Structure. Remove subject site and area within 'Urban Growth Centre', 'Urban Centres' and 'MTSAs' from 'Neighbourhoods'. Add a new 'Town Centre' located at Kennedy Road North and Vodden Street East. Extend the limit of the Kennedy Road 'Secondary Urban Boulevard' to Vodden Street East.	Comment received - New Schedule 1 has been updated and noted as communities, which encompass what is identified as the Mixed Use Area and Neighbourhoods on the Designations Map of Schedule 2. The relevant permissions are outlined by the designations shown on Schedule 2. Extending the Secondary Urban Boulevard to Vodden is contingent upon transit. The Mixed Use designation, now with Mixed Use Area permissions as a result of being within the Urban Growth Centre will be the relevant policies to review.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.2.d reads, "Neighbourhoods reflect new and existing lower-scale residential, commercial and institutional areas of Brampton...". Policy 2.1.6 reads, "Neighbourhoods will be planned at a lower-scale than Centres, Boulevards and Corridors, and will accommodate the lowest density and building heights while providing a full range and mix of housing options." Policy 2.1.21 reads, "Intensification in Brampton will be accommodated, subject to the policies of this Plan by...Promoting gentle intensification in Neighbourhoods..." The above noted policies are contrary to the Brampton Plan's intended Growth Management Framework. More specifically, the City's various Major Transit Station Areas ("MTSAs") are delineated in the new Brampton Plan, within which the underlying Growth Management Hierarchy is substantially comprised of the City's Neighbourhoods. As a result, many of the Centres and MTSAs, where the tallest buildings in the City are to be directed, are also identified as being within the City's Neighbourhoods where "lower-scale" uses are to be reflected. Schedules 1 and 2 be modified to remove Neighbourhoods from the delineated limits of the Urban Growth Centres and MTSAs to remove this built form conflict within the City Structure and City-wide Growth Management Framework, and to clearly distinguish these areas based on their position as high intensity growth areas within the City Structure.	Comment received - New Schedule 1 has been updated and noted as communities, which encompass what is identified as the Mixed Use Area and Neighbourhoods on the Designations Map of Schedule 2. The relevant permissions are outlined by the designations shown on Schedule 2. Extending the Secondary Urban Boulevard to Vodden is contingent upon transit. The Mixed Use designation, now with Mixed Use Area permissions as a result of being within the Urban Growth Centre will be the relevant policies to review.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	The Davpart Amendment Application is suitable located within an MTSAs and within 800 metres of the Queen Street 'Primary Urban Boulevard' and City of Brampton 'Urban Growth Centre'. The Centennial Mall lands have historically functioned as a local centre within the community. The subject site's community function as a neighbourhood centre is proposed to be maintained as the built form and land use composition is updated and transformed. In this regard, the Brampton Plan should be prepared to accommodate the subject site's proposed evolution as envisaged in the Davpart Amendment Application. While the subject site is located within the Kennedy Road Major Transit Station Area ("MTSAs"), a Strategic Growth Area planned to accommodate higher density developments, this should also include the extension of the 'Secondary Urban Boulevard' north of Queen Street East to Vodden Street East and a consideration for the intersection of Vodden street East and Kennedy Road as a 'Town Centre'. ØProposed Schedule Modification: Schedules 1 and 2 be modified to extend the Secondary Urban Boulevard along Kennedy Road to terminate at Vodden Street East. and institutional areas of Brampton..."	Comment received - Extending the Secondary Urban Boulevard to Vodden is contingent upon transit. Please review relevant schedules modifications.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 263 (261 and 263 Queen Street East)	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.6 reads, "Neighbourhoods will be planned at a lower-scale than Centres, Boulevards and Corridors, and will accommodate the lowest density and building heights while providing a full range and mix of housing options." Policy 2.1.21 reads, "Intensification in Brampton will be accommodated, subject to the policies of this Plan by...promoting gentle intensification in Neighbourhoods..." The above noted policies are contrary to the Brampton Plan's intended Growth Management Framework. More specifically, the City's various MTSAs are delineated in the new Brampton Plan, within which the underlying Growth Management Hierarchy is substantially comprised of the City's Neighbourhoods. As a result, many of the Centres and MTSAs, where the tallest buildings in the City are to be directed, are also identified as being within the City's Neighbourhoods where "lower-scale" uses are to be reflected. Schedules 1 and 2 be modified to remove Neighbourhoods from the delineated limits of the Urban Growth Centre, Urban Centres and MTSAs to remove this built form conflict within the City Structure and City-wide Growth Management Framework, and to clearly distinguish these areas based on their position as high intensity growth areas within the City Structure. Remove subject site and area within 'Urban Growth Centre', 'Urban Centres' and 'MTSAs' from 'Neighbourhoods'	Comment received - please review relevant schedules modifications.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of 227 Vodden Street East (Centennial Mall)	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	ØProposed Schedule Modification: Schedules 1 and 2 be modified to identify the intersection of Vodden Street East and Kennedy Road North as a Town Centre	Comment received - please review relevant schedules modifications.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	Schedules 1 and 1 be modified to include the limits of the City of Brampton Urban Growth Centre	Comment addressed - the Urban Growth Centre has been integrated into the new Schedule 2. The UGC is captured under Communities, which comprise of both Mixed Use Areas and Neighbourhoods.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and Sonell Oakville Inc., O/A Sonell Queen	Schedules 1 and 2	Revision Requested	Subject to the City's response to the concern above (policies 1.1.7b), Schedule 1-City Structure and Schedule 2-City-Wide Growth Management be modified to include the subject site within the limits of an Urban Centre	Comment received - please review relevant schedules modifications.
2022/06/03	Malone Given Parsons	Lauren Capilongo on behalf of TACC Holborn Corporation and TACC Holborn (Block 139) Inc.	Schedule 1.2 and 5	Revision Requested	The southern portion be designated "Employment" on Schedule 1: City Structure and Schedule 2: City Wide Growth Management. The Subject Lands should also be shown as "Neighbourhoods" and "Mixed-Use Employment" on Schedule 5: Designations. These requested changes are consistent with the previous employment conversion as well as the adopted Peel Region Official Plan. As noted above, OPA 130 to the City's Official Plan was approved for the Subject Lands which designates the majority of the Subject Lands as "Residential" and the southern portion as "Office" (see Figure 2). We note that the Draft OP proposes to designate the Subject Lands as "Employment" on Draft Schedule 1: City Structure and Schedule 2: City Wide Growth Management. Schedule 5: Designations shows the corner part of the Subject Lands as "Employment" and the northern portion as "Mixed-Use Employment" with a "Mixed-Use Districts" overlay applicable to the entirety of the Subject Lands (See Figure 3 below). Given the history of the Subject Lands and the approved employment conversion, the northern portion of the Subject Lands should be designated as "Neighbourhoods" on Schedule 1: City Structure, Schedule 2: City Wide Growth Management, and Schedule 5: Designations.	Comment received - please review relevant schedules modifications.
15-Jun-22	KLM Planning Parterns Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Cal Markell Development Inc (owner), 1724-1730 Queen Street West	Schedule 1	Revision Requested	Given the ongoing evolution of policy affecting the Subject Lands and the greater Springbrook OPA area, we believe that prior to a staff recommendation to adopt the Draft OP, revision to Schedule 1 should be undertaken to identify the portion of Queen Street West subject to the Springbrook OPA (and potentially the broader western segment of Queen Street from McLaughlin Road to Mississauga Road) as "Secondary Urban Boulevard".	Comment received
30-May-22	KLM Planning Parterns Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Panal Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Schedule 1	Revision Requested	Schedule 1 identifies the extension of Williams Parkway west of Mississauga Road. Given this road pattern is under appeal via the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan, we believe this should not be shown on this and all of the following schedules.	Comment addressed- relevant caveat language has been integrated into mapping to identify for this area, "Streets network subject to further refinement through Precinct Planning"

03-Jun-22	Woodbull LLP	Johanna R. Shapira on behalf of 69 Bramalea Holdings Limited	Schedules 1, 2 and 5	Revision Requested	dated April 2022: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Schedule 1 – City Structure; Draft Schedule 2 – City-wide Growth Management; and Draft Schedule 5 – Designations. Our client hereby requests that all proposed official plan mapping and policy be amended to reflect the Property's current designations and permissions in the Brampton Official Plan and the recently adopted Peel Region Official Plan, as set out in more detail below. By operation of local site-specific Official Plan Amendment 2006-133 (By-law 142-2017) ("OPA 133"), the current Brampton Official Plan designates the Property Communities in Schedule 1 – City Concept and Residential in Schedule A – General Land Use Designations. OPA 133 also introduces a special land use policy that permits the redevelopment of the Property for a mixed-use apartment building that includes residential and retail uses amongst other policies. OPA 133 was the result of the City's municipal comprehensive review that was completed in 2017, through which the Property was converted from employment uses to a mix of uses including residential. OPA 133 was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 2019. The applicable secondary plan – the Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan (Official Plan Amendment 2006-173 by By-law 229-2019) (the "Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan") – also acknowledges that residential and retail uses are permitted on the Property by operation of OPA 133. The modifications to the Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan to acknowledge those permissions were approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal in July 2021. Finally, we note that the Property is located within the KIT-2 Bramalea GO Major Transit Station Area in the newly adopted Peel Region Official Plan, which was adopted by Regional Council on 28 April 2022. The Regional Official Plan contemplates the integration of employment and nonemployment uses in major transit station area and does not designate the Property as an Employment Area. As such, designating the Property Employment in the new Brampton Official Plan would be contrary to both existing local planning policy and emerging regional policy. We note that the current Brampton Official Plan acknowledges through Part 1, Policy 1.1.1, that certain uses and designations approved prior to the implementation of Brampton Plan, as well as uses legally in existence prior to the implementation of this Plan, will be permitted to be established and continue without an amendment to the Brampton Plan. Additional and/or revised comments may be provided depending on the municipal response to this potential concern.	Comment Received- this will be designated as Mixed-Use Employment.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	Schedules 1, 2 and 5	Revision Requested	OProposed Schedule Modification: Subject to the comments above and below, Schedule 1-City Structure, Schedule 2-City-Wide Growth Management and Schedule 5- Designations should be modified to remove the subject site from the City's Employment Area and Employment Designation to allow mixed use development featuring significant office, retail commercial and residential uses from the "Natural Heritage System" designation. 1, 2, 5, and 6 inaccurately identify the entire property as being located within the local area "Natural Heritage System". Likewise, Schedule 7 incorrectly identifies the entire property as being located within a "Woodland". Prior to Council approving the 'new Official Plan, we respectfully request that the Schedules and policies thereto be revised to reflect Official Plan Amendment OP-2006-206, as follows: 1. Schedule 1 City Structure, Schedule 2 City-Wide Growth Management, and Schedule 5 Designations be revised to re-designate the northeastern limits of the subject site as 'Neighbourhoods'; 2. Schedule 6 Natural Heritage System be revised to remove the northeastern limits of the subject site from the "Natural Heritage System" designation; 3. Schedule 7 Natural Heritage Features be revised to remove the northeastern limits of the subject	Comment received- this will be designated as Mixed-Use employment, which prioritizes major office uses and will be further determined what sensitive uses will be allowed based on MTSA planning studies.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Mark De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of 10196 Bramalea Road	Schedule 1, 6, 7 and 14		The above noted policies (2.1.2.d, 2.1.6, 2.1.21) are contrary to the Brampton Plan's intended Growth Management Framework. More specifically, the City's various Major Transit Station Areas ("MTSAs") are delineated in the new Brampton Plan, within which the underlying Growth Management Hierarchy is substantially comprised of the City's Neighbourhoods. As a result, many of the Centres and MTSAs, where the tallest buildings in the City are to be directed, are also identified as being within the City's Neighbourhoods where "lower-scale" uses are to be reflected. Proposed Schedule Modification: Schedules 1 and 2 be modified to remove Neighbourhoods from the delineated limits of the Urban Centres and MTSAs to remove this built form conflict within the City Structure and City-wide Growth Management Framework, and to clearly distinguish these areas based on their position as high intensity growth areas within the City Structure	Comment received.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	Schedule 1 and 2	Revision Requested	The property directly to the north of the subject property is located within the "Mixed-Use Districts" designation, in accordance with proposed Schedule 5 – Designations, and is also located within a proposed Primary Major Transit Station Area (MTSA). MTSAs are intended to accommodate large scale intensification and foster mixed-use communities in order to take advantage of existing and planned major infrastructure investments in accordance with the Growth Plan (2020). The outcome will be an increase in housing supply, a reduction in dependence on automobiles for personal transportation, protection of farmland and natural areas on the urban fringe, and efficient use of major municipal and provincial infrastructure. The subject property is large in size, under-utilized, located along a Corridor and adjacent to existing high-density residential uses. The subject property is also located within close proximity to the planned Queen-Bramalea BRT station and directly adjacent to the outer boundary of the MTSA associated with that station. It is also notable that the subject property has a lot size that is more similar to the larger lots located within the MSTA and Mixed-Use Districts Designation than the adjacent small-size lots that are located within the Neighbourhoods Designation. In accordance with this discussion we kindly request that the subject property be included within the MTSA, and accordingly designated "Mixed-Use Districts" so that the subject property may be developed for an efficient use of the lands.	Comment received- please review updated Schedules, which help to clarify the intent of Community Areas (MUA/Neighbourhoods) in Schedule 1, compared to designations shown on Schedule 2)
03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Katie Pandey on behalf of 375 Clark LTD (owners), 375 Clark Blvd	Schedule 5	Revision Requested		Comment received
2022/06/03	Melrose Investments	Paulo Da Silva	Schedule 2		Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide input into the Draft Brampton Official Plan. Upon reviewing the draft Official Plan, I noticed that Schedule 2 does not identify Mississauga Rd north of Bovard as a Corridor. The draft text states that "Corridors are specific streets served by rapid, high-frequency transit, whose planned function combines a higher density of development and a greater degree of mixed uses than currently exists today." Schedule 3B identifies future Rapid Transit Routes on Mississauga Rd from Highway 407 to Mayfield Rd. It is also a Regional Major Arterial as shown on Schedule 3C. I am requesting that Schedule 2 identify Mississauga Rd north of Bovard Dr to Mayfield Rd as a Corridor, as it meets the requirements of one. This would be consistent with the Gore Rd on the east end of the City, which like Mississauga Rd is a Major Regional Arterial with future Rapid Transit Routes, but is identified as a Corridor or Planned Corridor up to Mayfield Rd.	Comment addressed- identified as a Planned Corridor to reflect similar identification as The Gore Road.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3a		While it shows Recreational Trails in the legend, the park trails I know of are shown as Multi Use Paths, could use more clarity on that. Needs a fair bit of work, like the Main Street on road bike lanes are labeled multi use path, which definitely isn't right	Comment received
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		I greatly appreciate the Future Rapid Transit on Mayfield and Bovard.	Comment received
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		The Bovard one should continue onto Castlemore so it can connect with a York Region BRT that they have on their draft official plan, and so it can link with both the Gore Road planned Rapid Transit, and the Town Centre planned out there	Castlemore Road east of Airport Road is identified as 'priority bus' in the Metrolinx RTP. City staff will confirm the need for such service on this corridor during the update of the TMP and will advocate to Metrolinx for its advancement in their project prioritization process.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		There should be a distinction between existing and planned frequent transit on the map, not as necessary, but also a good idea is doing likewise for Higher Order Transit	Comment received - the definitions have been updated to reflect HOT or rapid transit. The revised map(s) distinguish between existing/planned and potential future rapid transit routes.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		The City is planning true Bus Rapid Transit on Steeles like we are on Queen, the pre initial business case stuff for Steeles is already funded in the 2022 budget	Updated on revised Schedule 3B
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		The parts where it shows Rapid Transit over support corridor doesn't make sense, shouldn't it be showing drawn over frequent transit service?	Revised Schedule 3B shows 'potential future rapid transit' routes that would replace existing service on support corridors (and notes that the potential routes are subject to further study).
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		Will Priority Bus lines be considered frequent transit or rapid transit? They aren't mentioned in the draft OP	As part of the update of the City's TMP, staff will develop a framework for migrating service on select support corridors to rapid transit (Priority Bus/Züm).
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		Will Priority Bus lines be considered frequent transit or rapid transit? They aren't mentioned in the draft OP	Priority Bus is considered rapid transit. This will be reflected on the revised schedule and in the revised glossary.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		I can't find any references to Frequent Rapid Transit Routes in the draft OP	Revised terminology designates BRT and LRT as 'Higher Order Transit' and Priority Bus and Züm as 'Rapid Transit'. This will be reflected on the revised schedule and in the revised glossary.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		The planned north south Züm lines are all planned for Züm lines which is not marked	Updated on revised Schedule 3B
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3b		The planned north south Züm lines are all already planned to continue north of Queen and even Steeles, except Airport Züm, which is currently part of the Bovard Züm. Note, the Airport Züm will probably get split off in the future and continue north to Mayfield	Updated on revised Schedule 3B
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 3B		Are plans for higher order transit on Main north of downtown dead?	Main Street north of Downtown is shown as 'priority bus' in the Metrolinx RTP - staff agree with this designation.
2022/06/03	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of Mayfield Commercial Centre Ltd	Schedule 4: Provincial Plans and Policy Areas	Requires Clarification	We note that Schedule 4 – Provincial Plans and Policies identifies the subject property as being within a Provincially Significant Employment Zone, though this is inconsistent with Provincial mapping and with the recently adopted Region of Peel Official Plan. The adopted Regional Official Plan requires that lower-tier municipalities comply with their mapping in relation to employment areas and Provincially Significant Employment Zones. We request that Schedule 4 be updated to reflect that the subject property is not within a Provincially Significant Employment Zone.	The designation can be reconsidered if/when circumstances warrant.
03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of 110 East Drive (owner)	Schedule 4: Provincial Plans and Policy Areas	Requires Clarification	In addition, the Provincially Significant Employment Zone (PSEZ) policies within the DCBOP appear to prohibit residential uses where a PSEZ overlaps with a Mixed-Use District. We request that City Staff provide additional flexibility to allow residential uses on the Subject Property (and other similarly designated lots), which is located within a PSEZ, MTSA, and a Mixed-Use District. It is our opinion that permitting residential uses on the Subject Property, which is located near existing residential uses, will assist in meeting the minimum density target for the Bramalea GO MTSA while providing for an appropriate transition in use and built form from the low-rise residential neighbourhood to the north and the surrounding employment uses. We believe that implementing this request will broaden the range and mix of uses and provide transit-supportive densities that will help to achieve a complete community within the MTSA, thus representing good planning.	Comment received- sensitive uses are subject to the outcomes of the MTSA studies. Please participate in the work being conducted by the City to evaluate the context of each MTSA.

15-Jun-22	KLM Planning Parterns Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Amrit Singh, Sarvan Singh, Gurdeep Singh, Pawinder Gill (owners), 11903 Airport Road	Schedule 4: Provincial Plans and Policy Areas	Revision Requested	In our review of Provincial Mapping delineating Provincially Significant Employment Zones, these lands have not been identified as such. Furthermore, in review of the new Region of Peel Official Plan ("new ROP"), adopted by Peel Regional Council on April 28, 2022 and which will be in force upon Provincial approval, Figure 12- Provincially Significant Employment Zones also does not identify the lands as such. Given the above, it is requested that Draft OP Schedule 4 – Provincial Plans and Policy Areas be revised for consistency with Provincial Mapping and conformity with the New ROP. We reserve our right to provide further comments as necessary.	Comment addressed- updated schedule should address comments. Please review and advise staff if further discussion is required.
2022/06/15	KLM Planning Parterns Inc.	Alistair Shields on behalf of Upper Mayfield Estates Inc. (Part of Lots 17, Concession 6, EHS)	Schedules 1, 2, 4 and 5	Revision Requested	The Subject Lands are generally located on the south side of Mayfield Road, west of Airport Road and are known legally as Part of Lot 17, Concession 6, EHS. The Subject Lands are approximately 5.5Ha. (13.6acs.) in area, approximately 1.6Ha. (4.0acs.) of which is developable, and form a part of a larger parcel with a total area of approximately 15.6Ha. (38.6acs.). A valley feature traversing the larger parcel from north to south separates the parcel into two informal parts. This land use designation conversion request applies to the easterly portion of the Subject Lands. The Subject Lands are generally flat and devoid of vegetation as a result of former agricultural use with the exception of the valley feature. A design charrette/workshop was conducted by the City from April 19-22, 2022 for the lands located at the southwest corner of Airport and Mayfield Road. The purpose of the charrette was to engage stakeholders in a participatory planning process and work together to establish clear principles and concepts for the area. This charrette determined that a mixed-use designation was a more appropriate land use for the Subject Lands than the proposed employment use. This decision then informed the Regional OP update. The Region of Peel Council passed By-law 20-2022 on April 28, 2022, to adopt the new Region of Peel Official Plan ("ROP") which will be in force upon Provincial approval. In review of the new ROP, Schedule E-4 Employment Areas does not identify the lands as an employment area. The City Draft OP should reflect both the new ROP and the City's guidance for the lands in the area of Airport and Mayfield Road by removing the employment designation from the lands. Given the above, it is requested that Draft OP Schedule 4 – Provincial Plans and Policy Areas be revised for consistency with Provincial Mapping and conformity with the New ROP. We reserve our right to provide further comments as necessary.	Comment addressed- updated mapping conforms with Provincial and Regional employment mapping.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	"Schedule 4 - Provincial Plans & Policy Areas identifies the subject site as being located within a 'Provincially Significant Employment Zone' ("PSEZ"). Pursuant to the Growth Plan, PSEZ are: "Areas defined by the Minister in consultation with affected municipalities for the purpose of long-term planning for job creation and economic development. Provincially significant employment zones can consist of employment areas as well as mixed-use areas that contain a significant number of jobs." Draft Brampton Plan Policy 2.2.52 directs that within PSEZ, residential uses will not be permitted. The subject site has not been identified by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as a PSEZ, as required by the Growth Plan. Further, the recently adopted Region of Peel Official Plan does not identify the subject site as being located within a PSEZ (see Figure 12 of the 2022 Region of Peel Official Plan). Lastly, pursuant to draft Brampton Plan Policy 2.2.132, there are only three (3) defined PSEZ within that are to be identified on Schedule 4; being: (i) Pearson Airport Hub (Airport)-Zone 14, (ii) Pearson Airport Hub (Highway 50 Corridor)-Zone 15, and (iii) 401 407 (Meadowdale)-Zone 18. The subject site is not located in the above-noted PSEZ contemplated in the draft Brampton Plan. During the Public Information Centre held by the City of Brampton on May 19, 2022, GWD made submissions on behalf of Sonell requesting clarification on why the subject site has been identified on draft Schedule 4 as a PSEZ, and further, requested that the PSEZ overlay be removed from the subject site. In response City of Brampton Planning Staff identified this concern as a drafting error during the preparation of the Brampton Plan that Schedule 4 would be revised to remove the subject site as a PSEZ. At this time this drafting error has not been rectified and the PSEZ overlay continues to be shown on the subject site. Proposed Schedule Modification: Schedule 4 be modified to delete the identification of the subject site as being a PSEZ to be consistent with Provincial and Regional directions.	Comment addressed- updated mapping conforms with Provincial and Regional employment mapping.
27-May-22	Pound & Stewart	La Ferme H&S Limited Partnership	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	Schedule 4 identifies the subject property of 0 Heart Lake Road, along with others in the block, as PSEZ. This is incorrect.	Comment addressed- updated mapping conforms with Provincial and Regional employment mapping.
17-May-22	BILD member	Keith MacKinnon	Schedule 4		Just as a point of reference, the PSEZ mapping stops at the SW corner of Mississauga Road and Steeles whereas my clients lands at the North East and South East have been included in the latest draft Schedule 4, which they should not be.	Comment addressed- updated mapping conforms with Provincial and Regional employment mapping.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 4		The map shows a bunch of employment land that is not designated as Provincially Significant Employment Zone as PSEZ in the legend, is it the intention to have the extra stuff be labeled PSEZ by the province?	The data for the PSEZ area on Schedule 4 was downloaded from the Provincial LIO database. This data reflects the provincially identified PSEZ. Staff will review data and confirm this was downloaded correctly.
30-May-22	KLM Planning Parterns Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	Schedule 4 identifies the lands east of Mississauga Road, both north and south of Steeles Avenue West as being designated as Provincially Significant Employment Zones (PSEZ). This designation did not appear on any previous drafts and in fact the closest PSEZ was to the limit of the south west corner of Mississauga Road and Steeles so why are lands included in this designation? In our opinion, this should reflect the way it was previously wherein they were not within a PSEZ and furthermore, should reflect the limits of the PSEZ as noted in the Provincial mapping. In addition, the Built-Up Area and Greenfield Area shown on Schedule 4 does not seem to correspond to what is physically built on the ground. This particularly applies to the north east corner of Mississauga Road and Steeles Avenue West.	Comment addressed- updated mapping conforms with Provincial and Regional employment mapping.
03-Jun-22	Smart Centres	Joseph Cimer on behalf of Smart Centres (owners), 9920 Airport Road, 370 Main Street North	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	The current Provincially Significant Employment Zone (PSEZ), as reflected within the Province of Ontario's database, shows that much of our Smartcentres site along the Airport Road frontage is not within that Zone. Below is an excerpt of the mapping currently found on the Province's website which depict only a small segment of the site designated as PSEZ. The proposed policy shows much more of our site within the PSEZ and we ask that it be removed to reflect the current Provincial mapping. In our review of Provincial Mapping delineating Provincially Significant Employment Zones, these lands have not been identified as such. Furthermore, in review of the new Region of Peel Official Plan ("new ROP"), adopted by Peel Regional Council on April 28, 2022 and which will be in force upon Provincial approval, Figure 12-Provincially Significant Employment Zones also does not identify the lands as such. Given the above, it is requested that Draft OP Schedule 4 – Provincial Plans and Policy Areas be revised for consistency with Provincial Mapping and conformity with the New ROP. We reserve our right to provide further comments as necessary.	Comment addressed- updated mapping conforms with Provincial and Regional employment mapping.
15-Jun-22	KLM Planning Parterns Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Isola General Contractor (owner), 6029 Mayfield Road	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	We acknowledge that the current City of Brampton Official Plan designates the subject property as Industrial and Open Space. The Fletchers Meadow Secondary Plan (SPA 44) designates the subject property Primary Valley Land. Discussions have been held with City Staff regarding the development of the subject property for residential uses. We were made aware through these discussions and subsequent correspondence with the Director of Development Services (refer to Appendix 1) that the Industrial designation in the City's current Official Plan is a mapping error as the Northwest Sandalwood employment area is completely located east of McLaughlin Road. In addition, the applicable Fletchers Meadow Secondary Plan does not have any employment designations. It was our understanding that this mapping error would be addressed through an Official Plan housekeeping amendment, but since the City is in the process of updating their Official Plan, we ask that this mapping error be addressed through this process. We request that the portion of the lands designated Employment be changed to Neighbourhoods.	Comment addressed
2022/06/03	Malone Given Parsons	Lauren Capilongo on behalf of TACC Holborn Corporation and TACC Holborn (Block 139) Inc.	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	Remove the Subject Lands from the Provincially Significant Employment Zone Draft Schedule 4- Provincial Plan and Policy Areas identifies the corner of The Gore Road and Queen Street to be within a Provincially Significant Employment Zone ("PSEZ"). This is incorrect. The provincial mapping does not include the Subject Lands within a PSEZ. This is further confirmed by the Region's adopted Official Plan (April 2022) which does not include the Subject Lands in a PSEZ as shown on Figure 12- Provincially Significant Employment Zones to the Region's Official Plan. As such, we request that the City remove the portion of the Subject Lands at the corner of The Gore Road and Queen Street from the PSEZ on Schedule 4.	Comment addressed
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Sonell Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	The Employment designation allows for a wide range of industrial uses where those industrial uses are unlikely to cause negative impacts on adjacent lands (Draft Policy 2.2.2.c) and 2.2.114.a). Residential uses immediately about the subject site to the north and east along Turncreek Boulevard. The surrounding context centred around the intersection of County Court Boulevard and Hurontario Street has a strong residential presence. It is our opinion that the proposed Employment designation, which permits industrial uses and does not specifically permit residential or new office uses, is out of step with the existing Secondary Plan, many of the draft policies of the Brampton Plan and may cause compatibility issues with surrounding residential uses. In this context the "Employment" designation should be removed from the subject site and the policies of the Mixed-Use District designation should prevail. Removal of the Employment designation from the subject site would allow mixed use development featuring significant office, retail commercial and residential uses to be developed and to remove the potential for incompatible industrial land uses being developed as permitted within the proposed Employment Designation. Further the dual, overlapping designation of the lands results in unclear policy direction in regards to the applicability of residential land use permissions on the subject site. Proposed Schedule Modification: Schedule 5 – Designations, should be modified to delete the Employment land use designation on the subject. The Mixed-Use District land use designation should remain as proposed.	Comment addressed- this has been updated to become mixed use employment in updated mapping.
15-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Maple Lodge Farms Ltd.	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	Schedule 5 – Designations – The limits of the "Employment" and Mixed-Use Employment designations on lands north and south of Steeles Avenue West, east of Winston Churchill Boulevard, west of Mississauga Road, do not appear to reflect the existing conditions, Block Plan 40-3, and municipal infrastructure projects. Much of these lands have undergone extensive planning approval processes with construction occurring over the last decade. We urge City Staff to revisit the limits of these designations to ensure they coincide with existing and/or future developments.	Comment received.

03-Jun-22	Smart Centres	Joseph Cimer on behalf of Smart Centres (owners), 9920 Airport Road, 370 Main Street North	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	In the proposed Official Plan, our Kingspoint Plaza lands appear to be on the border of the Downtown Brampton Secondary Plan and within a "Neighbourhoods" designation. This site should be considered an extension of the Downtown with mid and high density residential within close proximity. Presently, it is a functioning shopping centre serving the neighbourhood with local convenience retail and services. Given that the Downtown of Brampton is experiencing significant growth, we believe additional mixed use areas will be required in short order to provide housing, especially affordable housing options which is less than 1km of the Brampton GO Station. We respectfully request that this site at 370 Main Street North be designated Mixed Use.	Comment received - to be explored through the Integrated Downtown Plan.
30-May-22	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	There is a small parcel on the east side of Mississauga Road, north of Olivia Marie, immediately abutting the MTSA boundary that is designated "employment" whereas the lands immediately north are designated as "Mixed Use Employment". The small portion should also contain the "Mixed Use Employment" designation in order to be consistent with the existing mixed use and residential buildings that are built and occupied there today.	Comment received - mapping done in conformity with draft Regional OP.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 5		There is a white spot on each side of 410 and Wanless, is this reserved land for a potential interchange?	Comment addressed.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	Schedule 5	Request Clarification	We request clarification as to whether the Natural Heritage System designation is entirely to the south of the Lands adjacent to Highway 407 (relates to Schedule 6, Natural Heritage System and Schedule 7, Natural Heritage Features).	Comment received - the areas pertaining to the 407 and hydro corridor are key linkage areas for linkage protection (overlay)
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	Schedule 5	Requires Clarification	As noted above for Policy 2.2.407, for the Canadian Tire Lands shown on Schedule 2 as Employment, in proximity to a Town Centre, with the Steeles Avenue East frontage shown as Corridors and Secondary Urban Boulevard, where the Lands are within the boundary of the Primary Major Transit Station Area (with the exception of the lands known municipally as 10 and 12 Melanie Drive) and split designated Employment and Mixed-Use employment predominantly within a Mixed-Use District on Schedule 5, we request confirmation that warehousing is permitted on the Canadian Tire lands in order to reflect the Minister Zoning Order.	Comment addressed - Mixed Use Employment permits these uses. Addressed through meeting.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	Schedule 5	Requires Clarification	As noted above for Policy 2.2.114, for the Canadian Tire Lands shown on Schedule 2 as Employment, in proximity to a Town Centre, with the Steeles Avenue East frontage shown as Corridors and Secondary Urban Boulevard, where the Lands are within the boundary of the Primary Major Transit Station Area (with the exception of the lands known municipally as 10 and 12 Melanie Drive) and split designated Employment and Mixed-Use employment predominantly within a Mixed-Use District on Schedule 5, we request confirmation that warehousing with associated trailer parking is permitted on the Canadian Tire lands in order to reflect the intended rezoning under the MZO.	Comment received - zoning implemented through an MZO would supersede the intent outlined through the Official Plan.
03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Katie Pandey on behalf of 375 Clark LTD (owners), 375 Clark Blvd	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	We are supportive of permitting a wide range of land-use permissions for the subject property (as per policy 2.2.68 and Table 5), however it is our opinion that the neighbourhoods designation is inappropriate for the subject property given the site specific context.	Comment received - neighbourhoods is inclusive of a wide range of uses beyond residential. Please review updated draft Brampton Plan that outlines the full list of permitted uses within the Neighbourhoods designation and reach out to staff with additional questions.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 6		There are two natural lakes in Brampton, only Heart Lake is labeled, should Teapot Lake, the very round one at Heart Lake Road and Mayfield also be labeled?	Comment received
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Clarendelle Holdings Limited (owner)	Schedule 6	Revision Requested	Schedule 6 incorrectly identifies the subject site as Employment, Provincially Significant Employment Zone (PSEZ), Parkway Belt West Plan and Planned MTSA. It is important that the Official Plan complies with the policies and schedules of applicable Secondary Plan and the Parkway Belt West Plan. We recommend that Schedule 6 be amended accordingly.	Comment received - the areas pertaining to the 407 and hydro corridor are key linkage areas for linkage protection (overlay and not a designation)
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 8		Emblerton Road width is missing from the Right of Way schedule. It was recently given to the City by the Region	Comment addressed - updated schedule reflects this change.
15-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Maple Lodge Farms Ltd.	Schedule 8		Schedule 8 – Road Right-of-Way Widths / Schedule 14 - Site & Area Specific Policies – In November 2021 City Council adopted Interim Control By-Law (ICBL) 306-2021 to align with the GTA West Corridor 2019 Focused Analysis Area (FAA). Similarly the Official Plan Schedules should now be revised to reflect the Province's FAA.	
2022/05/30	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Schedule 8	Revision Requested	In October 2019 the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) approved the Class Environment Assessment (EA) for a new north-south arterial road, Bram West Parkway, from Heritage Road to Financial Drive and the extension of Financial Drive from Heritage Road to Winston Churchill Boulevard. In our opinion the north-south corridor protection overlay is no longer needed and the Schedules should be updated to reflect its removal.	Comment received - must remain in conformity with Regional Official Plan. Corridor protection overlay to remain and relevant policies are found in Chapter 4
2022/05/30	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Schedule 8	Revision Requested	Identifies the proposed street patterns within Heritage Heights. Given this is under appeal, the street pattern should not be identified on this schedule. In addition, the schedule only identifies a minimum ROW width of 20 metres and yet, much of the residential communities within Brampton have been built using the 18 metre ROW. This should continue in order to maximize the amount of land available for development purposes. In addition, the corridor protection area should only apply to the location of the GTA West Corridor	Comment addressed- caveat language will be added to the schedule to identify that Streets network subject to further refinement through Precinct Planning in Heritage Heights.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	Schedule 8 and 14	Revision Requested	Schedules 8 and 14 inaccurately identify the Corridor Protection Area as depicted in Interim Control By-Law 306-2021 (through By-Law 290-2021). We respectfully request that the Schedules be revised to reflect the limits of the Corridor Protection Area as depicted in By-Law 290-2021.	Comment received- must remain in conformity with Regional Official Plan.
2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Creditview 4-P Holding Inc. (Owner of 7614, 7624, 7650 and 7662 Creditview Road)	Schedule 9	Revision Requested	Schedule 9 requires amendment to identify the subject site as being under appeal.	
2022/05/30	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Schedule 9	Revision Requested	Section 2.3.572 states that the Village of Churchillville is designated as a Heritage Conservation District on Schedule 9 and is guided by its district plan as amended, the Cultural Heritage Policies of this Plan and applicable Provincial, Regional and conservation authority policies	Comment received - mapping removed.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 10	Revision Requested	We are not aware of any Class B Heritage Resources located within Countryside Villages between Bramalea Road and Airport Road. The schedule identifies three locations and we do not believe this is correct. Furthermore, there is a Class B Heritage Resource identified on the west side of Mississauga Road within the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan area which is also under appeal and should not be reflected on this schedule. Lastly, a Class A Heritage Resource is identified on the east side of Heart Lake Road, south of Countryside Drive. This property is approved for development and it is only the frontage along Heart Lake Road that is a cultural heritage feature. This should be revised as it currently identifies the entire property, which is not correct.	Comment received - mapping removed.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 11		Shouldn't parklands in valleys like Archdekin Park be shown as Open Space on this schedule?	Comment received.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	Schedule 11	Requires Clarification	Is anyone ever going to fix that -30 McLaughlin Road isn't shown in any current Secondary Plan on GIS?	Comment received.
30-May-22	GSAI	Stephanie Matveeva on behalf of 2546781 Ontario Inc (owner), 4037 Countryside Drive	Special Study Area/Schedule 14	Revision Requested	We request clarification as to the policy intention for Densification Districts as there appear to be no associated policies in the Draft Official Plan.	Comment addressed - updated mapping and policies reflect direction.
30-May-22	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and Tesch Development Inc. c/o DG Group (owners)	Schedule 14	Revision Requested	Proposed removal of 4037 Countryside Road from Schedule 14 and Special Policy Area 2.	Comment addressed
June 2/2022	Dentons Canada LLP	Katryna Vergis-May on behalf of CNR Company (owner)	Schedule (?)	Revision Requested	As noted earlier, the Corridor Protection Area should only apply to the area in which the GTA West Corridor is scheduled to apply.	Comment received- must remain in conformity with Regional Official Plan.
May 25/2022	GSAI	Mark Condello on behalf of Castemore/Clarkway - Country Homes (owner)	Schedule 1 and 5	Revision Requested	Add Brampton Intermodal Yard as depicted on Schedule E-4 of the Region of Peel OP on all applicable mapping	Comment addressed - to be added to schedule 3b
May 26/2022	SGL Planning & Design	Paul Lowes on behalf of Mac Mor of Canada Ltd (owner), 75 Bramalea Road	Schedule 1, 2 and 5	Revision Requested	Designations of Employment and Mixed-Use Employment are inconsistent with MCR approval (82-2017 (Brampton.ca) which removed these from the Employment Areas and corresponding Land Use designation. Furthermore, our office is working with Stephen Dykstra on an Official Plan Amendment (OZS-2021-0050) to redesignate the lands as "Medium Density Residential" and "Valleylands" which is in keeping with the OLT's approval of the Block Plan for Area 47-1.	Comment addressed.
June 3, 2022	Malone Given Parsons	Lauren Caplinger on behalf of Alpha Stone Inc (owner), 0 Humbewest Parkway	Schedule 1, 2 and 5	Revision Requested	The lands at 75 Bramalea Road should be designated as "Neighbourhoods" on proposed Schedule 1: City Structure and should also be designated as "Neighbourhoods" on Schedule 2: City-Wide Growth Management. In addition, to achieve conformity with the adopted Peel Official Plan, the subject lands should be designated as "Neighbourhoods" with a Mixed-Use Districts overlay on Schedule 5: Designations.	Comment addressed.
May 27/2022	Pound & Stewart	Phillip Stewart on behalf of La Ferme H&S Limited Partnership (owner), 0 Heart Lake Road	Schedule 1, 2, 5, 6, 7	Revision Requested	We request that the Subject Lands be shown as "Neighbourhoods" on Schedule 1: City Structure, Schedule 2: City Wide Growth Management, and Schedule 5: Designations, consistent with the previous employment conversion as well as the adopted Peel Region Official Plan.	Comment addressed.
June 2/2022	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc (owner) - 4320 Queen Street East	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	Amend the Schedules list to reflect the more refined Secondary Plan (48 a) boundary of the Natural Heritage System as per PRE-2021-005 and PRE-2021-0012.	Comment received- more information is required. Pre-consultation applications would not refine the boundaries of the NHS.
					Schedule 4 - Remove the Subject Lands from "Provincially Significant Employment Zones";	Comment addressed- mapping conforms with Provincial and Regional mapping and must remain in conformity with the Provincially Significant Employment Zone boundaries.

June 2/2022	KIM Planning Partners Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc (owner) - 4320 Queen Street East	Schedule 5		Schedule 5 - Apply land use designations in accordance with OPA 129, being "Residential" and "Special Land Use Policy Area 15" for the north portion of the site, and "Office" and "Special Land Use Policy Area 15" for the south portion of the site;	Comment addressed.
June 2/2022	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc (owner) - 4320 Queen Street East	Schedule 14		Schedule 14 - Identify the lands as a "Special Land Use Policy Area"; and,	Comment received
June 3, 2022	Gagnon Walker Domes Professional Planners	Marc De Nardis and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Maple Lodge Farms Ltd (owner) 8301 and 8175 Winston Churchill Blvd		Revision Requested	Section 2.2.1.32 to 2.2.1.33 addresses Provincially Significant Employment Zones (PSEZ). Intended to protect employment areas critical to the local and provincial economy, there are three (3) PSEZ within the City of Brampton. The MLF lands and the surrounding employment area are located within PSEZ Zone 18 referred to as "Hutton / Peel". The limits of the Zone as depicted on Schedule 4 do not accurately reflect the limits defined by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) and requires revision: https://www.ontario.ca/page/provincially-significant-employment-zones .	Comment addressed - updated mapping downloaded and integrated into mapping.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd and GSAI	Michael Gagnon and Colin Chung on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Heritage Heights Landowners Group and Individual Landowners (NWBLG et al)	All Schedules	Requires Clarification	Our review of the natural heritage system (NHS) overlay on the land use schedules seems to be based on outdated info/mapping on some locations such as the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan area. The City ought to use the latest NHS mapping information - otherwise the New Official Plan is reflecting NHS features that are either no longer exist or that were assessed previously as not significant. Furthermore, all Official Plan schedules that show the NHS should not require an OPA if refined through Subwatershed Study, area-specific Environmental Impact Study/Assessment or some other forms of site analysis. Any update to the NHS system shown in the Official Plan should be part of the housekeeping exercise as part of the next Official Plan Review. There should be a policy that makes this clear.	Comment addressed- caveat language added to mapping. "The natural heritage system contained within Area 52 Heritage Heights is subject to a completed Subwatershed Study and the policies of the Secondary Plan, and to further refinements through Precinct Planning."
03-Jun-22	Weston Consulting	Jenna Thibault on behalf of Woodlawn Seniors Development Corporation (owner)	All Schedules	Revision Requested	It is our request that the Brampton plan include recognition of the lands identified as Area of Reduced Interest or remove the subject property completely from the Corridor Protection Area on all applicable schedules. (Property: PT LT 15 CON 5 WHS CHINGUACOUSY DES PT 6 PL 43R-962; BRAMPTON)	Comment received - required to conform to Regional Official Plan and maintain the Corridor Protection Area.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Definitions)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
01-Jun-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Harry Froussios on behalf of Loblaw's Companies Limited (owner), 85 Steeles Ave West, Vacant lands to the south of 85 Steeles Ave West; 70 Clementine Drive, and 35 Worthington Ave	Definitions	Revision Requested	As a general comment, in our submission, all defined terms under the Glossary should be italicized for ease of review; and	Comment received - in the next iteration, defined terms will be bolded for ease of use.
31-May-22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd	Jonathan Rodger on behalf of Canadian Tire Corporation Limited (owner), 2021-2111 Steeles Avenue, 10 and 12 Melanie Drive	Definitions	Requires Clarification	As a general comment, in our submission, all defined terms under the Glossary should be italicized for ease of review.	Comment received - in the next iteration, defined terms will be bolded for ease of use.
03-Jun-22	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler on behalf of Morguard (owners), 25 Peel Centre Drive and 410/Steeles Lands	Glossary-Building Typologies	Revision Requested	The OP appears to use the terms "Tall / Tall Plus" and "High-Rise / High-Rise Plus" interchangeably whereas only "Tall / Tall Plus" is defined in the document. We would like clarification that these terms are referring to the same thing. If so, the OP should be revised to only include one set of terms to maintain consistency.	Comment addressed- this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (General)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
28-Dec	General Public	Susan Laberge	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>Vision 2040 requires each project to be approved by the Urban Design Review Panel to ensure that the design sustainability score is improved and incorporates these neighbourhood improvements as well as "Green Building Strategies" like solar panels, passive solar, geothermal and green roofs.</p> <p>Although Vision 2040 hasn't been officially incorporated into the Strategic Plan yet, and therefore these initiatives may not be a by law requirement, we should be considering our carbon footprint for any new project approvals rather than fall behind before the new Brampton Plan is approved.</p>	Comment Received
28-Dec	General Public	Susan Laberge	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>I support Vision 2040 and I am in favour of higher density housing in all our neighbourhoods to provide desperately needed, affordable living options for all our residents, but we must ensure appropriate transitions in height and use of land to maintain our family friendly communities. We shouldn't be destroying the streetscape and heritage features by approving building by-law adjustments for multi-unit high-rise buildings that increase traffic congestion and sidewalk crowding, and cast permanent shade on adjacent established single family homes. Current adjustments to the building by-law should adhere to the new Plan's guidelines and ensure height transitions with low-rise and then medium-rise to avoid destroying our neighbourhoods. Temporarily halt zoning changes to permit high-rise buildings that don't allow appropriate transitions.</p>	Comment Received - There are a number of relevant sections in the Plan, specifically in section 2.1.1 "Principles of the City Structure", placing the four pillars of sustainability as the foundations for creating communities. These themes are woven throughout the Plan and specifically explored in the "Sustainability and Climate Change" Building Block in Chapter 3.
28-Dec	General Public	Susan Laberge	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>It will be necessary to clearly state how we will "improve walkability and provide safe pedestrian roads" in the Plan. It should include actual speed limits and traffic control options. Pedestrian safety cannot be attained if the speed limit exceeds 30 km as described in the 880.org details. And redesign of roads and intersection turning lanes that presently give automobiles the priority must be implemented. Our established neighbourhoods with narrow streets will be difficult to convert and adding occasional speed cushions and cameras will not resolve the current dangers. Very low speed limits, more stop signs and roads with multiple speed cushions placed within short distances may help and would not only reduce the danger to pedestrians, it may help discourage car use.</p>	Comment Received - see Vision Zero, a strategy to eliminate all traffic injuries by increasing safe mobility for everyone
28-Dec	General Public	Susan Laberge	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>Provide proper care and planting of native trees on city boulevards that will grow tall and maintain the tree canopy to seriously fight climate change. Hundreds of mature trees were recently lost to ice and wind storms and the Ash beetle infestation and many have been replaced with less beneficial, non-native lower growing, decorative and flowering trees. Investing more in a pro-active mature tree maintenance program now will save us the costs to our health and climate change effects in the future. At present, city boulevard trees are only attended to when a resident reports a serious problem.</p> <p>Trees on private property are not currently being managed effectively which is probably due to the high cost of staffing that would be required, but there must be a better way to oversee our mature trees. We should ensure that all new owners are formally and clearly notified of the Tree By-law before they take possession and then we should improve enforcement with the property owner and the tree cutting businesses.</p>	Comment Received - Brampton Plan aligns with the one million trees program, the City's tree canopy target to 2040, to help mitigate and adapt to climate change
28-Dec	General Public	Susan Laberge	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>Environmental pollution controls could be more detailed in the new Plan. The City is guilty of being the biggest culprit when applying road and sidewalk salt that is polluting our stormwater that poisons our vital rivers and lakes. Although we need to use some salt, I know that a very small amount, placed carefully at the proper time will keep the roads and sidewalks safe. The city roads department dumps thick layers and regularly large mounds of salt on roads and sidewalks, mainly because the equipment is faulty and not dispersing the salt at a low level and/or the operator is not taking time to do the job properly. Fines could be introduced for polluting our stormwater just like other pollution spills and the fines should be applied to the City Roads Department too!</p>	Comment Received
19-Jan	Bell Canada	Norm Lingard, Senior Consultant - Municipal Liaison	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>Bell Canada is most interested in changes to the transportation network and/or policies and regulations relating to the direction of growth and public infrastructure investments, heritage character, urban design, broadband and economic development related objectives and how Bell can assist Brampton to be a connected community. We have reviewed the Brampton Plan Draft, and have no specific concerns at this time, and offer the following comment.</p> <p>Bell Canada understands the City's desire to support high quality urban design through built form to enhance the appearance and livability of its urban areas and we look forward to the opportunity to work with the City to find solutions that align as much as possible with the municipality's urban design interests in principle, where feasible.</p>	Comment Received
03-Feb	Malone Given Parsons - Yaruo Developments and Yaruo Developments Inc	Joan MacIntyre - Principal Planner	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>We request that the City make Planned MTSA QUE-15 a priority for undertaking the necessary MTSA studies required to classify it as a primary or secondary MTSA in the new Official Plan.</p>	Comment addressed

					<p>The draft (parent) Official Plan (December 2022 version) proposes to designate the Subject Property as "Mixed Use", however in reading the draft "Mixed Use" policies, industrial uses are not permitted in "Mixed Use" areas. The "Mixed Use" designation therefore contradicts the proposed MTSA land use designation of "Light Industrial Mixed-Use", on the southern portion of the Subject Property. The "Mixed Use" designation in the draft parent Official Plan is of concern, as it would not permit the full vision of the MTSA study (continued/future industrial uses on the southern portion of the lands).</p> <p>While existing industrial uses on the Subject Property would be protected as legal non-conforming uses, the "Mixed Use" designation in the parent Official Plan could prohibit or hinder our client from any expansions or improvements to better utilize the lands for continued industrial purposes. We recommend adding policies in the draft Official Plan under the "Mixed Use" land use permissions that permit the continued/expanded industrial uses in appropriate locations.</p>	
28-Feb	GSAI Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Jennifer Staden	General comment	Revision Requested		Comment addressed
28-Feb	GSAI Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Jennifer Staden	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>We acknowledge that in the draft MTSA land use schedules, the northern portion is designated as "Medium Density Mixed-Use", and the southern portion designated as "Light Industrial Mixed-Use". We have concerns that the new "Medium Density Mixed-Use" designation on the northern portion would not appropriately recognize or protect industrial uses on the Subject Property. Policies should be added protecting industrial uses in mixed-use areas and any Secondary Plan update should include policies recognizing existing and continued industrial uses, as well as transitional policies. Similarly, the "Medium Density Mixed-Use" designation pertaining only to the northern portion of the Subject Property could limit the development potential of the southern portion of the Subject Property, which may eventually be envisioned for residential uses. We recommend the "Medium Density Mixed-Use" permissions be extended to the southern portion of the Subject Property, while still protecting existing/future industrial uses.</p>	Comment addressed
28-Feb	GSAI Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Jennifer Staden	General comment	Revision Requested	Regarding the proposed "open space" designation on part of the Subject Property, as these lands will contribute towards public enjoyment and access, they ought to count towards parkland dedication in future development applications.	Comment addressed
28-Feb	GSAI Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Jennifer Staden	General comment	Revision Requested	We are in support of policies that reduce or mitigate interface and compatibility issues.	Comment Received
28-Feb	GSAI Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Jennifer Staden	General comment	Revision Requested	We note that staff mentioned at the February 13, 2023 public meeting that maximum building heights will be removed from MTSA policies, in response to Minister Clark's letter to Peel Regional Chair Nando Iannicca. We are supportive of this revision.	Comment Received
13-Mar	Good mans LLP	Anne Benedetti	General comment	Needs Discussion	<p>The current draft Brampton Plan identifies the Bank Bros' Lands as an "Employment Area" and a "Priority Transit Station Area" and proposes to designate the lands "Mixed Use Employment". Further, the Plan includes a set of policies that apply to lands designated "Mixed Use Employment" and identified as "Priority Transit Station Areas" including a policy that provides that where a Major Transit Station Area Study has been completed and approved through an amendment to the draft Brampton OP, compatible new residential uses that do not conflict with the main employment uses may be permitted without the need for a Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p> <p>Our client's key concern is the protection of their existing industrial use, its ability to adapt and expand, and the associated jobs. Any draft Brampton Plan that considers the introduction of sensitive uses including residential uses in proximity to industrial facilities, such as the facility located on the Bank Bros' Lands, must require that protections are in place to ensure that land use compatibility is achieved and that the existing industrial facilities and their ability to operate and expand are not negatively impacted.</p>	Comment received - the provincial growth plan permits residential uses within MTSA's within protected growth areas
02-Jun	MHBC	Oz Kemal	General comment	Revision Requested	The draft OPA has created several layers of land uses for the Mount Pleasant GO MTSA that includes: Town Centre, Mixed Use, Corridors, MTSA's and Design Priority Areas. Added to this, is the current Fletcher's Meadow Secondary Plan policies and the 44-1 Precinct Plan. The purpose of an Official Plan Review is to simplify and clarify land uses and to guide development in the next 5 to 10 years. Focus land development for the Mount Pleasant GO through the MTSA policies only.	Comment received - Brampton Plan provides high level direction for the specific MTSA policies.
02-Jun	MHBC	Oz Kemal	General comment	Revision Requested	It is also recommended that the Official Plan simplify terms for Building Typologies to low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise and eliminate the term 'plus'.	Comment received
02-Jun	MHBC	Oz Kemal	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>The document appears to be created as a compilation of all City department documents, such as the Transportation Master Plan, the Parks & Recreation Master Plan, Regional Housing programs and services, a Community Development Plan and the City Council's Strategic Plan. For example, the majority of the document's policies do not guide a land use development application for one building, nor fall under Planning Act matters, with many representing the City's operational matters, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision Zero and traffic fatalities s.3.4.3.2 • Vulnerable Communities s.3.2.4.4 • Emergency Planning Procedures s.3.2.4.11.a • City's Green Procurement practice s.3.6.1.8; and, • Tourism s.3.6.2.8. <p>The recommendation would be to remove non-development related policies while referencing the multiple City plans and deferring to their content. An example is the section on Urban Design.</p>	Comment received - through the final, third draft, repetition/redundancies will be addressed. Please refer to the third draft for addressing this comment.
02-Jun	MHBC	Oz Kemal	General comment	Revision Requested	<p>Policy 3.1.1.4.1 requires that High-Rise and High-Rise Plus Buildings are to be of high-quality architecture. Under Bill 23, ascertaining design quality of buildings is no longer permissible. Policy 2.2.3.12 also states that a 'high level of design excellence' is required and that a building is to be 'in conformity' with the Urban Design policies of the OPA. Similarly, adding a regulatory standard within a policy document is not supported, such as 3.1.1.37.1, states that Mid-Rise Buildings shall 'generally', not exceed 100 metres in length.</p> <p>As recommended above in Recommendation 3, the Official Plan should remove all urban design-related policies and defer to the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines and/or area specific Urban Design Guidelines.</p>	Comment received - please see comment above.

02-Jun-23	Urban Strategies / Sheridan	Leigh McGrath	General comment		Supportive of Schedule 1, Urban Centers designation, Boulevards, Mixed Use Areas designation, NHS direction	Comment received
02-Jun-23	Urban Strategies / Sheridan	Leigh McGrath	General comment	Revision Requested	While the policy direction to enable the desired mix of uses on Davis Campus and the role of Davis within the proposed Uptown Urban Centre is aligned with Sheridan's vision for their campus, the current draft of the Official Plan does not include direction on how and when the City's Secondary Plans will be updated to conform to the direction of the parent Official Plan. We encourage the City to consider a concurrent update to the Fletchers Creek Secondary Plan to eliminate outdated policy direction for the Davis campus and to assist in streamlining future approvals processes. We welcome the opportunity to work with you to determine an expeditious way forward to align all levels of planning policy that apply to Davis Campus. Reducing barriers to implementation and processing timelines for Sheridan is important for the timely delivery of needed educational and community-supporting infrastructure that will support Sheridan's students and the Brampton community at large.	Comment received - key priority growth areas will be prioritized for secondary plan updates. The Steeles Ave W corridor has been identified as a Primary Urban Boulevard and is a priority area for review.
12-23-2022	General Public		General comment		Think more about spending more per capita on the arts/funding for projects in the public realm to attract people to walk/cycle rather than use cars. Montreal's pedestrian streets in the summer work so incredibly because they are a place for relaxation, recreation, performance, art installations, music events, mural festivals etc. If you think about streetscapes as going beyond just being utilitarian in that sense, Brampton will truly be remarkable. Also think about creative spaces as incubator spaces, as artists and arts collectives are true earners of creative economic growth and profile for a city. Paris is a good example of how a network and high concentration of artists and studio spaces led to it being a true destination and world-class centre for art and commerce. Brampton really needs to innovate here, as Toronto is losing its artists because they have not been prioritised. In a way, we lose our appeal and draw in the first place if youth aren't attracted to stay in a city that is cultural/artistic. If we don't have young artists: musicians, performers, writers, painters, filmmakers moving to Brampton, we won't be a truly exciting city that will attract post-secondary schools, youth, entrepreneurship etc.	Comment received
12-23-2022	General Public		General comment		The draft Brampton Plan is considerable in its scope and promises modern, sustainable development. The planning Team needs to be congratulated on the work to date. Having said that, I would like to see deliverables and timelines where we actually start doing something. I see more and more of Brampton's downtown shuttered and boarded up but nothing really happening. The optics of a boarded up downtown doesn't do anything to attract businesses or residents. We need some political will to see these outstanding visions come to life. We need honest, published communication with Bramptonians and Ontarians about what is currently happening in Brampton and how they should want to come here because we can say "look at how lovely Brampton is NOW" not just what a lovely vision we have and we MIGHT look like in 30 years. What is currently drawing young professionals to Brampton? Is it our thriving downtown with cafes and restaurants...no. What will compel our seniors to stay in Brampton? Is it the choice of lovely townhomes or stylish condominiums...no. When will these dreams become reality?	Comment received
12-28-2022	General Public		General comment		The Plan is very detailed and ambitious and, to be feasible, some changes could be implemented now. Slowing down traffic, not automatically approving rezoning to accommodate high-rises and a focus on features that work to fight climate change to name a few. Include actual speed limits in the Plan to clearly state how we will "improve walkability and provide safe pedestrian roads". It cannot be attained if the speed limit exceeds 30 km and intersection turning lanes give cars the priority and adding occasional speed cushions and cameras does not solve the current dangers. Temporarily halt zoning changes that permit high-rise buildings that don't allow appropriate transitions and don't meet the new Plan criteria. Provide proper care and planting of native trees on city boulevards to maintain the tree canopy to seriously fight climate change and notify all new owners of the Tree By-law before they take possession and improve enforcement.	Comment received
01-09-2023	General Public		General comment		It is way too crowded. Houses need to stop being built & we need wider roads, we do not need more bike lanes. Traffic is ridiculous & there are way too many Indian ppl. Brampton is not divers anymore	Comment received
02-13-2023	General Public		General comment		I see a huge area under "Corridor Protection Area" in west side of Brampton. I learnt that we already have interim control bylaw for smaller area same as "Focus Analysis Area, FAA" from highway 413 team. When we release the final plan, are we going to reduce Corridor Protection Area?	Comment received
05-11-2023	General Public		General comment		Narrow down "Corridor Protection Area" so that we can implement more development to meet New provincial legislation (I.e., Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022)	Comment received

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 1)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	April Fang	Table 1	Clarification Requested	Where can I find table 1?	Comment addressed - Table 1 is found on page 2-8
2023/03/29	Region of Peel- Public Health	Sarah Powell	Section 1-3, Health and Wellness		Thank you for including the revised language we proposed for Section 1-3, the Health and Wellness section.	Comment received
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Gr	Wayne Koethe, Principal Planner	Section 1, Page 1-1 & 1-2	<i>Needs Discussion</i>	This section states "a population of 1 million+ people"; However, Regional OP (Section 4, Table 3, Page 120) sets a 2051 target of 985,000 for Brampton. Suggested change could state "a population of nearly 1 million people".	Comment received
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Melanie Williams	Chapter 1 - List of Schedules	Revise	The 'List of Schedules' will need to be revised (e.g., titles and numbering) if comments provided by the Region on Schedules and Figures, are accepted.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and will be rectified in the updated draft document as the schedules are finalized
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - List of Schedules	Revise	As to comments provided by the Region on Chapter 2, add Schedule 6C. Water Resources Features and Areas .	Comment addressed - as Schedule 6B demonstrates both the NHS and WRS, the title has been updated to reflect this.
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - A Rapidly Growing City - Introduction - 2nd Paragraph	Housekeeping	Insert comma in the last sentence after "Lake Ontario,"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - A Rapidly Growing City - Introduction - 3rd Paragraph	Housekeeping	Change "Frist" to " First "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Melanie Williams	Chapter 1 - A Rapidly Growing City - Realizing the Plan - Environmental Sustainability	Revise	For clarity suggest "Brampton Plan will protect, conserve, restore, enhance and consider the impacts of development on the health and sustainability ability of the natural environment to be healthy and self-sustaining..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - A Rapidly Growing City - Realizing the Plan - Cultural Sustainability	Housekeeping	Insert a period at the end of the sentence.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - A Rapidly Growing City - Brampton Tomorrow - 3rd Paragraph	Housekeeping	Remove comma after "festivals".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services, Region of Peel	Melanie Williams	Chapter 1 - A Rapidly Growing City - Brampton Tomorrow	Revise	Update to include reference to Agricultural System and agri-food network, to align with PPS "Support, sustain and enhance the long-term economic prosperity and productivity of the Agricultural System's agri-food sector network."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - Part 1.2 Provincial and Upper-Tier Planning Requirements - Provincial Policy Statement	Housekeeping	The Province is currently considering a merger of the PPS and Growth Plan. These sections will likely need to be amended following the completion of the review.	Comment received
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - Part 1.2 Provincial and Upper-Tier Planning Requirements - Greenbelt Plan - 2nd Paragraph, 1st Sentence	Housekeeping	Insert " is " after Northwest Brampton and delete the word "by".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 1 - Part 1.2 Provincial and Upper-Tier Planning Requirements - Greenbelt Plan - 2nd Paragraph, 2nd Sentence	Housekeeping	Remove 's' on follows and includes.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 1 - Part 1.2 Provincial and Upper-Tier Planning Requirements - Parkway Belt West Plan	Housekeeping	The Province has proposed to revoke the Parkway Belt West Plan. This section may need to be deleted.	Comment received

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Part 2.1)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1	Revision Requested	The title page references this section as Part 2.1. Confirm that section numbering is correct and revise accordingly.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.1	Needs Discussion	Revise "Natural Heritage System" to "Natural System". Regional staff recommend the City incorporate a broader concept of the "Natural System" within the Brampton Plan to provide a framework for both the Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System as separate but complementary components with policy direction for both systems while recognizing that some components/features of the Water Resource System are also defined as part of the NHS for the purposes of their protection, restoration and enhancement. The use of the term "Natural Heritage System" for both the broader framework and the more specific "Natural Heritage System" designation is potentially confusing for readers of the Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1	Revision Requested	Confirm that section numbering is correct and revise section numbering accordingly (e.g., references Part 2.1 but is under section 2.2).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1	Revision Requested	Recommend capitalizing "eCity's".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2.1 f.	Needs Discussion	<p>Elements of the City-wide Growth Management Framework - It is recommended the City clarify how the Natural Heritage System is being defined in the Plan for the purposes of the City-wide Growth Management Framework.</p> <p>The labelling of the higher-level Natural Heritage System is confusing if it is also including the City's Natural Heritage System land use designation, the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System overlay and Water Resource System overlay that are components of the broader NHS system policy framework for the City-Wide Growth Management Framework. In different sections the Natural Heritage System is identified as both an overlay on Schedule 1 and a land use designation on Schedule 2. We recommend the City relabel the higher-level Natural Heritage System policy framework differently than the more specific Natural Heritage System land use designation formally designated on the Schedules.</p> <p>An approach similar to the Regional Official Plan or Greenbelt Plan is recommended with suggested wording as provided below (i.e. identifying the broader system as the City's Natural System made of a Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System). Further discussion with City staff is recommended.</p> <p>"The Natural Heritage System is made up of a Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System and includes natural spaces heritage and water resource systems, features and areas such as provincially and locally significant woodlands, rivers,</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2.24	Revision Requested	<p>Add "designation" and "floodplains," after "Natural Heritage System". The revisions are needed to conform to the Growth Plan DGA policies specifying what are eligible "take outs" for the purposes of measuring greenfield density.</p> <p>"..., the Natural Heritage System <u>designation, floodplains</u>, rights-of-way for hydro corridors, energy transmission lines, highways, railways, and cemeteries..."</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2	Needs Discussion	Change title from "Natural Heritage System" to "Natural System".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2 pg 2-22	Needs Discussion	Brampton's Natural Heritage System policies sets the context for conservation and protection within the City-Wide Growth Management Framework. In conformity with the policies of this Plan, the Region of Peel Official Plan, and Provincial Plans, the Natural Heritage System System, made up of the Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System , will be protected, enhanced, restored, and conserved for its the long-term sustainability of the System . The major watersheds found in Brampton and surrounding areas connect the city to many other communities and to natural ecosystems beyond our borders. The Natural Heritage System is System is vital to both our quality of life and to the health of natural ecosystems both within and beyond our current boundaries.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2 pg 2-22	Needs Discussion	The Natural Heritage System policy framework of the Brampton Plan , including the Natural Heritage System and W water R resource S ystems helps to shape and inform the locations for growth in the City Structure. By promoting a compact and connected city, Brampton will direct development away from sensitive natural heritage features and water resources, while improving air and water quality and opportunities for recreation, environmental education, and tourism.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2 pg 2-22	Needs Discussion	The following policies provide high-level directions for the Natural Heritage System, including the water resource system . Part 2-2-2.3 of Brampton Plan contains detailed policies for the Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System components .	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2.37	Revision Requested	Delete "Heritage" after "Natural".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2.37 a.	Revision Requested	Add "System" after "Natural Heritage" and capitalize "Water Resource System". Delete extra semi-colon at end of the clause.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	Policy has been removed	Revision Requested	Recommend deleting and replacing "will implement" with "implements" as the primary direction for the implementation of the Region of Peel Official Plan should be the Brampton Plan except where reference is to the Region's Official Plan for specific and more directive policy requirements is needed (e.g., for the protection of the Core Areas of the Greenlands System). The Regional Official Plan provides policy criteria and guidance to the City for the further interpretation, identification, protection, restoration and enhancement of the Greenlands System Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors. The City's Official Plan should provide more specific direction for their interpretation and identification to clarify implementation and to avoid applying two sets of policy criteria at the local level unless that is intended. A separate policy should be included in the Brampton Plan that specifically addresses protection of the Core Areas of the Greenlands System as the Regional Official Plan is directive with respect to protection of the Core Areas.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	Policy has been removed	Revision Requested	Regional staff recommends simplifying reference to the Greenlands System policies. Recommend the following revisions to Policy 2.2.2.39: "Brampton Plan will implement implements the policies of the Region of Peel Official Plan as they relate to the Greenlands System, which includes the Natural Heritage System of the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan, as well as the Conservation Authority Natural Heritage System. In the City of Brampton this includes the Core Areas, Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors of the Greenlands System, and the Greenbelt Plan's Natural Heritage System overlay, key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features of the Greenbelt Plan."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	Policy has been removed	Revision Requested	Add "and Water Resource System" at the end of the policy.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.3.10 d.	Revision Requested	Revise from 'Zum' to 'Züm' through draft Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
26-Jan	Kaneff	Kevin Freeman	2.1.2.1 a.	Needs Discussion	Since Neighbourhood Centres are not currently identified on Schedule 1, has staff considered locational criteria that would help to further define areas that would be supported by the neighbourhood Centre overlay?	Comment received - Neighborhood Centre locations are identified through the secondary planning stage
19-May	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	2.1.2.1 (Intensification)	Revision Requested	We recommend specifying that intensification will not be permitted within natural hazards - the preamble for Built-up Area notes "preventing encroachments within the Natural Heritage System and Natural Hazards", however a policy should be included under 2.1.2.18 as well	Comment received - in order to prevent redundancies and/or repetition, the comment is addressed through the "Built-up Areas" preamble text
19-May	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	2.1.2.18	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.2.18 (built up area/intensification) could also specify that intensification is not permitted within lands subject to natural hazards.	Comment received - in order to prevent redundancies and/or repetition, the comment is addressed through the "Built-up Areas" preamble text
19-May	TRCA	Liz Speller, Watershed Planning	2.1.2.f and 2.1.10	Revision Requested	Suggestion to add the WRS (in addition to the NHS) to align with provincial language/guidance to identify/protect the NHS and WRS (recognizing that the WRS is included as part of the NHS later in the Official Plan - OP). Comment partially addressed - WRS added to preamble for natural heritage system, but not where suggested in 2.1.2.6. No further comments.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
20-May	TRCA	Liz Speller, Watershed Planning	Part 2.1 (page 2-2)	Revision Requested	Consider adding the WRS to the City-Wide Growth Management Framework (in addition to the Natural Heritage System - NHS) and note them as complementary systems. This would align with provincial language/guidance to identify/protect both NHS & WRS. While the comment has been addressed, we note that the WRS could also be referenced in the graphic on page 2-2 (Part 2.1) under NHS. No further comments.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
02-Jun	MHBC	Oz Kemal	2.1.2.47	Revision Requested	The purpose of undertaking an Official Plan Review is to ascertain the availability and capacity of municipal infrastructure. The City's density policies should be based on where and when capital planning investments in infrastructure improvements or expansions are to occur in the next five to 10 years. The Official Plan's lifespan is technically only five to 10 years of development guidance. In the OPA section on Servicing Growth, policy 2.1.2.45 indicates that while Brampton supports the principle that new growth should support itself in terms of capital investments, it will leverage innovative infrastructure financing such as P3s or solicit funding from upper levels of government. This is then followed by policy 2.1.2.47 that says that: <i>The City must be satisfied that adequate Civic Infrastructure, in accordance with the policies of Part 2.2, can be supplied prior to any development proceeding and, where technically and economically possible.</i> Section 2.1.2.47 should be rephrased to state that: <i>The City has assessed the provision of Civic Infrastructure, in accordance with the allocated minimum growth density targets noted through policy 2.1.2.26 and Table2: Minimum Density Targets for Centres, and as guided by policies within Chapter 11 1: A Rapidly Growing City, and the Intensification policies 2.1.2.17 and 2.1.2.22 regarding where growth is to occur within the Built Up Area.</i>	Comment received.
10-Mar	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	Pg 2-5	Revision Requested	The OP states the NHS will be "maintained, restored, and enhanced" whereas, throughout the Plan, related policies say, "protect, restore and enhance" the NHS. We suggest consistency in keeping with the latter. However, we defer to the Region regarding consistency with specific language.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified to include "protect, maintain, restore, and enhance" in the updated draft document

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Part 2.2)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2	Revision Requested	Revise blue text box to include "or restrictions" in the description of Overlays. "Overlays then provide further permissions <u>or restrictions</u> related to use and form for specific areas in the city. ..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.1.1 f.	Revision Requested	Recommend the following revisions for clarification of the policy: The Natural Heritage System designation applies to natural heritage features and areas, such as valleyland and watercourse corridors, <u>natural linkages between the natural heritage system and its features</u> , wetlands, woodlands, <u>fish habitat, wildlife habitat</u> , areas of natural and scientific interest, <u>and environmental environmentally</u> sensitive/significant areas, and <u>the Greenbelt, natural linkages between natural heritage system features and areas</u> . <u>The purpose of the Natural Heritage System designation is</u> to protect, enhance, and restore the diversity and connectivity of natural features and the linkages among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features ad ground water features.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.8.28 l.	Revision Requested	Revise "agricultural" to "agriculture".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Recommend the following revisions for clarity: 1 st paragraph, 2 nd sentence – The Water Resource System is <u>complimentary-complementary</u> to the Natural Heritage System <u>as both systems support both natural heritage and hydrologic features and functions</u> .	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Needs Discussion	The second sentence is unclear because it refers to the Water Resources System as being complementary to the Natural Heritage System. In other sections of the Brampton Plan the Water Resource System is described as a "component" of the Natural Heritage System. A consistent description of the relationship between the two systems should be presented. Clearly indicate that the water resource features and areas are included as components of the "Natural Heritage System". Revisions to the Preamble under the title "Identify, Protect, <u>Restore</u> and Enhance the Natural Heritage System" are recommended.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Last sentence, add "improve" after "enhance". The policies contained within this section are intended to promote a systems approach to identify, protect, enhance, <u>improve</u> and restore the Natural Heritage System in the City.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.1	Revision Requested	Add missing comma after "restoration".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9.1. a.	Revision Requested	The term "linkage" is referenced twice. Recommend deleting "and their linkages" after "natural heritage features and areas".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.1. c.	Revision Requested	Add "linkages" after "buffers". "...planned built-form and community design and stewardship, buffers, <u>linkages</u> , ecological restoration and enhancement, appropriate mitigation, ..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.1	Revision Requested	Add "Restore" after "Protect" in the title to reflect the policy direction for the NHS.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.1	Revision Requested	Add "Restore" after "Protect" to the title "Identify, Protect and Enhance the Natural Heritage System". Under title "Identify, Protect, Restore and Enhance the Natural Heritage System" - The introductory paragraph is unclear and repeats the reference to restoration and enhancement. Revisions are suggested for clarity and to strengthen direction for restoration and enhancement as they appear to be an optional consideration (e.g., recognizing opportunities vs requiring consideration of). Since the 'protection, restoration and enhancement' is already referenced in the first sentence, the reference in the second sentence can be deleted. Recommended changes are provided below: "The Brampton Plan <u>generally</u> defines our Natural Heritage System and includes policies to ensure its protection, enhancement, and restoration. It <u>builds implements on</u> the Region of Peel <u>Core Areas of the Greenlands</u> System by incorporating <u>local provincially, regionally and locally significant</u> features and areas, <u>and recognizing opportunities for restoration and enhancement</u> ."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9.1	Revision Requested	Add "Watercourses (including intermittent and permanent streams)" and "Waterbodies (including inland lakes and their littoral zones)" after "Wetlands" in the list of NHS components and remove "Water Resource System" from this list of features. •Wetlands • <u>Watercourses (including intermittent and permanent streams)</u> • <u>Waterbodies (including inland lakes and their littoral zones)</u> •Woodlands The above policy 2.3.8.189 establishes the structure for this section of the plan. It identifies an over arching "Natural Heritage System" which is comprised of two distinct components, a natural heritage system and water resource system. Since this section is intended to provide the identify, protect and enhance policies for the Natural Heritage System component, the broad reference to "Water Resource System" should be deleted and replaced with the specific list of sensitive surface and ground water features and areas that are subject to the Natural Heritage System policies of this section (e.g. waterbodies (including inland lakes and their littoral zones, watercourses and wetlands).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.1	Revision Requested	In the 6th paragraph, 2nd sentence, add "and protection standards " after "This section establishes specific policies". The references to "protection standards in this and other policies are required to be consistent with provincial policy and conform to the Region of Peel Official Plan. This section establishes specific policies <u>and protection standards</u> for each of these natural heritage features and areas that form the Natural Heritage System.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.2	Revision Requested	Delete and replace "as shown" with "designated" after "The precise boundaries of the Natura Heritage System...". The Natural Heritage System is designated on Schedule 2.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.2. b.	Revision Requested	Recommend also listing water resource system features: "The results of studies listed in sub-section .a may refine the extent of natural heritage <u>and water resource system</u> features shown on <u>Schedule 6b</u> ".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.3	Revision Requested	Provided the preamble and policies in Section 2.3.8 clearly define the water resource features and areas that are included as components of the "Natural Heritage System" then the additional reference to "and water resource features and areas" after "protect the Natural Heritage System" is not needed here and can be deleted. Additional editorial revisions are recommended below: - add "the" after "Subject to" and "a" after "will strive to achieve".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.4	Revision Requested	Recommend the following revisions for clarity: - Add "the" after Subject to..." - Revise Clause a. - <u>Protection Protect</u> - Protect <u>areas natural heritage features, areas and functions</u> and avoid any negative impacts. - Clause d. - d. Change "and its function" to "and their functions".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.5	Needs Discussion	The protection standard in this policy is unclear and difficult to understand. Suggest City review the policies comprehensively to ensure the required protection standards in the Provincial Policy Statement are appropriately reflected in the draft Brampton Plan. Suggest the following revisions "... <u>seek opportunities to manage, protect,...</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.8	Revision Requested	Revise – Policy 2.3.8.195 – The protection standards in this policy are unclear and not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement or the Region of Peel Official Plan. Recommend deleting and replacing "policies" with "protection standards" after "in accordance with".	Comment received. Staff prefer to use the term "policies" rather than "protection standards".
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.9	Revision Requested	Revise clause b. to "b. removal is permitted by this Plan, and the Region of Peel Official Plan" to "The removal is permitted by this Plan, the Region of Peel Official Plan, and applicable provincial plans and policies;" to ensure that all relevant protection standards are considered when natural feature removals are considered.	Comment received. Staff prefer to use the term "policies" rather than "protection standards".
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.9	New Policy	Add new clause "d. The removal is in accordance with ecosystem compensation guidelines approved by the City, Province or other agency." to ensure consistent guidance is applied when considering removals. Both CVC and TRCA have recommended guidelines for ecological offsetting the City can use for this purpose in addition to the Provincial and Federal requirements under the Endangered Species Act and Fisheries Act.	Comment received. Staff prefer to use the term "policies" rather than "protection standards".
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.10	Revision Requested	Suggest changing "Offsetting" to "Ecological offsetting".	Comment received. Staff prefer to use the term "policies" rather than "protection standards".
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.11 a.	Revision Requested	Add comma.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.11 c.	Delete Policy	Clause a. indicates that offsetting compensation must provide ecological function that is "equivalent to or in excess of" the function of the feature to be removed while c. indicates that compensation only needs to "reflect the loss". Clause c. is unclear and should be deleted.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.20 a.	Revision Requested	Revise by adding "if measures are taken to minimize the number of such structures and their negative impacts" at the end of the clause.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.20 b.	Revision Requested	Change "natural structures" to "forest, fish and wildlife management" to be consistent with Provincial and Regional policy.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.22	Delete Policy	Duplication of policy 2.3.8.212.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.24	Revision Requested	Recommend deleting "generally" as the Regional Official Plan policy 2.14.15 is to "Prohibit development and site alteration within Core Area...except for...".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.26	Revision Requested	Add "through a subwatershed study, Environmental Implementation Report, or other natural heritage system study" after "in consultation with the Conservation Authorities and relevant agencies".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.27	Needs Discussion	Add "Subject to the policies of this Plan," at the beginning of the policy and "in or on lands" after "will not be permitted". The suggestion to include the additional wording at the beginning of the policy and similar policies in this section clarifies that the "no negative impacts" protection standard is subject to the prohibition of development and site alteration in Core Areas of the Greenlands System in the draft Brampton Plan. The policy is also unclear as it only addresses lands adjacent to valleylands and watercourse corridors and does not clarify what the protection standard is for development within features (e.g. when non-Core Greenlands minor headwater valley/stream corridors are permitted to be altered if a no negative impact standard can be demonstrated).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9.28	Needs Discussion	This policy can be strengthened by inserting direction related to maintaining the ecological integrity of valleylands (e.g., To maintain the open character, <u>and</u> linkage functions <u>and ecological integrity of</u> Valleylands.). It is also recommended the City consider adding policy relating to minimizing the footprint and number of structures crossing valley and watercourse corridors.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9 'Wetlands'	Revision Requested	Change "willow" to "shallow".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.32	Revision Requested	Change "on lands adjacent to" to "on adjacent lands to" and review capitalization of the term "adjacent lands" throughout this section to reference the definition in the Glossary and for consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement and Region of Peel Official Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.32 c.	Revision Requested	Recommend strengthening the protection afforded to non-provincially significant wetlands by adding criteria/factors to be considered when it might be appropriate to remove or replicate the wetland. Suggest adding " <u>provides only a limited contribution to the ecological integrity and function of the Natural Heritage System and</u> " after "form and function" or other appropriate criteria to provide a basis for determining if non-PSWs should be protected. The policy currently does not provide a basis for limiting removals.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.32 b.	Revision Requested	Throughout the draft Brampton Plan, references to "Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry" should be revised to "Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.36	Revision Requested	Recommend changing "consider" to "define".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.36 b.	Revision Requested	Change to 'Core Area Woodland' to be consistent with Regional Official Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.37	Revision Requested	Remove quotation mark "" at the beginning of the policy, change "consider" to "define" and "meeting" to "meet".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.37 b. iv	Needs Discussion	What was the rationale for not including the G1, G2 and G3 ranks recommended in Regional Official Plan Table 1?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.37 b. vi	Revision Requested	Suggest rewording to also include animal habitat of species of special concern, as identified in Regional Official Plan Table 1: "Habitat with Endangered, or Threatened or <u>Special Concern</u> animal species as defined by the Provincial and Federal Species at Risk lists; and/or ".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.38	Revision Requested	Recommend adding "Naturalizing Plantations" after "Plantations". The Brampton Plan refers to both terms in Policy 2.3.8.228 and in the Glossary.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.39	New Policy	Recommend revision to woodland exclusion policy to align with standard provincial and Region of Peel Official Plan exclusions and making the last sentence a separate policy: "2.3.8.225 <u>Woodlands do not include plantations that are:</u> <u>a. Managed for production of fruits, nuts, Christmas trees, nursery stock or other agro-forestry type uses;</u> <u>b. Managed for tree products with an average rotation of less than 20 years; or,</u> <u>c. Established and continually managed for the sole purpose of complete removal at rotation without a woodland restoration objective, as demonstrated with documentation acceptable to the City.</u> -do not include a cultivated fruit or nut orchard, or plantation established and maintained for the purpose of producing Christmas trees. Woodlands experiencing changes, such as harvesting, blowdown, or other tree mortality, are still considered woodlands. Such changes are considered temporary whereby the forest still retains its long-term ecological value. <u>2.3.8.XXX Woodlands experiencing changes, such as harvesting, blowdown, or other tree mortality, are still considered woodlands. Such changes are considered temporary whereby the forest still retains its long-term ecological value."</u>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.40 & 2.2.9.41	Revision Requested	Policies 2.3.8.226 and 2.3.8.227 specify open breaks of 30 metres and 20 metres, to indicate when two or more adjacent woodland patches would be considered one woodland patch. The separation distances are not consistent. It is recommended that draft Brampton Plan policies 2.3.8.226 and 2.3.8.227 be revised to align with provincial guidelines for consistency (e.g., ORMCP Technical Paper, Greenbelt NHS KNHF Technical Paper) – 20 metres is standard separation criterion used to determine if adjacent patches are considered one woodland.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	Policy has been removed	Revision Requested	Change "cultural woodlands" to "cultural woodland" and capitalize "Woodland Edge", "Plantation" and "Naturalizing Plantation". "Woodland Edge" is a defined term in the Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.42	Needs Discussion	The policy is unclear and should be revised as it refers to "Regionally Significant Woodlands", which are undefined in the Plan, but excludes reference to "Core Woodlands" which are defined in Policy 2.3.8.222. If the intent is to provide a "no development and site alteration" protection standard to all Core Woodlands and Locally Significant Woodlands as defined in the Brampton Plan, the policy should refer to these terms. As the term "Core Woodlands" in the Brampton Plan references includes Core Area Woodlands as defined in the Regional Official Plan a separate reference to Regionally Significant Woodlands in this policy is not needed. Regional staff have recommended changes to Policy 2.3.8.222 to clarify the reference to Core Area Woodlands as defined in the Regional Official Plan and recommend providing a clarification for development and site alteration that may be permitted in Locally Significant Woodlands (e.g., infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process). "Development and site alteration will not be permitted within <u>Regionally Significant Core</u> Woodlands, except in accordance with the policies of the Region of Peel Official Plan, or Locally Significant Woodlands." The City should confirm the intended protection standard for "Locally Significant Woodlands" and whether it is intended that a "no development and site alteration protection standard" is to be applied as proposed to all "Locally Significant Woodlands".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.44	Revision Requested	Revise to "Development or site alteration <u>on</u> adjacent <u>lands</u> to a woodland will <u>be</u> ...".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.47	Revision Requested	Revise to "Development or site alteration is not permitted within or <u>on</u> adjacent <u>lands</u> ...".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.50	Revision Requested	Revise to "...where subdivision approval is proposed within or <u>on</u> adjacent <u>lands</u> ...". Reference to "Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry" should be revised to "Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.54	Revision Requested	Reference to "Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry" should be revised to "Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Reference to "Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry" should be revised to "Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.59	Revision Requested	Reference to "Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry" should be revised to "Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Add "Protected Countryside" to the section title.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	The description of the Greenbelt Plan will need to indicate how the Brampton Plan is designating and identifying the land use designations and overlays of the Greenbelt Plan. Separate comments providing corresponding revisions to the mapping and legends on Schedules 1, 2, 6a, and 6b are provided. The revisions are required to ensure the Brampton Plan conforms to the Greenbelt Plan. Recommended changes to paragraph 1, 3rd sentence are provided below: "Within the City of Brampton, about 202 hectares of land adjacent to the Credit River Valley in Northwest Brampton are designated as Protected Countryside <u>on Schedule 2 and identified as with a Greenbelt Plan</u> Natural Heritage System <u>overlay as shown on Schedules 6a and 6b.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Add "enhance the spatial extent of agriculturally and environmentally protected lands, " after "the surrounding major lake systems, to" to reflect purpose of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside as described in the Greenbelt Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Revise description of the Greenbelt's Natural System and Urban River Valley designation to more closely align with the descriptions provided in the Greenbelt Plan- " <u>Within the Protected Countryside,</u> " the Natural System <u>identifies lands is made up of a Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System</u> that support both natural heritage and hydrological features and functions including providing pollinator habitat, which is an essential support for ecosystems."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Revise description of the Greenbelt's Natural System and Urban River Valley designation to more closely align with the descriptions provided in the Greenbelt Plan- "Brampton Plan also <u>recognizes that designates lands along</u> the Credit River, Etobicoke Creek and three tributaries of the West Humber River- <u>identified as Urban River Valleys on Schedules 2 and 6a-, Urban River Valley designations provide for</u> apply to publicly owned lands that form important river valley linkages and corridors in an urban context between the Protected Countryside and Lake Ontario."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.67	Needs Discussion	It is recommended the City clarify the land use designations that apply within the Greenbelt Area and consider whether separate stand-alone Rural Lands and Natural Heritage System designations should be established to further clarify and implement the Greenbelt Plan's Protected Countryside designation and Natural Heritage System overlay. The PPS and Greenbelt Plan provide direction to municipalities to identify land use designations in rural areas to guide appropriate development and land use in these areas. A dual designation Protected Countryside/Natural Heritage System approach may not adequately address the policy direction needed. Is the policy direction for the Greenbelt Plan's NHS overlay and the Brampton Plan's Natural Heritage System designation within the Protected Countryside clear to readers of the Plan? Subject to the above clarification, the following revisions to Policy 2.3.8.254 are recommended to conform to the Greenbelt Plan: "The Greenbelt Plan Natural System is shown on Schedule 6b- For those lands within the Greenbelt Plan Natural System- Protected Countryside, the applicable policies of the Greenbelt Plan will apply including but not limited to, the Natural Heritage System, Water Resource System, key hydrologic areas, key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and infrastructure policies, in addition to the policies of this Plan."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.68	Needs Discussion	The City's approach to designating the Rural System of the Greenbelt Plan in Brampton as Protected Countryside Area creates a very restrictive designation outside of the City's Natural Heritage System and an overly permissive designation within the City's Natural Heritage System. The City should consider identifying two designations within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside (e.g., consider designating a Rural Lands land use designation and the City's Natural Heritage System designation on Schedule 2. A Rural Lands designation in the Greenbelt is recommended to replace the Neighbourhoods designation on Schedule 2). Further discussion with City staff is recommended. Subject to the above clarification, the following revisions to Policy 2.3.8.255 are recommended: "2.3.8.255 Within the Protected Countryside Area of the Greenbelt shown as designated on Schedule 6b 2 , the following uses, buildings, and structures are permitted, <u>subject to Policy 2.3.8.254</u> : a. Normal farm practices and a full range of agricultural uses, as well as agricultural-related and on-farm diversified uses, <u>subject to the Natural System policies of the Greenbelt Plan, and should be compatible with and not hinder surrounding agricultural operations in accordance with provincial guidelines-</u> Criteria for all these uses will be based on provincial Guidelines- on Permitted Uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Area; "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner		New Policy	Add new Policy 2.3.8.XXX after Policy 2.3.8.255 to conform to the Greenbelt Plan: " <u>Agricultural, agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses shall be permitted in accordance with provincial Guidelines on Permitted uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Areas. Proposed agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses should be compatible with and should not hinder surrounding agricultural operations.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner		New Policy	Add new Policy 2.3.8.XXX after Policy 2.3.8.255 to conform to the Greenbelt Plan: " <u>All development and site alteration will be subject to the Natural System policies of the Greenbelt Plan. Within the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System overlay shown on Schedules 6a and 6b, key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features will be protected in accordance with the policies of the Greenbelt Plan, the Region of Peel Official Plan and this Plan. Within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan, new development and site alteration shall demonstrate there will be no negative impacts on key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features or their functions and that connectivity between key features located within 240 metres of each other will be maintained or, where possible, enhanced for the movement of plants and animals.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.69	Revision Requested	Revise to include "...key natural heritage <u>feature and or a</u> key hydrologic features..." and "...identify <u>environmental key</u> features...".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.71	Revision Requested	Hyphenate the word "on-farm".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner		New Policy	Add after Policy 2.3.8.258 the following new policy addressing minimum distance separation requirements in the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan: " <u>Within the Protected Countryside new land uses, including the creation of new lots, and new or expanding livestock operations shall comply with the minimum distance separation formulae.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.74	Revision Requested	Revise by adding references to Schedules 2 and 6a and clarifying that the Urban River Valley is a dual designation that applies to publicly owned lands in conjunction with the other underlying land use designations, overlays and policies in the Brampton Plan (e.g., Natural Heritage System, Water Resource System). The City should ensure that all land use designations applying to the publicly owned lands within the URV designations have regard to the objectives of the Greenbelt Plan. (Greenbelt Plan Section 6.2) Recommended revisions to Policy 2.3.8.261 are as follows: "Within the Urban River Valley designation <u>shown on Schedules 2 and 6a</u> , the following <u>additional</u> policies will apply to publicly owned lands: "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Revise - Title and first paragraph for clarity Identify, Protect, Improve or Restore the Water Resources-System This Plan recognizes the importance of Brampton's Natural Heritage System, shown on Schedule 6a, which includes the Natural Heritage System and the Water Resources System. The Water Resources <u>Resource</u> System is comprised of complex interrelated systems, features and areas. This includes ground water and surface water, which are important resources as they supply drinking water and help maintain ecological integrity of ecosystems. The Credit River, Humber River, Etobicoke Creek, and their tributaries form the major watersheds in the Region of Peel. <u>The Water Resource System features and areas overlap with the Natural Heritage System designated on Schedules 2 and 6a and are subject to the policies for the Natural Heritage System where features and areas of the Water Resource System are defined, and addressed as components of the Natural Heritage System. The hydrologic features and areas of the Water Resource System, including those not designated on Schedules 2 and 6a, and as further defined in this Plan, are shown on Schedules 6b and 6c.</u>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Revise the third paragraph: The W ater R esources- S ystem , which complements the Natural Heritage System, is addressed from a number of perspectives in Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9.75	Revision Requested	Revise: Section 2.3.8 - third introductory paragraph under the title "Identify, Protect, Improve or Restore the Water Resource System" The term "Water Resource System" should be consistently capitalized throughout.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9.76	Revision Requested	the following recommended revisions are provided to clarify the direction: "The City will <u>use implement</u> watershed plans, <u>as appropriate</u> , and the watershed planning process to protect, improve and restore <u>water quantity and quality and</u> the hydrological function, quality and quantity of the City's water resources."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Preamble "Surface Water and Groundwater Resources" 1st paragraph – Revise second sentence "Groundwater resources include groundwater recharge and discharge areas, water tables and aquifers. Surface water features include <u>headwaters, watercourses and headwater drainage features, including permanent and intermittent streams, wetlands, lakes and their littoral zones, rivers, stream channels,</u> recharge/discharge areas, seepage areas, springs, and <u>associated riparian zones.</u>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Preamble "Surface Water and Groundwater Resources" 3rd paragraph – Revise first sentence: "...Provincial Policy Statement <u>and relevant provincial plans.</u> Watershed Plans..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.80	Revision Requested	Provide clarify regarding the process through which delineation of features will be required and strengthen the policy to also provide the options of requiring avoidance of impacts. Recommended revisions are provided below: <u>As identified through Watershed and Subwatershed Plans: The boundaries of water resource features and areas will be delineated through watershed and subwatershed plans, Environmental Implementation Reports, and other natural heritage system studies through the planning and development review process and in consultation with relevant agencies.</u> <u>d</u> Development and site alteration will be restricted in or near sensitive surface water features and sensitive groundwater features such that these features and their related hydrologic functions will be protected, improved or restored. <u>Avoidance, M</u> itigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to protect, improve or restore sensitive surface water features, sensitive groundwater features, and their hydrologic functions.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9.81	Revision Requested	"...proposed with <u>within</u> a significant..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner		New Policy	Insert a new policy to address contaminant management plans. In accordance with the applicable source protection plan. The City may want the option to request a contaminant management plans when major developments that may be a threat to groundwater quality are proposed. Under the Clean Water Act, these land uses within HVAs are not considered a significant drinking water threat which have policies that must be complied with. <u>"A Contaminant Management Plan may be required as a condition of development approval for development proposed within Highly Vulnerable that involves the manufacturing, handling and/or storage of bulk fuel or chemicals as activities prescribed under the Clean Water Act, as deemed necessary by the City in consultation with the Region."</u>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.86	Revision Requested	Remove "... or agricultural practices, ...".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.9.87	Revision Requested	Suggest deleting "wellhead protection areas" as there are no WHPAs in the City of Brampton. The Regional Official Plan encourages salt management plans in HVAs and SGRAs where road salt is a low or moderate threat in accordance with the applicable source protection plan. Recommended revisions are as follows: <u>"A contaminant management salt management plan will may be used required in vulnerable areas where the application of road salt to impervious areas is a moderate or low threat in wellhead-protection areas, highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas."</u>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9 'Natural Hazards'	Revision Requested	References to the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry will need to be updated throughout the Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.94	Revision Requested	Add space between 'plain' and 'where'.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.105	Revision Requested	Note- the role and function of the CAs as identified in the draft Brampton Plan may need to be revisited based on changes implemented through Bill 23.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and noted in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Remove 's' on 'Resource' throughout.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and noted in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.106	Revision Requested	Remove 's' on 'Resource' throughout.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and noted in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.106	Revision Requested	Add space before 'Buffers'.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and noted in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.107	Revision Requested	Spell out 'Natural Heritage System'.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and noted in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.108	Revision Requested	Policy is incomplete. Clarify if the word "except" should be deleted.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.109	Revision Requested	Add " <u>wide</u> " after "minimum 30 metre".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.110	Revision Requested	Remove 's' on 'Resource' throughout.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.111	Revision Requested	Revise "... an a ..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.112	Revision Requested	"... meters metres ...".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.116	Revision Requested	Remove 's' on 'Resource' throughout.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.130	Needs Discussion	The policy requirement for no net loss and net ecological gain is contradictory and unclear.	Comment addressed - with relation to policy 2.2.9.3, the policy has been clarified
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Add - "...consider <u>the</u> cumulative impacts <u>of increasing urbanization and climate change and to</u> ...".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.133	Revision Requested	Revise to include "functions on an ecosystem basis <u>and providing recommendations addressing flooding hazards and stormwater management taking into account changing climate conditions</u> ".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager	2.2.9.134	Revision Requested	The following revisions are recommended to conform to the Region of Peel Official Plan and to reorder policy clauses for clarity: As the City plans, manages, and conserves our natural heritage within the context of these subwatersheds, the City will require that subwatershed studies: a. Identify surface water features, ground water features, hydrogeologic functions, soil and geological conditions, fluvial sediment transportation regimes, and natural heritage features and areas which are necessary for the ecological and hydrological integrity of the watershed; x. Establish environmental targets to maintain, restore and enhance existing conditions; x. Assess the cumulative environmental impacts from existing and planned development; b. Recommend appropriate restrictions to development and site alteration in or adjacent to sensitive and vulnerable surface and ground water features such that these features and their related hydrologic, hydraulic, and geomorphic functions and water quality will be protected, improved, or restored; c. Support the preparation of a landscape scale analysis that examines natural features, functions, and linkages that extend across and beyond subwatershed boundaries; d. Recommend improvements for the water quality of valleylands through a multi-faceted approach that includes water conservation, infrastructure improvements, and stewardship efforts; e. Protect, restore, and enhance natural heritage features;	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.141	Revision Requested	Remove 's' on 'Resource' throughout.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9 'Stewardship and Education'	Needs Discussion	As Stewardship and education can be for both the Natural Heritage and Water Resource Systems, it is suggested that both be referenced under "Natural System". Revise to remove "Heritage".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.155	Needs Discussion	As Stewardship and education can be for both the Natural Heritage and Water Resource Systems, it is suggested that both be referenced under "Natural System". Revise to remove "Heritage".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Feb-23	City of Brampton - City Planning & Design	Claudia LaRota	2.2.7.68	Delete Policy	Delete - "To protect designated employment lands within the City, Places of Worship will be permitted in areas designated for employment purposes in accordance with the criteria outlined in this Plan. The relevant Brampton Plan land use designation and Zoning By-law will set out further provisions and performance standards with respect to the location and size of Places of Worship."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Feb-23	City of Brampton - City Planning & Design	Claudia LaRota	2.2.7.72	Delete Policy	Delete - "Places of Worship of up to approximately 3,000 square metres (32,230 square feet) of gross floor area will be permitted on lands designated Industrial on Schedule 2 that are located at the edge of an employment lands area, except where the lands are identified Provincially Significant Employment Zones on Schedule 5, and unless it is demonstrated that there are land use conflicts with adjacent uses. Places of Worship are not intended to be located within heavy industrial areas categorized as Class III in the "Industrial Categorization Criteria" of the Ministry of the Environment (MOE). The scale, access and parking associated with the Place of Worship will be functionally compatible with existing and planned land uses on the surrounding areas so as not to impede the operation or permitted expansion of adjacent industrial uses."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Feb-23	City of Brampton - City Planning & Design	Claudia LaRota	2.2.7.73	Delete Policy	Delete - "Places of Worship with a gross floor area greater than 3,000 square metres will be permitted in an Employment Area designation of Brampton Plan, only if the site is located in an area intended for Mixed Use Employment, subject to amending the applicable Secondary Plan and Zoning Bylaw. In addition to the foregoing, Places of Worship of up to approximately 5,000 sq. m. of gross floor area will be permitted on lands intended for Mixed use Employment or light industrial uses, only if the site is located within approximately 500 metres from an area that is primarily residential in nature and zoned for residential purposes"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Feb-23	City of Brampton - City Planning & Design	Claudia LaRota	2.2.8.9	Delete Policy	Delete - "Places of Worship with a gross floor area greater than 3,000 square metres will be permitted in an Industrial designation of Brampton Plan, only if the site is located in an area intended for commercial, mixed commercial/industrial or light industrial uses, subject to amending the applicable Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law. In addition to the foregoing, Places of Worship of up to approximately 5,000 sq. m. of gross floor area will be permitted on lands intended for mixed commercial/industrial or light industrial uses, only if the site is located within approximately 500 metres from an area designated "Residential" in Brampton Plan, and zoned for residential purposes."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Feb-23	City of Brampton - City Planning & Design	Claudia LaRota	2.2.8.18	Revision Requested	Revision: 2.2.8.18 Places of worship less than 3,000 square metres will be permitted on lands designated Mixed-Use Employment that are located within a 500 metre radius from a Neighbourhoods designation.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
26-Jan	Kanef	Kevin Freeman	Table 8 - Minimum Buffers, pg. 2-145	Needs Discussion	Table 8 in Section 2.2.9.110 identifies minimum buffer requirements for natural heritage features and hydrologic features. The tables notes that the minimum buffer requirement for a wetland is 15 metres whereas the current Official Plan and CVC policy requires that a 10 metre buffer apply to non-provincially significant wetlands. What is the rationale for increasing the minimum buffer requirement from 10 metres to 15 metres for non- provincially significant wetlands?	Comment received. Under the current Official Plan, the minimum buffer requirements are 10m, however, staff have continuously requested 15m for non-psw wetlands. The updated OP solidifies this. As noted in CVC's Buffer report (2012), a minimum 15m wetland buffer is based on best practices to protect the water quality of wetlands. This includes sediment and nutrient removal, as well as the removal of pollutants. This new minimum requirement is in line with other Ontario municipalities (e.g., Waterloo) who have a minimum 15m non-psw buffer. As stated, a 15m buffer is employed in order to receive the benefits from the buffer in the same way to those listed as consideration for PSW
26-Jan	Kanef	Kevin Freeman	2.2.9.30	Requires Clarification	We would like to confirm that the interpretation of the draft policy (2.2.9.30)with respect to site alteration within a Provincially Significant Wetland buffer is subject to consultation with City staff and the Conservation Authority. It is our understanding that modest encroachment within a 30m PSW buffer is discretionary and supportable in certain instances provided it is appropriately justified within an Environmental Impact Study.	Comment received. Environmental Planning notes that it is stated in both the current and draft Official Plan that development and site alteration is not permitted in PSWs in accordance with the PPS. Under the draft official plan policy 2.2.9.32 (a), development and site alteration are not permitted unless there has been an ecological assessment of the wetland features and functions, and it has been identified that there will be no negative impact on the PSW or their ecological/hydrological function. This policy is also within the current official plan

17-Apr	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler	2.2.4.2	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.4.2 d) indicates that new single use buildings are discouraged along Primary Boulevards while Policy 2.2.4.2 h) indicates that single use buildings are permitted on portions of the Secondary Urban Boulevard that are not within delineated Centres. Taken in concert, these policies appear to suggest that single use buildings are permitted but discouraged along Primary Boulevards but are prohibited along Primary Boulevards that are within Centres. We appreciate the response provided by staff to our initial comment on this matter. However, we continue to have concerns that, without proper clarification in the proposed OP policy framework, sites like BCC may run into issues when existing single use buildings are proposed to be reconfigured, upgraded or expanded. We request that a policy be added as follows: Existing single use buildings are permitted and may be reconfigured, upgraded and expanded, as required	Comment received - single use buildings are already permitted.
17-Apr	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler	2.2.8.17	New Policy	The 410 / Steeles Lands contain an existing shopping centre which is almost fully built out but with a number of vacant development sites still available. As per our previous comment letter, we continue to request that a policy be added that recognizes existing shopping centres and ensures their ability to expand and develop over time without being subject to Policy 2.2.8.17. We request that the following policy be added to clarify that 2.2.8.17 does not affect new building within existing shopping centres. Policy 2.2.8.17 does not apply to development within existing shopping centres	Comment received
19-May	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	Pg 2-114	Revision Requested	The fifth paragraph states that the Brampton Plan will direct development away from areas of significant natural or human made hazards of natural resources. It is unclear why the term "significant" is used. This could lead to confusion given that the reader may think natural hazards vary in their significance, and because the term is used to signify provincial significance of natural heritage features. We suggest stating that development will be directed outside natural or human made hazards.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
19-May	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	2.2.9.4 d	Revision Requested	We suggest specifying that compensation is a last resort.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
19-May	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	2.2.9.9, 2.2.9.10, 2.2.9.14, 2.2.9.16, 2.2.9.20 d & g	Requires Clarification	It is unclear if the lower case 'nhs' is intentional. We suggest consistency where the NHS is in reference to the City's NHS and/or the Growth Plan or Greenbelt NHS, i.e., as opposed to the natural heritage systems references in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), or the Regional (Greenlands System) NHS.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
31-Oct	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	2.2.9.27	Revision Requested	Please consider replacing "net benefit" with " net ecological benefit ".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
31-Oct	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	2-174; 2.2.9.94	Revision Requested	This section states that, "in line with Provincial policies, a one zone concept is applied to determine the flood plain." We recommend revising to, "In accordance with Provincial policies and provincial technical guidelines, generally, the flood plain consists of one zone defined by the selected flood standard." Policy 2.2.227 states that, "...where Two Zone or Special Policy Area status has been approved, site specific policies related to development and redevelopment will be detailed in the relevant Secondary-Level Plans." We recommend revising to "...where provincially approved Two Zone or Special Policy Area status has been approved, provincially approved site specific policies related to development..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
10-Mar	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	Pg 2-27	Revision Requested	Re: "The Natural Heritage System, including the Water Resources Systems..." WRS is plural, where it should be singular, as is the case throughout the rest of the Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
10-Mar	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	NHS: Permitted Uses and Activities- Section 2.2.9.20	Revision Requested	2.2.9.20 f) – provides that a new SFD may be permitted within the NHS, "if the need has been demonstrated and it has been established that there is no reasonable alternative, on an existing lot of record". While the preamble speaks to the potential for studies to be undertaken and approved by the City and appropriate agencies, this requirement is not necessarily reflected in the policy. We recommend stating the requirement in the policy to avoid confusion or conflict with other policies where a SFD could be prohibited due to the presence of natural hazards and where detailed studies are required. For example, policy 2.2.9.91 expressly states, where permitted, proposals for development/site alteration within natural hazards will be supported by detailed studies...	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
10-Mar	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	NHS: Natural Hazards - Section 2.2.9.88	Revision Requested	2.2.9.88 states, "The City, in consultation with the conservation authorities, will: ...b) identify hazardous forest types for wildland fire in accordance with provincial guidelines." As per O.Reg. 686/21, which outlines conservation authority Mandatory Programs and Services, CAs' plan review role does not include hazardous forest types for wildland fire (see s.7. (1) (a) and (b) of the regulation).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
10-Mar	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	NHS: Natural Hazards - Section 2.2.9.88	Revision Requested	As described in Table 8, the description of buffers in 2.2.9.88 should also mention that buffers are inclusive of natural hazards associated with natural features (e.g., significant valleyland). As written, it portrays the function of buffers as strictly ecological, where there can be a natural hazard mitigation component.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
10-Mar	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	NHS: Natural Hazards - Table 8, Sections 2.2.9.110 and 2.2.9.115	Revision Requested	Table 8 and policies 2.2.9.110 and 2.2.9.115 indicate that the limit of development extends to the outermost edge of the natural feature, natural hazard and associated minimum buffer. Table 8 also identifies minimum buffers as being no less than 10m (save for potentially Significant Wildlife Habitat). Further, 2.2.9.111 prohibits development and site alteration in a buffer, except for trails supported by technical study. In our experience, partner municipalities have indicated that policies requiring a rigid minimum buffer of 10 metres can be challenging to implement where TRCA may permit development or site alteration within a reduced buffer, in accordance with the Living City Policies. While we recognize the prudence of maintaining a minimal standard for buffers to provide consistency, we note that provincial guidance on natural hazards recommends a minimum 6m erosion access allowance and does not specify a minimum buffer requirement for flood hazards. We suggest stating that: development and site alteration within the minimum buffers of hazardous lands is generally prohibited, unless it is demonstrated through appropriate technical studies, prepared to the satisfaction of the City and the Conservation Authority, that the development or site alteration will not pose a risk to human health and safety or property, will not adversely impact upon adjacent properties or infrastructure, and will not have a negative impact on significant natural heritage and hydrologic features and/or their functions.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

24-Apr	TRCA / Planning Ecology	Brennan Paul, Senior Ecologist	Natural Heritage System - 2.2.9.32(b)(d)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.9.32 (b) and (d) state that wetland evaluations must be approved by the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry. This is no longer a requirement of the province therefore this sentence should be deleted.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
24-Apr	TRCA / Planning Ecology	Brennan Paul, Senior Ecologist	Natural Heritage System - 2.2.9.34	Revision Requested	2.2.9.34 indicates that Conservation Authorities are the approval body for wetland compensation. This is inaccurate as CA's provide advice to municipalities under the municipal planning process. This section should indicate that appropriate compensation will be determined in consultation with local Conservation Authorities.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
24-Apr	TRCA / Policy	Heather Rodriguez, Planner	Natural Heritage System 2.2.9.32 (b)(d)	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.9.32 (b) and (d) are duplicates, consider the removal of (b) or (d).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
26-Apr	TRCA / DPP	Adam Miller, Associate Director Development Planning and Permits	Natural Heritage System 2.2.9.30	Revision Requested	While the PPS prohibits development and site alteration in Provincially Significant Wetlands (PPS - 2.1.4) it does not speak to associated buffers. Some flexibility should be provided for development within the 30 metre buffer. For example, minor reductions have been permitted where supported by technical studies prepared to the satisfaction of the City of Brampton and local Conservation Authorities. Flexibility is also needed for existing development/redevelopment.	Comment received.
26-Apr	TRCA / DPP	Adam Miller, Associate Director Development Planning and Permits	Natural Heritage System 2.2.9.32 (a)	Revision Requested	This policy should clearly identify that it only applies to development adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland and not within a Provincially Significant Wetland (which is prohibited by the PPS). The preamble notes this but the reader may not pick up on that and assume the management tools/options (i.e., compensation) may be permitted for both PSWs, unevaluated wetlands and other wetlands.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
26-Apr	TRCA / DPP	Adam Miller, Associate Director Development Planning and Permits	Natural Heritage System 2.2.9.32 (c)	Revision Requested	We note that a hierarchical approach should be applied when considering off-setting/compensation policies. We recommend policy 2.2.9.32 (c) states that if mitigating impacts is not possible, removal/compensation measures may be considered in consultation with local Conservation Authorities.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
26-Apr	TRCA / DPP	Jason Wagler, Senior Manager, Development Planning and Permits	Natural Heritage System 2.2.9.32 (f)	Revision Requested	2.2.9.32 (f) suggests that where development is proposed within a wetland's catchment, mitigating impacts to wetland hydrology is to be employed where it is feasible. This suggests that if it isn't feasible, impacts that have a negative impact on the wetland and its functions could be permitted. This policy isn't consistent with the PPS. The PPS identifies that development and site alteration on adjacent lands to wetlands must have no negative impacts on the feature and its ecological functions (2.1.8). The PPS also protects surface water features (2.2) such as wetlands and their hydrologic functions against changes that degrade the quality and quantity of water in that feature. The inability to maintain a wetland's hydrologic functions has a direct impact on the feature and consequently its ecological functions. We suggest revising the policy to state that if development is proposed within the catchment of a wetland, the risk to the wetland's hydrologic function is evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures are implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Brampton and local Conservation Authorities to maintain the wetland's functions and assure no negative impacts to the feature.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
19-May-23	Dentons / CN	Jessica Jakubowski	2.2.8.10; 2.2.8.11	Revision Requested	We continue to respectfully suggest that policies 2.2.8.10 and 2.2.8.11 are more appropriately located in the general land use compatibility section, starting at Policy 3.5.2.9. As currently located, the policies could be interpreted to only apply to employment uses, instead of generally to land uses in proximity to employment uses. For example, a person with interest in a non-employment parcel adjacent to an employment parcel might overlook these policies, despite the fact that based on the PPS they apply.	Please review policies 3.5.2.10 - 3.5.2.14 and let us know if you have further comments.
02-Jun-23	MHBC	Oz Kemal	2.2.2 MTSA - Heights and Densities	Revision Requested	The draft OPA should focus on the provision of minimum building heights rather than maximums within the MTSAs, as well as permitting a phasing of increased building heights over time. As Minister Clark informed Peel Region, through the Province's modification of policy 5.6.19.10 of the Peel Region Official Plan, wherein the Province removed the discretion of lower-tier municipalities to set maximum heights within MTSAs (see attached letter). The Province modified this Regional policy to ensure that "transit supportive outcomes are achieved, and that adequate housing supply is brought forward faster." The recommendation is to amend Table 4 Framework for Building Typologies and Table 5 Summary of Building Typologies by Designation and Overlay respectively in section 2.2.2, by providing minimum heights for Low-Rise Plus to High-Rise Plus rather than a range of heights.	Comment received

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 3)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
26-Jan	Kaneff	Kevin Freeman	3.3.1.41 (and related IZ policies e.g. 5.10)	Revision Requested	Recognizing the widespread shortage of purpose-built rental housing in Brampton and the Region of Peel, we encourage the City to consider policies that would exempt rental housing development from Inclusionary Zoning provisions and support the implementation of a Community Improvement Plan to incentivize new rental development. As proponents of purpose-built rental housing, we would like to assist the City towards achieving their goals for increasing the market supply of rental housing and maintaining stability within the rental market.	Comment received - purpose-built rental will be excluded from Inclusionary Zoning.
17-Apr	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler	3.2.3.10	Revision Requested	Although Morguard is not opposed to considering sustainability measures, we are concerned with the prescriptive nature of this policy which may be interpreted as requiring the implementation of very specific sustainability measure, district energy, by a development proponent with any major development. District energy is one of many possible sustainability measures that can be pursued to achieve carbon reductions. Such measures need to be specific to the type of development being proposed and consider the surrounding land use and ownership context. We request that this policy be amended to allow flexibility as follows: 3.2.3.10 The City will develop District Energy Ready Guidelines and will require district energy systems to be incorporated- considered in all major growth and intensification areas including Centres and Boulevards	Comment received. District Energy is a priority project within Brampton's CEERP to achieve the city's greenhouse gas reduction targets. As identified in the CEERP, this includes actions to implement district energy in high growth districts including urban towns and centres with a mix of combined heating and power and other low-carbon heating and cooling sources. Schedule 8 demonstrates the energy planning districts and District Energy nodes in the City.
17-Apr	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler	3.3.1.35	Revision Requested	Policy 3.3.1.35 and any other associated policies should clarify that contributions to affordable housing would occur through the available legislative tools which are inclusionary zoning and community benefits charges, where applicable.	Comment received
04/28/2023	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	3.2.5.2	Revision Requested	Suggest including the term "blue roof" to emphasize this option as an alternative green roof surface.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
04/28/2023	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	3.2.5.3	Revision Requested	Suggest adding "minimizing flooding and erosion hazard", after "...reducing SWM runoff...."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
04/28/2023	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	3.2.6.18 & 3.2.6.21	Revision Requested	Suggest replacing term "wet weather practices" with "best management practices". Or if this term is to be used suggest defining.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
19-May-23	Dentons / CN	Jessica Jakubowski	3.5.2.13	Revision Requested	Policy 3.5.2.13 states that a complete application to introduce, develop or intensify sensitive land uses, including residential uses, in a location identified in the previous policy will be required to include a Compatibility/Mitigation Study, which will be addressed in the applicant's Planning Rationale. As in our previous submissions to the City, CN continues to recommend that this policy be strengthened by including reference to the PPS land use compatibility test, as outlined in Policy 2.2.8.11 of the December OP.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
19-May-23	Dentons / CN	Jessica Jakubowski	3.5.2.25	Revision Requested	"Prior to the approval of development applications within noise and vibration sensitive areas, the proponent is required to engage the services of a qualified consultant to undertake an analysis of noise, vibration, and air quality, and to recommend noise and vibration abatement features as prescribed in the preceding general policies and subject to direct input from, and consultation with the appropriate rail company."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
19-May-23	Dentons / CN	Jessica Jakubowski	3.5.2.27	Revision Requested	"All residential development or other sensitive land uses located between 300 metres and 1000 metres of a rail yard will be required to undertake noise studies and air quality studies, as they relate to air quality in proximity to rail yards, to the satisfaction of the City and the appropriate railway, to support its feasibility of development and, if feasible, the development proponent will undertake appropriate measures to mitigate any adverse effects from noise and air quality that were identified."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
02-Jun-23	MHBC	Oz Kemal	3.3.1.9	Revision Requested	A further recommendation is that the following policy should be deleted that defers to the Zoning By-law to regulate building density and heights through massing and design regulations for residential developments. The act of 'regulating' density, built form, massing and design, increases the barriers to the supply of housing, given that regulations tend to restrict these matters through the implementation of minimums and maximums. Should built form continue to be regulated in the Official Plan, we would request that low density, commercial land uses as envisioned through the phasing of development over time, be recognized and permitted.	Comment received
02-Jun-23	MHBC	Oz Kemal	3.4.2.49	Revision Requested	The second draft OPA provides multiple references to parking standards that are worded in a manner that results in inconsistencies amongst one another. For example, in section 2.2.3 Centres, under "Prioritize Sustainable Mobility", policy 2.2.3.22 states that there will be no minimum automobile parking required for development within Centres. But in section 3.2.4 Sustainable Mobility, the subsection on Parking, policy 3.4.2.49, states that minimum parking requirements 'may' be eliminated, rather than 'shall be', in Town Centres (and MTSAs) through Zoning By-law regulations. The recommendation is to rephrase policy 3.4.2.49 to state: Minimum and maximum parking requirements shall be eliminated and shared parking requirements may be established by the Zoning By-law, in Centres, Boulevards, and Major Transit Station Areas and other areas determined by Council.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 4)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
13-Feb	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Jason Afonso	Special Land Use Policy Areas 4 & 5	Delete Policy	In light of the approved MZO and Draft Plan of Subdivision which implement a mixed-use community, it is our opinion that the current special land use policies are not consistent with the recent approvals and therefore, are no longer appropriate or required in order to guide development within the area. In this regard, we request that Special Land Use Policy Areas 4 and 5 (as highlighted on Attachment 2) be removed from the updated Draft Official Plan as well as from related Schedule No. 12 (included in Attachment 2).	Comment addressed- Special Policy Areas 4 and 5 have been removed from Chapter 4
16-Mar	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Mark Condello	Special Land Use Policy Areas X	New Policy	<p>Recognizing that the OLT settlement for Block 47-1 and Block 47-2 relied on the current policy framework in the City's Official Plan (dated September 2020), on behalf of the Landowner Group, we request that the policy framework that guided the settlement between all parties continue to be identified in the Brampton Plan. This could be achieved by way of introducing a Special Land Use Policy Area for Block Plan 47-1 and Block Plan 47-2, that recognizes the flexibility on heights and densities in the Town Centre and High Density designation that guided the OLT's approval. To achieve the Landowner Groups objective, we recommend the following policy framework be included in Brampton Plan.</p> <p><u>X. Special Land Use Policy Area X – Block Plan 47-1 and Block Plan 47-2 a) Notwithstanding the policies of this Plan, the land use and built form permission for the Bram East Town Centre have been determined through a Block Planning process. Land designated High Density Residential in Schedule 47 (a) of the Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan (SPA47) is permitted a maximum density of 200 units per net hectare.</u> <u>b) Variations of the maximum density, that do not alter the intent of the Brampton Plan, shall be considered without an Official Plan Amendment.</u> <u>c) Maximum height permissions shall be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</u></p>	Comment received - this will be identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Gr	Wayne Koethe, Principal Plan	Section 4 item 5 v), Pa	Revision Requested	"That the requirements of access, servicing, land use organization and phasing for the development of Special Land Use Policy Area 18 will be identified as part of a required Precinct Plan, or equivalent and a Growth Management Staging & Sequencing Report to the satisfaction of the City of Brampton, <u>in consultation with the Region of Peel;</u> "	Comment received - this section has been removed in the updated draft document
2023/04/24	GSAI	Jennifer Staden	Special Land Use Policy Area 2	Revision Requested	<p>We do not think that an Official Plan Amendment should be required to fulfil the MTSA vision of mixed-use and/or residential land uses on our clients' lands, when an OPA is not required for the balance of the MTSA lands. We therefore request the MTSA land use designation of High/Medium Density Mixed-Use for the Subject Lands with the Special Land Use Policy Area (as per our revised wording above) as an overlay.</p> <p>"The Special Land Use Policy Area in the vicinity of Clark Boulevard and West Drive identifies an area with long term potential for high density residential development. a) Notwithstanding the Neighbourhood designation of those lands within the Special Land Use Policy Area designation on Schedule 12 of this Plan, within the vicinity of Clark Boulevard and West Drive, <u>only the continuation and expansion of industrial uses will be permitted until such time as the predominant existing uses have been relocated or are proposed to be relocated or to cease operations.</u> b) At such time as the predominant existing industrial users have indicated their intention to relocate or cease operations, the City will consider <u>development of the Neighbourhood designation an amendment to this Plan,</u> subject to appropriate studies, to provide for the transition of this site to an appropriate mix of higher order uses."</p>	Comment received - this will be identified and rectified in the updated draft document

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 5)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	5.5.21.u	Requires Clarification	Clarify whether the "a" at the end of the policy is in reference to 5.5.21.a or an unfinished sentence?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	5.11.19.d	Revision Requested	Please add "be free and clear of encumbrances" and "include" .d Considers the provision of serviced land of a suitable size for high-density development for the purposes of affordable housing, gratuitously conveyed to the Region or made available to a non-profit housing provider. Land conveyances for affordable housing must be free and clear of encumbrances, include zoning appropriate for affordable housing development, be tied to development milestones (e.g., registration of plan of subdivision for the applicable lands), and include cost-sharing provisions.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Affordability Threshold"	Revision Requested	Consider revising definition of "Affordability threshold" to: "means the maximum rental rate or purchase price of a housing unit that low/ moderate-income households can afford"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Community Housing"	Revision Requested	Consider revising "Community Housing" definition to read "means housing owned and operated by non-profit housing corporations, housing co-operatives and municipal governments or district social services administration boards. These providers offer subsidized or low-end-of market rents." Note: "non-profit housing societies" is not a common term in this jurisdiction	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Complete Communities"	Revision Requested	Consider revising "Complete Communities" definition for clarity - moving location of "including affordable housing" Complete Communities means the meeting of people's needs for daily living throughout an entire lifetime by providing convenient access to an appropriate mix of jobs, local services, a full range of housing including affordable housing, community infrastructure, schools, recreation and open space for their residents. Convenient access to public transportation and options for safe, non-motorized travel is also provided.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Emergency Shelters" and "Emergency Shelter/Transitional Shelter"	Revision Requested	Consider combining definition of "Emergency Shelters" and "Emergency Shelter/Transitional Shelter" for a single definition of "Emergency Shelter" to read: "means a facility designed to meet the immediate needs of people who are homeless. These shelters typically have minimal eligibility criteria, offer shared sleeping facilities and amenities. They may or may not offer food, clothing or other services. Some emergency shelters allow people to stay on an ongoing basis, while others are short term and are set up to respond to special circumstances, such as extreme weather." Note: Keep separate definition of "Transitional Shelter"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Homelessness"	Revision Requested	Consider revising definition of "Homelessness" to: "means the condition of being without long-term accommodation."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Inclusionary Zoning"	Revision Requested	Consider revising definition of "Inclusionary Zoning" to Regional OP definition: "means policies, zoning by-laws and programs that require development of residential units to include affordable housing units and provide for those units to be maintained as affordable over time."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Market Rental Housing"	Revision Requested	Consider revising to add "additional residential units" and "rented condominium units" Market Rental Housing means rental units in the private rental market and include purpose-built rental units as well as units in the secondary rental market, such as additional residential units, rented condominium units and single detached dwellings.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Non-Market Housing"	Revision Requested	Consider revising to remove "society" and replace with "housing corporation": Non-Market Housing means affordable housing that is owned or subsidized by government, a non-profit housing corporation, or a housing cooperative; whereby it is not solely market driven. Examples include transitional housing, emergency housing and rent-geared-to-income housing	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Non-profit Housing"	Revision Requested	Consider revising to read: "means community housing provided by a non-profit corporation, where a percentage of tenants pay rent geared-to-income or receive rent supplements, and the remaining pay market rents"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Purpose-Built Rental"	Revision Requested	Revise "rental pool" to "rental market"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Subsidized housing"	Revision Requested	Consider revising to Regional OP definition: "means housing that is a sub-set of affordable housing, sometimes referred to as "assisted", "social" or "rent-geared-to-income" housing. It refers to housing units provided under a variety of federal and provincial housing programs by the municipal non-profit housing corporation (Peel Housing Corporation) and private non-profit and co-operative non-profit housing corporations. It also refers to housing units within the private rental sector, including affordable housing, where rent-geared-to-income subsidy is provided through a rent supplement agreement with the landlord."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Madison Van West	Glossary "Transitional housing"	Revision Requested	Consider revising to read: "means accommodation that is owned and/or operated by or on behalf of a public authority or a not for profit housing corporation, that is meant to bridge the gap from homelessness to permanent housing by offering structure, supervision, and support services. It is considered an intermediate step between emergency shelter and supportive or permanent housing and has limits on how long an individual or family can stay, generally up to a maximum of 2 years."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Paul Lewkowicz	5.5.20	Revision Requested	Carrying forward language from the secondary plan section 5.5.8 j) and 5.5.10 a) iii, consider including language in the block planning section regarding an evaluation of housing needs and options as it applies to the precinct plan, including housing priorities and targets.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Paul Lewkowicz	5.5.21	Revision Requested	Consider including language regarding prioritizing the need for applicants to demonstrate affordable housing contributions in precinct planning for large developments so that more affordable housing (i.e. land, units, or other) can be secured through new developments. Building in requirements in the secondary plan and consequently precinct plan for affordable housing contributions.	Comment received - prioritizing affordable housing is addressed in the existing policy
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Paul Lewkowicz	5.11.19	Revision Requested	Remove "Housing Assessment Report" in the first sentence. Appears to be an error.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Paul Lewkowicz	5.11.19 c)	Revision Requested	Revise language to also speak to the contribution or provision of affordable housing units through mechanisms other than IZ.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Paul Lewkowicz	5.18 Glossary	Revision Requested	Definition of "Affordable (Housing)". Consider a broader reference to the new definition of affordability that will exist in the revised DC Act as proposed in Bill 23 (and potentially a merged PPS – Growth Plan).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Housing	Paul Lewkowicz	5.18 Glossary	Revision Requested	Definition of "Low and Moderate-Income Households": Consider Regional OP definition or at minimum revising for clarity and grammar and reference existing PPS. "Low income: In the case of ownership housing, households with incomes at or below 30 percent of the income distribution for the regional market area, or in the case of rental housing, households with incomes in the lowest 30 percent of the income distribution for renter households for the regional market area. Moderate income: In the case of ownership housing, households with incomes between 30 to 60 percent of the income distribution for the regional market area, or in the case of rental housing, households with incomes between 30 to 60 percent of the income distribution for renter households for the regional market area."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	Roman Kuczynski	5.1.2	Revision/Clarification Requested	The Growth Management Program will assist in determining the staging, timing, and relative priority (<i>not sure what it means possibly simply "phasing"; section 5.3 is titled "Development Phasing"</i>) of development and growth-related infrastructure.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	Roman Kuczynski	5.1.7	Revision Requested	Key performance indicators will be monitored based on the City-Wide Building Blocks and policy areas (e.g. Built-up Area, UGC, DGA, MTSA, Employment Areas) of Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	Roman Kuczynski	5.3.1.f	Revision/Clarification Requested	Ensures that the provision of hard and soft infrastructure (<i>is it defined or just used loosely</i>) occurs in a coordinated and economically viable manner, in accordance with approved infrastructure plans.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	Roman Kuczynski	5.5.10.x	Revision Requested	The population and employment projections and resultant development density (persons and jobs per hectare) for the Secondary Plan area and if applicable minimum densities for specific policy areas (e.g. DGA, UGS, MTSA) within the Secondary Plan;	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	Roman Kuczynski	5.7.1.a	Revision/Clarification Requested	The minimum number of people and jobs (<i>should this be replaced with or just added "minimum density of people and jobs per hectare"</i>) that will be accommodated within the Major Transit Station Area as listed in Table 1;	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	April Fang	5.18 Glossary	Revision Requested	Designated Growth Areas means lands within settlement areas, but outside of delineated built up areas designated in an official plan for growth over the long-term planning horizon of this Plan provided in policy 1.1.2, but which have not yet been fully developed. Designated growth areas include lands which are designated and available for residential growth in accordance with policy 1.4.1(a), as well as lands required for employment and other uses.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Growth Mgmt	April Fang	Shapefile/Schedule	Revision Requested	Need to update Peel MTSA points & Planned MTSA 800m buffer to remove Heritage Height to reflect the Province modifications	Comment received - this will be revised through a conformity exercise
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Public Health	Sarah Powell	Section 5.5.8	Revision Requested	Background Studies: A Health Assessment should be included in this list.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Public Health	Sarah Powell	Glossary	Revision Requested	Consider including language around protecting and promoting for health impacts, specifically, a high quality physical environment including protecting for air and water quality.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Gr	Wayne Koethe, Principal Plan	5.5.7, Page 5-12	Revision Requested	"provided that the Secondary Plan is adopted within a reasonable period of time as determined by the City."	Revision reference not found
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Gr	Wayne Koethe, Principal Plan	5.5.10 a), Page 5-14	Revision Requested	Add to the list: "The phasing and sequencing of development"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Gr	Wayne Koethe, Principal Plan	5.5.15 d), Page 5-16	Revision Requested	"Identify hard infrastructure requirements to support development, and the sequencing of development in relation to the infrastructure"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Gr	Wayne Koethe, Principal Plan	5.5.21, Page 5-18	Revision Requested	Add to the list: "The phasing and sequencing of development"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 5 - 5.1 Measurement - 3rd Paragraph, Last Sentence	Housekeeping	The word "City" should be capitalized because it is a reference to the corporation.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.5 Secondary-Level Plan - Secondary Plans - Background Studies Policy 5.5.8.b	Revise	Please see Region comments provided on Chapter 2 on the suggested changes to the use of terms for Natural System, Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System. We recommend the City consider changing 'Natural Heritage System' to 'Natural System' or adding the term 'and Water Resource System' after 'studies to address the Natural Heritage System'. "Natural heritage and subwatershed studies to address the Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Mark Head	Chapter 5 - 5.5 Secondary-Level Plan - Secondary Plans - Background Studies Policy 5.5.8.e	General	The Region can provide the City with draft Terms of Reference on the Climate Adaptation Strategy.	Comment received - the City will appreciate receiving the draft Terms of Reference on the Climate Adaptation Strategy from the Region
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Mark Head	Chapter 5 - 5.11 Planning and Development Applications - Pre-Consultation and Complete Applications 5.11.4	Housekeeping	Recommend listing studies/information in alphabetical order and/or grouping related studies together in the list.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Mark Head	Chapter 5 - 5.11 Planning and Development Applications - Pre-Consultation and Complete Applications Policies 5.11.4 .n and .o	Clarify	Policies '.n' and '.o' – appear to be duplicated. Suggest revising and listing as Environmental Implementation Report or Master Environmental Servicing Study and/or Environmental Impact Study.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.11 Planning and Development Applications - Consent to Sever Policies 5.12.24	Revise	Include reference to the Region Official Plan and Provincial Plan's as Greenbelt Plan severance policies apply within the Greenbelt area. See ROP Policy 7.4.9."Consents must comply with any relevant policies of this Plan, Provincial Plans and the Region of Peel Official Plan. "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Mark Head	Chapter 5 - 5.11 Planning and Development Applications - Consent to Sever Policies 5.12.XX	Revise	Recommend adding new Policy 5.12.XX after Policy 5.12.29 as follows: 5.12.XXConsents to sever a lot may be permitted to enable the securement of lands for natural heritage conservation purposes by a public authority or a non-government conservation organization, provided that: .aThe consent will avoid fragmentation of the Natural Heritage System's features and areas, where possible; .bThe acquired and retained lots are in compliance with the Zoning By-law; .cWhen deemed necessary, a restrictive covenant or conservation easement is placed on title of the land to be held for conservation purposes prohibiting development of the land for non-conservation uses in perpetuity. Definitions for public authority and non-government conservation authority are also recommended to be included in the Glossary in conjunction with the policy. Definitions are provided in the Region of Peel Official Plan as follows: Public authority: any federal, provincial, regional, or municipal agency including any commission, board, authority or department established by such an agency exercising any power or authority under a Statute of Canada or Ontario. Non-government conservation authority: a non-profit conservation body independent of any government such as a land trust, conservancy or similar not-for-profit agency that is	Comment received.
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary	Housekeeping	Consider if terms which are found in the glossary should be bold or italics throughout the document in order to indicate to the reader that they are defined terms. Key terms that used for the purpose of achieving conformity with provincial plans and policies should identified in the Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary	Revise	Recommend the following terms be listed or defined in the Brampton Plan: -Erosion Hazard -Habitat of Aquatic Species at Risk -Highly Vulnerable Aquifer -Intermittent Stream -Key Hydrologic Area -Minimum Distance Separation Formula -Non-government Conservation Organization -Permanent Stream -Public Authority -Seepage Areas and Spring -Sensitive Ground Water Feature -Sensitive Surface Water Feature - Significant Groundwater Recharge Area - Sustainability Assessment Tool - Sustainability Score Thresholds - Sustainable New Communities Program -Watercourse -Water Resource System	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Mark Head	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - 2nd Paragraph	Revise	Recommend revising "coordination with these documents is also required to provide intent to meaning of this Plan" to "reference to terms defined in these documents is also required to support the interpretation and implementation of this Plan". "Definitions provided for in the Planning Act, the Provincial Policy Statement, A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the Region of Peel Official Plan have not been duplicated in Brampton Plan, therefore coordination with these documents is also required to provide intent to meaning of this Plan reference to terms defined in these documents is also required to support the interpretation and implementation of this Plan."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - 3rd Paragraph	Clarify	No tables are included in the Glossary. Clarify if it is the City's intention to provide tables to indicate which provincial and regional terms are referenced in the Brampton Plan and suggest further clarification of how provincial/regional terms are to be applied in relation to local Brampton Plan terms.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Cultural Woodland	Housekeeping	Delete first reference of the definition of Cultural Woodland as it is duplication and the second reference is more comprehensive. "Cultural Woodland means having a tree crown cover of at least 60%, and a large portion of potentially non-native species."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Mark Head	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Cultural Woodland - 1st Sentence	Revise	Recommend keeping and revising the second definition of Cultural Woodland, by adding "at least" after "containing a large proportion of non-native species and having...". "Cultural Woodlands a treed vegetation community originating from, or maintained by, anthropogenic influences and culturally based disturbances; often containing a large proportion of non-native species and having <u>at least</u> 35 to 60 percent cover of coniferous or deciduous trees."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Deep Overburden	Revise	Delete as the term 'Deep Overburden' is not used in Brampton Plan	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Designated Vulnerable Area	Revise	The term "vulnerable area" is found throughout Brampton Plan without the reference to "Designated". Consider removing the word "designated"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Dry Swales	Revise	Confirm that this term is used in Brampton Plan. If not, revise the term to "Headwater Drainage Feature", which is a more up-to-date term to describe the feature and the term used in the Brampton Plan. If including a definition for Headwater Drainage Feature, suggest adapting the definition in TRCA's Living Cities Policies – " <u>Headwater Drainage Feature: means ill-defined, non-permanently flowing drainage features that may not have defined bed or banks. They are zero-order intermittent and ephemeral channels, swales and rivulets, but do not include rills or furrows. HDFs are assessed in accordance with recommended evaluation procedures and guidelines.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Ecological Buffers	Revise	Based on previous comments on Natural System, Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System, suggest adding "and water resource system before "features and areas and "changing "Natural Heritage System" to "Natural System". Ecological buffers may apply to both natural heritage and water resource system features and areas. " <u>Ecological Buffer means areas that serve to protect natural heritage and water resource system features and areas, and their ecological functions and processes, to maintain the ecological integrity of the Natural Heritage System through appropriate buffers.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Essential	Revise	The Glossary references the definition of essential used in the Peel Region Official Plan, which defines essential as meaning "necessary to the public interest after all reasonable alternatives have been considered" and employs the term in referring to infrastructure. In the Brampton Plan, the term is used in other contexts where the Region Plan definition may not be appropriate. It is suggested that the City, rather than referencing the Peel Region definition of essential, define essential as follows: " <u>Essential means, with respect to infrastructure or services, necessary to the public interest after all reasonable alternatives have been considered.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Food System	Revise	Suggested revisions to the definition of Food Systems is provided for consideration: "Food Systems means all <u>economic, social and environmental processes</u> , networks, and infrastructure that are involved with the growth, harvest, <u>production</u> , processing, packaging, distribution, transport, marketing, sale, serving, consumption, <u>resource recovery</u> and disposal of food."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Natural Heritage System	Revise	Based on previous comments provided by the Region on Chapter 2, the City may wish to also add a definition to define the Natural System in the Glossary, if helpful to readers, as well as the Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System. Also suggest further clarifying the definition by adding "as described in this Plan and" after "means a system" to tie the Glossary definition to the more specific description and definition in the policies of the Plan. "Natural Heritage System means a system <u>as further described in this Plan and</u> made up of natural heritage features and areas, linked by natural corridors..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - On-Farm Diversified Uses	Revise	The reference to Prime Agricultural Areas could be removed as no PAAs are identified with the Brampton Plan. Brampton should consider if ground-mounted solar facilities will be permitted in the Rural System, as an on-farm diversified use.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Plantation	Revise	the following revisions are suggested to provide clarity "Plantation means a treed community in which the majority of trees have been planted or the majority of the basal area is in trees that have been planted, <u>often characterized</u> in regularly spaced rows. With time and forest management, natural regeneration can become established and eventually convert the community to <u>woodlands natural woodland or forest.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Pond	Housekeeping	List 'Pond' as a separate Glossary definition from 'Plantation'.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Restoration Areas	Revise	Based on previous comments on Natural System, Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System, suggest reference the "Natural System" instead of "Natural Heritage System" or capitalize the term "natural heritage system".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Significant a)	Housekeeping	Based on changes to the OWES that came into effect Jan 1, 2023, this definition needs to be revised as the identification/approval role of MNR for the identification of PSWs has changed.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis, Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams	Chapter 5 - 5.18 Glossary - Surface Accessory Parking Lots	Housekeeping	Add the missing the corresponding definition.	Comment addressed - this definition is no longer present in the updated draft document

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Schedules)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.1.2.6 (comment is regarding Schedule 1 and 2)	Needs Discussion	Elements of the City-wide Growth Management Framework – Recommend revisions to clarify the City-wide Growth Management Framework and differentiate the labelling for the Natural Heritage System overlay on Schedule 1 and designation on Schedule 2. “The Natural Heritage -System policies sets the context for conservation and protection when developing the City-Wide Growth Management Framework. In conformity with the policies of this Plan, the Region of Peel Official Plan and relevant Provincial Plans and policies, these lands Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System features and areas will be maintained, restored, improved and enhanced for long-term sustainability of the System.”	Comment addressed - Schedule 1 has been amended to show the NHS is not overlay.
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.1	Requires Clarification	The Natural Heritage System is identified as both an overlay on Schedule 1 and a designation on Schedule 2. Refer to comments on Policy 2.2.2.2 f. recommending relabelling the Natural Heritage System overlay on Schedule 1 to “Natural System”.	Comment addressed - Schedule 1 has been amended to show the NHS is not overlay.
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Gail Anderson, Principal Planner	2.2.1.2	Needs Discussion	Reference to Schedule 1 - The Natural Heritage System (recommended to be labelled “Natural System”) also appears on Schedule 1. The description of the Natural Heritage System overlay is missing in this section but is shown on Schedule 1. Refer to comments on Policy 2.2.2.2 f. recommending relabelling the Natural Heritage System overlay on Schedule 1 to “Natural System”. Recommend adding 2.3.1.1 e. to describe the “Natural System” overlay.	Comment addressed - Schedule 1 has been amended to show the NHS is not overlay.
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9	Revision Requested	Schedules 5, 6 and 7 are the relevant schedules that designate/identify the Natural Heritage System and its components/elements. The recently circulated version of Schedule 5 identifies Provincial Plan Areas and does not identify the NHS. Schedule 2 designates the NHS along with other land use designations but is not referenced in the preamble paragraphs. Schedules 6a and 6b further identify components/elements of the NHS and some of the Water Resource System’s features and areas. It is recommended the City review the different schedules designating and/or identifying the NHS and WRS systems to ensure the appropriate systems, features and areas are designated and/or identified appropriately on the schedules. Recommended changes to the 6th paragraph are provided below: - delete “shown on Schedule 5 and in greater detail on Schedules 6 and 7” after “components of the Natural Heritage System as” in the first sentence and replace with “designated on Schedule 2 and shown on Schedules 6a and 6b”; - add “designated or” after “may be present but are not” in the second sentence; and, - delete “Schedule 7” in the second sentence and replace with “on the schedules”. The policies of this section apply to recognized, potential and unevaluated components of the Natural Heritage System as shown on Schedule 5 and in greater detail on Schedules 6 and 7, designated on Schedule 2 and shown on Schedules 6a and 6b.	Comment addressed - Schedule 1 has been amended to show the NHS is not overlay.
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Mark Head, Manager Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9.12	Revision Requested	Recommend revising by changing “designated on Schedule 6b” to “as shown on Schedule 6b”. It is unclear whether natural heritage features and areas are “designated” or “shown/identified” on Schedule 6b. If Schedule 6b also designates Natural Heritage System features and areas in addition to Schedule 2, which designates the Natural Heritage System, then it would be appropriate to designate the features. The reference to Schedule 6b in other policies does not indicate that features are designated on the Schedule. Alternatively, the City could consider changing “designated on Schedule 6b” to “as defined and protected in accordance with the policies of this Plan” to reference the policies of the Plan rather than specific mapping.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
Dec-22	Region of Peel - Planning & Development Services	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	2.2.9 'Natural Hazards'	Revision Requested	Introduction - Indicates incorrect draft Schedule. Should reference Schedule 6a Natural Heritage System, instead of Schedule 7 Parks and Open Space.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
26-May-22	SGL Planning & Design Inc.	Paul Lowes	Schedule 1, Schedule 3, Schedule 2	Revision Requested	We note the Draft Schedule 1 City Structure, 2 City Wide Growth Management, and Schedule 5 Designations continue to show the subject as an Employment designation . The Draft Official Plan schedules and land use policies should conform with the Adopted Peel Region Official Plan, which show the subject site outside of the Employment Area. In order to bring the Brampton Official Plan into conformity with the adopted Peel Official Plan, the 75 Bramalea Road lands should be designated as “Neighbourhoods” on proposed Schedule 1: City Structure and should also be designated as “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule 2: City-Wide Growth Management. In addition, to achieve conformity with the adopted Peel Official Plan, the subject lands should be designated as “Neighbourhoods” with a Mixed-Use Districts overlay on Schedule 5: Designations.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
31-Jan-23	SGL Planning & Design Inc.	Raymond Ziemba	Schedule 1, Schedule 3	Revision Requested	We have reviewed the Draft Brampton Official Plan released in December 2022, and note the Draft Schedule 1 City Structure, and 2 Designations, continue to show the subject site as an Employment designation. The Draft Official Plan schedules and land use policies should conform with the Peel Region Official Plan (November 2022), which shows the subject site outside of the Employment Area. In order to bring the Brampton Official Plan into conformity with the Peel Region Official Plan (November 2022), the 75 Bramalea Road lands should be designated as “Community Areas” on proposed Schedule 1: City Structure and should also be designated as “Mixed Use” on Schedule 2: Designations.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
13-Feb	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Jason Afonso	Schedule 13	Revision Requested	In light of the approved MZO and Draft Plan of Subdivision which implement a mixed-use community, it is our opinion that the current special land use policies are not consistent with the recent approvals and therefore, are no longer appropriate or required in order to guide development within the area. In this regard, we request that Special Land Use Policy Areas 4 and 5 be removed from Schedule 12	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
13-Feb	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Jason Afonso	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	The configuration of the road network and the related right-of-way widths should be revised within the area of the subject lands to match the approved Draft Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document

13-Feb	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Jason Afonso	Schedule 7	Revision Requested	The location of the Neighbourhood Park on the Approved Draft Plan should be shown on the Schedule.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
13-Feb	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Jason Afonso	Schedule 10	Revision Requested	The Schedule should be revised to identify the lands at the northwest quadrant of Mississauga Road and Bovaird Drive West as part of Secondary Plan Area 51: Mount Pleasant, consistent with Schedule 11 which shows the lands correctly as Block Plan Area 51-3.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
26-Jan	Kaneff	Kevin Freeman	Schedule 12	Needs Discussion	We note that the Mississauga Road Corridor Special Policy Area was not included in previous draft of the Official Plan, dated April 2022. we would like to better understand the rationale for the inclusion of the new Special Policy Area and the implications that this may have on future employment related development opportunities. The redevelopment potential of our lands has been limited by a restrictive 'Office' designation in the current Official Plan and 'Office Centre' designation in the Secondary Plan that do not permit industrial or prestige industrial related land uses. We are of the opinion that this Mississauga Road Corridor Special Policy Area contradicts some of the key Employment and Goods Movement Corridor policies contained within the draft Official Plan such as 2.1.3.14, 2.1.2.5, 2.2.1.1 c.	Comment received - this area is subject to review through the BramWest Secondary Plan Review.
2023/03/29	Region of Peel - Gr	Wayne Koethe, Principal Planner	Schedule 11	Needs Discussion	Is there a reason why precinct plan No. 47-3 in SP 47 was removed between drafts?	Comment received - there is no Precinct Plan no. 47-3 completed at this time.
17-Apr	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler	Schedule 2, & 6A	Needs Discussion	The schedules appear to identify the existing concrete stormwater drainage channel and abutting manicured lawn areas (see photo in Appendix 2). We request that this designation be removed from the property on all schedules. Note that Morguard is also currently working with the City and Conservation Authority staff through site plan application SPA-2021-0268 to address flooding concerns caused by this concrete channel by enclosing the channel, relocating Peel Centre Drive on top of the channel, and creating a new open channel to the east	Comment received - please be advised that when the work to relocate the channel has been completed, the Official Plan will require an amendment at that time.
05/25/2023	TRCA		NHS (6A) and Natural Heritage Features (6B)	Requires Clarification	Based on TRCA mapping, some unevaluated wetlands are not captured in Schedule 6B. Upon request, TRCA can share its current wetland data/mapping and/or meet to provide examples of apparent discrepancies.	Comment addressed
19-May-23	Dentons / CN	Jessica Jakubowski		Revision Requested	The Brampton Intermodal Yard (the "Intermodal Facility") is depicted on schedule E-4 of the Region of Peel's recently-adopted 2022 Official Plan. As this mapping has been adopted by the Region, CN submits that it should also be reflected in the upcoming new draft of the Official Plan, and a similar label should be added to all appropriate mapping. Similar comments were made in the June 2022 Letter prior to the release of the December OP and we respectfully ask for confirmation of the City's intent as it relates to including the Intramodal Facility in the new draft of the Official Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
02-Jun-23	MHBC	Oz Kemal	Schedule 8	Revision Requested	A District Energy system works on the premise that there is a source of cheap energy such as waste heat from an existing boiler or sewage treatment facility. This raises the question of how the City of Brampton plans to generate heat in the Mount Pleasant GO Station Area and where it plans to locate the heat generation facility in the pre-determined "District Energy Area" shown on Schedule 8: Energy Planning Districts. It also is important to ascertain where and when the City will, not only build the facility, but also construct the water distribution pipes that connect the heat generation facility to the multiple buildings within the Area. Normally the heat generation facility and the pipes are critical and preliminary elements for implementation of a District Energy system. It would be costly to design a new development to be 'district energy' ready in absence of the City having undertaken any feasibility studies of undertaking District Energy systems in the Mount Pleasant GO Station area. Designing a building for two completely different types of heating/cooling systems will add costs to future purchasers. Remove the District Energy Area overlay from the Mount Pleasant GO Station in Schedule 8: Energy Planning Districts, until such time as the City has invested in a heat pump facility in the area or undertaken a feasibility assessment. In the interim, the policies may suggest that alternate green energy systems be considered for individual developments.	Comment addressed - the title of Schedule 8 has been updated to clarify that it demonstrates proposed energy planning districts.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Definitions)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
01-Dec	TRCA - Ecology	Paul Brennan	Glossary	Needs Discussion	"Cultural Woodland" and "Cultural Woodlands" are both defined. They are the same terminology but are inconsistent. The definition of "Cultural Woodland" should be consistent with industry standards such as Ontario's Ecological Land Classification. Please clarify the discrepancy.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
01-Dec	TRCA - Ecology	Paul Brennan	Glossary	Requires Clarification	If definitions for every wetland type, e.g., "Fens", "Marsh" and "Swamp" are required (i.e., if the broader definition of Wetland is not sufficient), they should be consistent with Ontario's Ecological Land Classification and PPS.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
01-Dec	TRCA - Ecology	Paul Brennan	Glossary	Requires Clarification	We note that the term "Key Natural Heritage Features" (KNHFs) is not typically used outside the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). As such, it may not be necessary to categorize features in this manner outside the ORMCP; instead the PPS definitions could be used for significant natural features. Further, it is unclear how the definition of "Natural Heritage Features and Areas" differs from the KNHF definition. Referencing areas outside of Brampton could lead to confusion and should be avoided.	Comment addressed - KNHFs have been removed in the updated draft document
01-Dec	TRCA - Ecology	Paul Brennan	Glossary	Needs Discussion	Under the definition for "Significant", in regards to a) wetlands identified as significant by MNRF using evaluation procedures established by the Province, we note that the government is proposing updates to Ontario's Wetland Evaluation System (OWES), including shifting responsibility for wetland evaluation from MNRF to evaluators and approval to municipalities. As such, wording for this definition could be revised to allow for that possibility. TRCA could assist with a revision.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
01-Dec	TRCA - Ecology	Paul Brennan	Glossary	Revision Requested	Regarding the definition of "Valleylands and Watercourse Corridors", we note that valleylands do not require watercourses to be considered valleys under TRCA policies. Dry valleys are still considered to be valleylands. We recommend clarifying this within the definition. TRCA could assist with a revision.	Comment received.
01-Dec	TRCA - Ecology	Paul Brennan	Glossary	Requires Clarification	It is unclear why a definition of "Woodland Edge" is required. The area adjacent to a woodland could have many different characteristics and often, the adjacent areas are in a manicured or landscaped state. This definition would not appear to capture all possibilities for lands adjacent to a woodland. TRCA could assist with a revision.	Comment received.
01-Dec	TRCA - Engineering	Dan Hipple	Glossary	Revision Requested	We recommend the following revision to the definition of "Flooding Hazard" b).b 1..i 1...i the flood resulting from the rainfall actually experienced during a major the Regional sStorm Event such as the Hurricane Hazel storm..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated draft document
02-Jun	MHBC	Oz Kemal		Revision Requested	Remove the chart of building height standards from the definition of Building Typologies, and provide a definition of the terms low-rise to high-rise plus in terms of what the terms mean.	Comment received

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (General)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Throughout Plan	Revision Requested	Some subsections of the Brampton Plan don't have numbers associated with them or a clear distinction when one section starts/ends making it difficult to understand which sections the policies fall under (i.e. Planning for Growth in the City, Built-up Area, Designated Greenfield Areas, then Strategic Growth Areas in the City, followed by Centres). Consider clarifying sections/overarching organization of policies within the Plan.	Comment received.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Throughout Plan	Revision Requested	It is unclear whether some preamble text is intended to be read as policy or as explanatory notes without section numbering. Some preamble text may need to be turned into policies (these have been identified in the comments below) but may require further review.	Comment received - preamble text is meant to provide context and an introduction to the relevant policies.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Throughout Plan	Clarification Requested	It is noted that specific policies on boulevards will be established through secondary plans. Should this be assumed for the Hurontario corridor as well? RPOP policies 5.6.18.9 may warrant carrying over into the Brampton Plan (i.e. opportunities for intensification, compact urban form, mix of uses, etc. along Hurontario corridor specifically). Also, there is no specific secondary plan/precinct plan or corridor policies for the Main St/Hurontario corridor. Please clarify whether the Hurontario corridor is to be treated differently than the Steeles and Queen St. corridors considering it will have an LRT (also identified as a Regional Intensification Corridor on Schedule 5 but not referenced in policies).	Comment received - the Hurontario/Main corridor has a Secondary Plan in effect. All boulevards and corridors require Secondary-level planning studies and this will apply to the Hurontario/Main corridor as well.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Throughout	Clarification Requested	To clarify, higher density development as it relates to RPOP policy 5.4.19.9 (urban nodes and corridors in the DGA) is translated into Town Centres, Urban Centres, MTSAs, Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards and Corridors which may be found both inside and outside the DGA in the Brampton Plan? Policies in Chapter 2 address this RPOP policy, but do not specifically speak to the DGA, but rather the noted designations which can be found throughout Brampton. Clarification on which specific policies in the Brampton Plan address specific RPOP DGA policies is required between Brampton Plan policies 2.1.2.1-3, 2.1.2.18, 2.2.7.3 and throughout chapter 2.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Wayne Koethe	5.6.8	Revision Requested	RPOP Policy 5.6.8 should be added to the OP - 5.6.8 "To preserve and protect lands adjacent to highways, rail corridors, rail yards and major truck terminals for employment lands and infrastructure uses, where appropriate."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Wayne Koethe	5.6.16	Revision Requested	RPOP Policy 5.6.16 should be added to the OP - "5.6.16 Require the local municipalities to plan for and develop employment and industrial uses near and adjacent to major goods movement facilities and corridors, including highways, rail facilities, airports, haul routes, major truck terminals, and major facilities, to serve as a transition buffer with sensitive uses."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	General	Revision Requested	Suggest removing "South Peel" references throughout, unless referring to specific legacy servicing agreements. Instead, for example wherever "South Peel Servicing System" is mentioned, replace with "Lake-Based System".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Infrastructure Programming Transportation Division	Syeda Bunari	General	Revision Requested	I did not see a mention of or any policy direction related to source water protection; source protection areas, source protection plans and policies and the Region's Risk Management Office - (Note to Jason: Mark Head and Therese Estephan may provide comments/guidance)	Comment received.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Strategic Policy and Performance Division - Health Intelligence and Analytics; Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Jason De Luca; Soma Mondal	General	Revision Requested	As outlined in section 6.3 - Human Services - of the Region of Peel Official Plan (RPOP), Peel is responsible for planning, delivering, and/or contributing to the funding of a wide range of human services, including land ambulance / paramedic services. Peel staff have identified Mississauga's Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) as 'hotspots' where the demand for emergency health services, such as paramedic/land ambulance, is currently, or anticipated to become, significant. Like any other urban growth centre, high demand for emergency health services is expected in MTSAs as they are intended to absorb high density development and a significant proportion of region-wide growth. The RPOP promotes the development of 'healthy communities' which are characterized in the RPOP by a number of health-promoting elements including "an optimum level of appropriate health and sick care services available to all; and, high levels of positive health and low levels of disease" (Glossary, RPOP). Furthermore, MTSAs are intended to be 'complete communities' with a mix of uses that support the needs of those who live and work in Peel (5.6.19.2, RPOP). In aiming to ensure that Brampton's MTSAs are planned to be healthy and complete communities, we recommend the addition of policies that leverage residential development pressures to create opportunities for new paramedic stations to be strategically located in high population density nodes. You may wish to look at case study examples in Toronto, Calgary, Vancouver, Victoria, New York and Washington where public services such as fire, paramedic and recreation centres have been or are planned to be incorporated into high density residential mixed use projects. We also recommend arranging a meeting with Peel Policy Development, Real Property Asset	Comment received - Brampton Plan does not preclude the development of paramedic stations within mixed use designations.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Chapter 2	Revision Requested	The term "Employment Area" and "Employment area" designation are interchanged in some policies impacting interpretation. In the RPOP, "Employment Areas" are protected in accordance with Growth Plan policies. It's important to make clear that "Employment Areas" are protected against non-employment uses as defined in the RPOP. Suggest modifying "Employment" designation to "Core Employment" for better clarity.	Comment received.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Throughout Chapter 2	Revision Requested	Suggest internal policy referencing throughout for better clarity.	Comment received - given the style of Brampton Plan, which is intended to be written as a full Plan, section references are not included as they quickly become outdated during future updates.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Throughout Chapter 2	Revision Requested	Consistent use of "Major Transit Station Area" or "MTSA"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Mixed Use Employment designation.	Clarification Requested	Further justification and studies in accordance with RPOP Policy 5.8.35 regarding the placement of Mixed Use Employment designation is required. Staff must demonstrate the criteria is being met to designate the lands Mixed Use Employment.	Comment received.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	General	Statement	Comments on PSEZ policies and mapping will be provided at a later date.	Comment received.

2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	General	Statement	Additional employment related comments are forthcoming.	Comment received.
2023/08/25	Smart Centres	Mark Hamidi	General	Revision Requested	Extend PMTSA north to include Kingspoint Plaza	Comment received.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Employment Areas	multiple policies	Residential uses are not permitted as of right within MTSA's. See RPOP Policy 5.8.36 which requires satisfaction of certain criteria prior to permitting mixed use residential within Employment Areas.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel -Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Employment Areas	multiple policies	where "non-employment uses" is referenced, suggest adding "such as Major Retail, residential, and other sensitive land uses not ancillary to the primary employment use," to make clear what non employment entails.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
09/28/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	General	Statement	The September 2023 Official Plan draft was only made publicly available online last week (week of September 18th), giving less than two weeks for members of the public to review/digest the 600-page document and provide comments. The redlined version of the draft Official Plan, a key component in reviewing the latest draft, was only available yesterday evening (September 27th). Furthermore, there are brand new schedules (1B, 6C and 13) which are still not publicly available for review and comment. We are of the opinion that this deadline does not afford reasonable time to review and provide meaningful comment on the draft Official Plan, which is a critical document in land use planning and community building within the City of Brampton. In support of enhanced engagement with the public/stakeholders/affected landowners, GSAI recommends a four (4) week extension on this deadline, such that all interested parties will be able to submit formal comments by the end of October. We understand that you are striving to reach the November 4th conformity deadline, however other municipalities (namely, Town of Caledon) have stated they will not meet the November 4th deadline, to afford reasonable time for public input.	Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement. Furthermore, of the schedules referenced in the comment: 1B and 6C were released with the rest of the Plan on September 19th, 2023. Additionally, there is a notation in the final draft Brampton Plan referencing Schedules 13a-n and noting to visit the City's website for more information on MTSA studies, which these schedules are related to.
09/21/2023	Member of Public	Brian Walker	General	Clarification Requested	Is the report in a format that can be used to copy sections? Seems the Final .pdf copy is a series of pictures/images.	Comment addressed - the City is working to ensure that the final document is accessible by including Alt-Text for all images and ensuring all text is included in the document as text and not images.
09/29/2023	Member of Public	John van West	Urban Forestry	Concern	There is no purpose in planting one million trees (presumably inclusive of boulevard trees) as a proactive Brampton Plan vision between now and 2040 when any and possibly all of the one million new plantings may well be abandoned and left without any attendant care (the provisioning of water principal among such care), post-planting due to long term budget shortfalls. In this matter, I implore the three of you to advocate for increasing Brampton's Urban Forestry's Department budget, in order for this department to maintain Brampton's existing forest cover and to facilitate the planting of the million trees as committed in the Brampton Plan, in order for the City to realize its "urban forestry goals and target". But more to the point, and more importantly, such a departmental budget increase will enable this Department to thereafter administer and maintain the effective health of these recently planted one million trees (and existing trees), inclusive of the boulevard trees.	Comment received - comment will be shared with relevant City staff
2023/10/02	Member of Public	Les Molnar	Whole Document	Concern	Your ideology that most peoples lives will revolve around a 10 - 15 minute city concept and that travel by walk or bike to all the amenities (food/work/restaurants/recreation/education/medical etc..) is not a concept that is not realistic in our setting. In dense urban areas such as Paris, or even downtown Toronto, or Manhattan it may work, but because we have such urban sprawl the elimination of the dependency of the automobile is not realistic. If 77% of the labour force in Brampton drives to work now (from your Geo Study), adding another 10,000 residents in this area will only increase the congestion and add to the frustration of all commuters. As we switch from gas to electric and possibly to hydrogen in future cars, and the fact that vehicles will drive themselves, and be smaller in footprint and have less environmental impact more residents will want a vehicle. You only have to look at the current situation at Hwy 10 and Steeles to see what I mean regarding the congestion. The existing land owners that want to build towers in this area do their traffic studies such that they do not take into account the additional towers that will be North, South, East or West of their land. They are skewed to take into account their immediate area only which is not realistic. What is the City doing about this?	Comment received - traffic studies account for all relevant development applications, work alongside transportation team to understand impacts to surrounding areas.
2023/10/02	Member of Public	Les Molnar	Whole Document	Concern	I am concerned that the City of Brampton is not extending the LRT to the Downtown area. This to me is a huge mistake. It is literally a train to nowhere! If I have to take the GO train to Toronto, I will need to hop on the LRT to the gateway Terminal (10 & Steeles) and then hop on the bus to downtown Brampton, or to Bramalea road. Is that efficient? You yourself would probably drive. Until Brampton decides to extend the LRT what good is it. We would have been better to build extra lanes North and South and have dedicated electric bus lanes during the morning and evening rush hours like some areas have. I am beginning to think that the 5 Billion Dollars that will be spent on the LRT is questionable, especially when it does not go downtown. If you want to redevelop downtown you have to give riders an efficient way to get there. A vibrant Downtown area is vital to our future.	Comment received - The City of Brampton is in the process of completing the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for the extension of the Hurontario LRT along Main Street from Steeles Avenue to Brampton GO Station. We are in the pre-planning stage of the process and have completed the draft preliminary (30%) design and Environmental Project reports for two (2) preferred options (one Surface and one Tunnel/Underground option). The TPAP for the extension is expected to be completed by the end of 2024. The City is currently advocating with the Federal and Provincial Governments to obtain funding commitments for the implementation of the LRT Extension.
2023/10/02	Member of Public	Les Molnar	Whole Document	Concern	You have to remember that most of the residents in this area have no idea of what is coming upon them. That in itself is of major concern. The forced displacement of residents in this area is another aspect that has not been addressed in your Plan. Should housing values be negatively affected by the Official Plan when action is taken, The City of Brampton will be liable.	Comment received.
2023/10/02	Member of Public	Les Molnar	Whole Document	Concern	One of my concerns in this experiment is that the residents that will be moving into these Hubs, will have to have enough income for their housing and living needs. The commercial/retail jobs that will be available on the main floors of these complexes usually don't provide the income level necessary, as they are typically lower income positions. If you are working at home, or in another part of the City then you will need to take Public Transit and/or drive (in whole or in part) to work in order to have the minimum income required to live here. So what is the profile of the typical resident in these new Hub areas?	Comment received - Brampton Plan sets the foundation to provide housing for people of all ages, stages, abilities, and incomes. All will be welcome in Community Hubs.
2023/10/02	Member of Public	Les Molnar	Whole Document	Revision Requested	Why don't you review the Development of Shoppers World and put more high rise buildings there rather what is currently proposed?	Comment received - Shoppers World is part of Uptown, and is identified as an Urban Center. Brampton Plan sets the foundations to allow high-rise buildings and a full mix of uses in this area.
2023/10/02	Member of Public	Les Molnar	Whole Document	Concern	My last point is that it seems like the growth in the "Uptown" area is going to happen haphazardly. With so many different developers ready to build who is really in control? Who will turn the switch on/off? I know I don't and don't believe that you know the full impact of this major change upon our great city.	Comment received - please see the Shoppers World Master Plan for details on the intended growth in Uptown.
2023/10/02	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Maurice Luchich	Whole Document	Revision Requested	It is our opinion that the limits of MTSA's that are defined in the Official Plan, while necessary to provide context for the policies of the MTSA, the MTSA policies should include some degree of flexibility for surrounding areas, particularly lands on the periphery of the MTSA limit. We would suggest that the City consider more flexible land use policies for sites on the periphery of MTSA boundaries as they present a unique opportunity to act as transitional parcels and can be strategically utilized based on their locational attributes to assist in creating complete communities, providing a smooth transition in land uses and contribute to the achievement of growth targets.	Comment received - Applications for lands at the periphery of the MTSA's boundaries will be reviewed on a site-specific basis, considering existing context and appropriate transitions to the surrounding area.

2023/10/02	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Maurice Luchich	Whole Document	Revision Requested	The policies found in the Official Plan (and zoning by-law) are largely prohibitive. Within the boundary of the "Mature Neighbourhood" shown on Schedule 12 – Site and Area Specific Policies, there are a variety of areas targeted for growth, such as Urban Centres, a Gateway, and MTSAs. The policies of the Mature Neighbourhoods should provide flexibility and consideration for the other locational advantages in these areas. By offering flexibility for new development within Mature Neighbourhoods, the City will allow better use of underutilized lands which can act as complementary or transitional areas to/from areas targeted for growth, such as MTSAs, but still have the ability to utilize services, schools, and retail/commercial opportunities in the mature or stable residential area. By adding flexibility in the Official Plan policies (and eventually, through the implementing Zoning By-law), the City would still be afforded the opportunity to evaluate the appropriateness of these development application through the planning approvals process. Otherwise, the policies continue to restrict development. This logic impacts the City's ability to facilitate growth through intensification (particularly infill) that is supportive of provincial and regional policy directives and from a long-term planning perspective, that may be appropriate for the character area. For example, it is reasonable to assume gentle intensification could be introduced within Mature Neighbourhoods which have a MTSA, that would still fit and be desirable for the existing community and the future planned MTSAs. We acknowledge that the appropriateness of infill and redevelopment at higher densities should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis but believe there are instances within a Mature Neighbourhood that sites should be considered for higher densities. With that, we believe that added flexibility in OP policies are appropriate to assist in achieving broader growth targets and appropriate development patterns throughout the	Comment received - the Mature Neighbourhoods policies apply in areas outside other overlays; where Mature Neighbourhoods intersect with other overlays, the other overlay and/or MTSAs policies will apply.
2023/10/02	Glen Schnarr & Associates	Maurice Luchich	Schedule 3A	Clarification Requested	We note that there is a "Desired GO Connection" notation provided on Schedule 3A – Active Transportation Network. Per our review of the Draft Official Plan, there is no direction on the meaning of this symbol or what associated policies which may impact development potential that emanate from the "Desired GO Connection" symbol. As such, we respectfully request clarification from staff on the purpose, function and implications of the notation.	Comment addressed - this connection, as referenced in the Active Transportation Master Plan, is a trail connection between Bramalea GO and the termini of the Chinguacousy and Don Doan trails at Victoria Park. Language to explain this symbology has been added to the final Brampton Plan.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	Whole Document	Recommendation	we suggest that all defined terms should be italicized or bolded throughout the Official Plan for ease of review.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	Whole Document	Revision Requested	As a general comment, the redevelopment of the Canadian Tire Lands for employment uses (including the proposed warehousing uses under the first phase of redevelopment) through the Minister Zoning Order (MZO) that was endorsed by Council, should be reflected in the applicable Draft Official Plan Policies and Framework. In the Response to our comments for the First Draft Official Plan, Staff note "Comment Addressed - MZO currently has no standing and will not be reflected in current iteration of Brampton Plan. Revised Mixed-Use Employment policy section identifies the permissions for MTSAs that are located in PSEZ, subject to further planning studies." We reiterate our comment.	Comment received - MZO currently has no standing and will not be reflected in current iteration of Brampton Plan. Revised Mixed-Use Employment policy section identifies the permissions for MTSAs that are located in PSEZ, subject to further planning studies.
09/27/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Suggestion	I would personally like to see Brampton increase density as a potentially viable alternative to outward development past Heritage Road. There's proposed development west of Heritage and north of Embleton Road i.e. through Precinct Planning. At the end of the day, it is at the discretion of the City of Brampton to decide how best to proceed to account for affordable housing targets. If development did occur (or continue to expand) in the Precinct Areas in west Brampton west of Chinguacousy Road, please make sure that a) the houses aren't gargantuan and b) there's still green space. The visual aesthetics of the newly built housing on and near Heritage Road south of Embleton isn't great in my opinion. Allow room for sustainable urban agriculture; that isn't possible with what I consider to be oversized homes covering what were once agricultural properties.	Comment received - Brampton Plan has set foundations to ensure we achieve key outcomes in comment (affordable housing, sustainable urban agr, protection and access to green space, full mix and range of houses, key intensification targets)
09/27/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Suggestion	Heritage Planning Maps could be added to Brampton Plan. There are natural heritage features in these maps; that's great. Greenbelt considerations are important. Should cultural heritage sites be mentioned in some of these extra maps? Some structures and properties should remain as they are to preserve aspects of Brampton's history. The only constant in life is change and so I won't raise a stinker about these issues personally. Although perhaps not entirely pertinent to this type of public engagement -- I haven't had the time to review all documents -- I would also have liked to see some maps discussing where land use changes are proposed, i.e. Amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law at 227 Vodden Street East (OZS-2022-0001), and whether they were approved, rejected or in progress.	Comment addressed - the City's Heritage Maps can be found on the City's website (https://www1.brampton.ca/EN/Arts-Culture-Tourism/Cultural-Heritage/pages/identification.aspx). Reference to these maps has been added to Brampton Plan, however due to frequent updates to the maps, they are not included as a schedule to the Plan.
10/02/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	"Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. ("GWD") acts as Planning Consultant to Centennial Mall Brampton Ltd. ("Davpart"); the registered owner of the property municipally known as 227 Vodden Street East (located at the southeast corner of Kennedy Road North and Vodden Street East) in the City of Brampton ("subject site"). The subject site is located within the Kennedy 'Primary' Major Transit Station Area ("MTSA"). At the September 29, 2023 Special Meeting of City Council, the Davpart Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments were recommended for approval, along with the granting of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval in principle. At this Special Meeting of City Council, the enacting by-laws were directed to be prepared for final endorsement at the City Council Meeting scheduled for October 18, 2023. Davpart does not support any policy or land use designation of the Draft Brampton Plan that is contrary to City Council direction. We write to express Davpart's continued concerns regarding the potential implications of the final draft of the new proposed City of Brampton Official Plan ("Draft Brampton Plan") policies on the subject site. We understand that the City of Brampton released the final Draft Brampton Plan the week of September 18, 2023 for public review and comment. We note that while Davpart has been actively monitoring the Draft Brampton Plan process and provided various public input into this review exercise, neither GWD nor Davpart were immediately informed by the City that the final Draft Brampton Plan had been released at that time. Further, we understand that certain critical Draft Brampton Plan Schedules, which are intended to form part of the new Draft Brampton	Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement. Furthermore, an announcement to inform that the Final Draft Brampton Plan was released and available for review was posted to the City's website (www.brampton.ca/BramptonPlan) on September 19, 2023 and an email was sent on September 20, 2023 to notify those who opted into receiving updates about Brampton Plan that the final draft is available for review.

10/02/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	<p>Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. ("GWD") acts as Planning Consultant to Soneil Markham Inc. ("Soneil"), the registered owner of the property municipally known as 2 County Court Boulevard (located at the northeast corner of Hurontario Street and County Court Boulevard) in the City of Brampton ("Subject Site"). The Subject Site is within the Ray Lawson County Court 'Primary' Major Transit Station Area ("MTSA") pursuant to the new Region of Peel Official Plan.</p> <p>We write to express Soneil's continued concerns regarding the potential implications of the final draft of the new proposed City of Brampton Official Plan ("Draft Brampton Plan") policies on the subject site.</p> <p>We understand that the City of Brampton released the final Draft Brampton Plan the week of September 18, 2023 for public review and comment. We note that while Soneil has been actively monitoring the Draft Brampton Plan process and provided various public input into this review exercise, neither GWD nor Soneil were immediately informed by the City that the final Draft Brampton Plan had been released at that time. Further, we understand that certain critical Draft Brampton Plan Schedules, which are intended to form part of the new Draft Brampton Plan, have not yet been released or included for public consultation. Notwithstanding, the City has requested that all public input on the Draft Brampton Plan (as partially released) be received by October 2, 2023 in order to be considered as part of an upcoming final Staff Recommendation Report.</p> <p>Respectfully, this commenting period of a mere two (2) weeks is inadequate given the magnitude and broadness of the scope of the planning exercise as it pertains not only Soneil, but also all other</p>	<p>Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement.</p> <p>Furthermore, an announcement to inform that the Final Draft Brampton Plan was released and available for review was posted to the City's website (www.brampton.ca/BramptonPlan) on September 19, 2023 and an email was sent on September 20, 2023 to notify those who opted into receiving updates about Brampton Plan that the final draft is available for review.</p>
10/02/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	<p>Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. ("GWD") acts as Planning Consultant to Soneil Mississauga Inc. and Soneil Oakville Inc. (collectively "Soneil"), the registered owner of the properties municipally known as 261 & 263 Queen Street East in the City of Brampton ("Subject Site"). The Subject Site is located at the southwest corner of Queen Street East and Rutherford Road South and is located within the Regionally approved Rutherford 'Primary' Major Transit Station Area ("MTSA").</p> <p>We write to express Soneil's continued concerns regarding the potential implications of the final draft of the new proposed City of Brampton Official Plan ("Draft Brampton Plan") policies on the subject site.</p> <p>We understand that the City of Brampton released the final Draft Brampton Plan the week of September 18, 2023 for public review and comment. We note that while Soneil has been actively monitoring the Draft Brampton Plan process and provided various public input into this review exercise, neither GWD nor Soneil were immediately informed by the City that the final Draft Brampton Plan had been released at that time. Further, we understand that certain critical Draft Brampton Plan Schedules, which are intended to form part of the new Draft Brampton Plan, have not yet been released or included for public consultation. Notwithstanding, the City has requested that all public input on the Draft Brampton Plan (as partially released) be received by October 2, 2023 in order to be considered as part of an upcoming final Staff Recommendation Report.</p> <p>Respectfully, this commenting period of a mere two (2) weeks is inadequate given the magnitude and broadness of the scope of the planning exercise as it pertains not only Soneil, but also all other</p>	<p>Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement.</p> <p>Furthermore, an announcement to inform that the Final Draft Brampton Plan was released and available for review was posted to the City's website (www.brampton.ca/BramptonPlan) on September 19, 2023 and an email was sent on September 20, 2023 to notify those who opted into receiving updates about Brampton Plan that the final draft is available for review.</p>
10/02/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	<p>Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. ("GWD") is Planning Consultant and agent to Mr. Zia Mohammad and Ms. Shamyra Hameed ("Client"); the registered owners of the property municipally known as 8671 Heritage Road, in the City of Brampton (hereinafter referred to as the "subject site").</p> <p>We write to express our Client's continued concerns regarding the potential implications of the final draft of the new proposed City of Brampton Official Plan ("Draft Brampton Plan") policies on the subject site.</p> <p>We understand that the City of Brampton released the final Draft Brampton Plan the week of September 18, 2023 for public review and comment. We note that while our Client has been actively monitoring the Draft Brampton Plan process and provided public input into this review exercise, neither GWD nor our Client were immediately informed by the City that the final Draft Brampton Plan had been released at that time. Further, we understand that certain critical Draft Brampton Plan Schedules, which are intended to form part of the new Draft Brampton Plan, have not yet been released or included for public consultation. Notwithstanding, the City has requested that all public input on the Draft Brampton Plan (as partially released) be received by October 2, 2023 in order to be considered as part of an upcoming final Staff Recommendation Report.</p> <p>Respectfully, this commenting period of a mere two (2) weeks is inadequate given the magnitude and broadness of the scope of the planning exercise as it pertains not only our Client, but also all other landowners and other stakeholders in the City of Brampton</p>	<p>Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement.</p> <p>Furthermore, an announcement to inform that the Final Draft Brampton Plan is released and available for review was posted to the City's website (www.brampton.ca/BramptonPlan) on September 19, 2023 and an email was sent on September 20, 2023 to notify those who opted into receiving updates about Brampton Plan that the final draft is available for review.</p>
10/02/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	<p>Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. ("GWD") acts as Planning Consultant to Amexon Holdings Ltd. ("Amexon"); the registered owner of the property municipally known as 21 Queen Street East in the City of Brampton ("subject site"). The subject site is located on the south side of Queen Street East, between Main Street South and Chapel Street. The subject site is currently developed with a 9-storey office building and is located within the Regionally approved Brampton GO 'Primary' Major Transit Station Area ("MTSA").</p> <p>We write to express Amexon's continued concerns regarding the potential implications of the final draft of the new proposed City of Brampton Official Plan ("Draft Brampton Plan") policies on the subject site.</p> <p>We understand that the City of Brampton released the final Draft Brampton Plan the week of September 18, 2023 for public review and comment. We note that while Amexon has been actively monitoring the Draft Brampton Plan process and provided various public input into this review exercise, neither GWD nor Amexon were immediately informed by the City that the final Draft Brampton Plan had been released at that time. Further, we understand that certain critical Draft Brampton Plan Schedules, which are intended to form part of the new Draft Brampton Plan, have not yet been released or included for public consultation. Notwithstanding, the City has requested that all public input on the Draft Brampton Plan (as partially released) be received by October 2, 2023 in order to be considered as part of an upcoming final Staff Recommendation Report.</p> <p>Respectfully, this commenting period of a mere two (2) weeks is</p>	<p>Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement.</p> <p>Furthermore, an announcement to inform that the Final Draft Brampton Plan was released and available for review was posted to the City's website (www.brampton.ca/BramptonPlan) on September 19, 2023 and an email was sent on September 20, 2023 to notify those who opted into receiving updates about Brampton Plan that the final draft is available for review.</p>

10/02/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	<p>"Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. (GWD) acts as Planning Consultant to the Hillside To Properties Inc. (Client) for the property legally known as Part of Lot 14, Registered Plan 347 in the City of Brampton (subject site). The subject site is located at the southwest corner of Steeles Avenue West and Lancashire Lane in the City of Brampton and is located in the Gateway Terminal 'Primary' Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) pursuant to the new Region of Peel Official Plan.</p> <p>We write to express our Client's concerns regarding the potential implications of the final draft of the new proposed City of Brampton Official Plan ("Draft Brampton Plan") policies on the subject site.</p> <p>We understand that the City of Brampton released the final Draft Brampton Plan the week of September 18, 2023 for public review and comment. We note that while our Client has been actively monitoring the Draft Brampton Plan process neither GWD nor our Client were immediately informed by the City that the final Draft Brampton Plan had been released at that time. Further, we understand that certain critical Draft Brampton Plan Schedules, which are intended to form part of the new Draft Brampton Plan, have not yet been released or included for public consultation. Notwithstanding, the City has requested that all public input on the Draft Brampton Plan (as partially released) be received by October 2, 2023 in order to be considered as part of an upcoming final Staff Recommendation Report.</p> <p>Respectfully, this commenting period of a mere two (2) weeks is inadequate given the magnitude and broadness of the scope of the planning exercise as it pertains not only our Client, but also all other landowners and other stakeholders in the City of Brampton.</p>	<p>Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement.</p> <p>Furthermore, an announcement to inform that the Final Draft Brampton Plan was released and available for review was posted to the City's website (www.brampton.ca/BramptonPlan) on September 19, 2023 and an email was sent on September 20, 2023 to notify those who opted into receiving updates about Brampton Plan that the final draft is available for review.</p>
10/02/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	<p>Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. (GWD) acts as Planning Consultant to Choice Properties Limited Partnership and Loblaw Properties Limited (collectively "Choice/Loblaw"), the registered owner of the property municipally known as 85 Steeles Avenue West in the City of Brampton ("subject site"). The Subject Site is located at the southwest quadrant of Hurontario Street/Main Street and Steeles Avenue and is located within the Regionally approved Gateway 'Primary' Major Transit Station Area ("MTSA").</p> <p>We write to express Choice/Loblaw's concerns regarding the potential implications of the final draft of the new proposed City of Brampton Official Plan ("Draft Brampton Plan") policies on the subject site.</p> <p>We understand that the City of Brampton released the final Draft Brampton Plan the week of September 18, 2023 for public review and comment. We note that while Choice/Loblaw has been actively monitoring the Draft Brampton Plan process and provided various public input into this review exercise, neither GWD nor Choice/Loblaw were immediately informed by the City that the final Draft Brampton Plan had been released at that time. Further, we understand that certain critical Draft Brampton Plan Schedules, which are intended to form part of the new Draft Brampton Plan, have not yet been released or included for public consultation. Notwithstanding, the City has requested that all public input on the Draft Brampton Plan (as partially released) be received by October 2, 2023 in order to be considered as part of an upcoming final Staff Recommendation Report.</p> <p>Respectfully, this commenting period of a mere two (2) weeks is inadequate given the magnitude and broadness of the scope of the</p>	<p>Comment received - Staff recognize that timing between the release of the third draft and adoption of Brampton Plan is tight; however, the Official Plan Review process began in 2019, and has had active engagement during that timeframe including: 2 draft OPs for review and comments, addressing comments received for each draft, and showcasing how they've been addressed as part of an iterative process. The City believes this has far exceeded Planning Act requirements and has ensured robust stakeholder and public engagement.</p> <p>Furthermore, an announcement to inform that the Final Draft Brampton Plan was released and available for review was posted to the City's website (www.brampton.ca/BramptonPlan) on September 19, 2023 and an email was sent on September 20, 2023 to notify those who opted into receiving updates about Brampton Plan that the final draft is available for review.</p>
10/04/2022	Member of Public		Whole Document	Statement	<p>Overall, The brampton plan covers almost all the major parts that are necessities and things can be taken into account as luxuries of brampton.</p>	Comment received.
10/04/2023	Member of Public		Whole Document	Concern	<p>regarding green spaces in the city's final draft, may not adequately address the recreational and environmental needs of international students, potentially affecting their overall experience.</p>	Comment received - Brampton Plan sets the foundation to provide equitable access for the needs of all people in brampton.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	Whole Document	Revision Requested	<p>As a general comment, in our submission, all defined terms under the Glossary should be italicized for ease of review</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	Whole Document	Revision Requested	<p>As a general comment, we suggest that all defined terms should be italicized or bolded throughout the Official Plan for ease of review</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	MHBC	Oz Kemal	Whole Document	Revision Requested	<p>The document appears to be created as a compilation of all City department documents, such as the Transportation Master Plan, the Parks & Recreation Master Plan, Regional Housing programs and services, a Community Development Plan and the City Council's Strategic Plan. For example, the majority of the document's policies do not guide a land use development application for one building, nor fall under Planning Act matters, with many representing the City's operational matters, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vulnerable Communities (s.3.2.4.4) • Emergency Planning Procedures (s.3.2.4.11.a) • Tourism (s.3.6.2.7.) <p>The recommendation would be to remove non-development related policies while referencing the multiple City plans and deferring to their content. An example is the section on Urban Design and its reference to the urban design manuals.</p>	Comment received.
10/02/2023	MHBC	Oz Kemal	Whole Document	Revision Requested	<p>Please note that the previous version and final draft (Sept 2023) and the redline version all have different policy references for the same policy that are not properly correlated. Given the limited review time, it makes it difficult to capture all the changes proposed between drafts. For instance, the redline version between December 2022 and September 2023 noted that the original policy 2.1.2.45 was amended to policy 2.1.2.86, but the final clean version of September 2023 notes the same policy as 2.1.2.47.</p>	Comment received - the City worked to make the redline version as accessible as possible with many additions and removal of policies between drafts. Although the City tried to make documents as user friendly as possible, this comment is noted for future work.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Jennifer Staden	Special Land Use Policy	Revision Requested	<p>In reviewing the updated draft Official Plan (September 2023), we were surprised to see the site-specific policy related to the Subject Property (100 West Drive) has been removed. "Special Land Use Policy Area 2" now relates to completely different lands and no site-specific policies are proposed for 100 West Drive. This seems counterintuitive to the previous discussions we have had with City staff regarding the future vision for the Subject Property (100 West Drive).</p> <p>We therefore request staff to reinstate a site-specific policy for the Subject Property to ensure our client's permissions for continuation, expansion and redevelopment of the Subject Property (100 West Drive) for industrial uses is permitted as-of-right.</p>	<p>Comment received. The MTSA Transition Policies incorporated into Chapter 4 of the final Brampton Plan allow the uses existing in the Zoning By-law to continue, however, they are ultimately intended to be redeveloped in conformity with the land use designations shown on Schedules 13a - 13n (MTSA land use schedules).</p> <p>Given the proposed MTSA Transition Policies, a site-specific policy is not warranted in Brampton Plan. The proposed MTSA transition policies ensure the continuation, expansion and redevelopment of 100 West Drive for industrial uses.</p>

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 1)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	Drivers of Change - Housing Affordability P 1-4	Recommendation	Appreciate reference to housing affordability in Chapter 1. Especially reference to need for more rental. Wondering where we can talk about more housing choice and affordable units for households of different sizes. Appreciate the reference in financial sustainability but want to connect housing choice with affordability.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	1.1.8 d	Clarification Requested	Seeking clarification if wording will remain the same.	Comment received - this policy will remain the same.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Wayne Koethe	Entire Section	Revision Requested	This section states "a population of 1 million+ people"; However, Regional OP (Section 4, Table 3, Page 120) sets a 2051 target of 985,000 for Brampton. Suggested change could state "a population of around 1 million people" similar what the next page of the draft 1-2 says	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Transportation Planning, Transportation Planning	Afroz Hasan	Part 1.2	Revision Requested	Section should be revised to include reference to the Connecting the GGH: A Transportation Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Part 2.1)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2023/03/10	TRCA	Jeff Thompson, Policy	Pg 2-5	Revision Requested	The OP states the NHS will be "maintained, restored, and enhanced" whereas, throughout the Plan, related policies say, "protect, restore and enhance" the NHS. We suggest consistency in keeping with the latter. However, we defer to the Region regarding consistency with specific language.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	2.1.1. f)	Revision Requested	Opportunity to mention affordability?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	2.1.2.68 d)	Revision Requested	Appreciate "but not limited to", but for added effect, could we include licensed child care in the list of examples?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Part 2.1	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "The Mobility Framework, which ties together the City-Wide Growth Management Framework, is crucial to supporting the growing multi-modal transportation needs of those who live, work, learn, and play within the cCity." "City" should be lowercase in this sentence.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Part 2.1	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "The City Structure builds on the strengths and opportunities provided by the existing urban fabric and emerging trends. These are encapsulated within the City-Wide Growth Management Framework and Mobility Framework that make up the City Structure." A period is needed at the end of this sentence.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.1.1 (h)	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Providing transit and other mobility options to navigate the city safely and equitably, and broader region, and to connect a city of approximately 1 million people on the move." Suggest rewording to: "Providing transit and other mobility options to navigate the city and broader region safely and equitably, and broader region , and to connect a city of approximately 1 million people on the move."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 2.1.1.1 (e)	Revision Requested	Consider including MTSAs as part of this policy.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.2	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "The City-Wide Growth Management Framework forms the basis for all planning and development in the city. It provides direction for how and where growth is to occur by planning documents from upper-levels of government..." Suggest rewording the latter sentence to: "It provides direction for how and where growth is to occur by implementing planning documents direction from upper-levels of government."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.2	Revision Requested	"The City-Wide Growth Management Framework carefully reflects how the City can maximize existing investments in infrastructure and environmental opportunities, while minimizing environmental impacts on community services and facilities, transit, water and wastewater that are vital to the social, environmental and financial sustainability of Brampton." This sentence is unclear - please consider rewording.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Preamble?	Revision Requested	Not sure if this section would be regarded as a policy. Consider making the following text a standalone policy: "Planning for Growth in the City Minimum growth forecasts have been prepared to the year 2051. These population, housing, and employment forecasts, shown in Table 1, will be monitored and revised through future comprehensive reviews of this Plan. They will also be used by Brampton Plan to guide policy and land use decision making until 2051."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.2.11	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Sufficient lands and opportunities for strategic intensification have been identified through this plan to meet the projected growth requirements for population, housing, and jobs until 2051." The word "been" is missing from this sentence.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Planning for Growth in the City (2.1.2.12)	Revision Requested	Suggest the following policy edit to conform to RPOP 4.3.14: Planning for Growth in the City 2.1.2.12 The supply of land will be monitored to ensure sufficient capacity, specifically related to infrastructure and public service facilities , to accommodate the forecasts identified in Table 1 and in accordance with the Growth Management policies in Chapter 5.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Planning for Growth in the City (2.1.2.13)	Revision Requested	Please include 2041 forecasts shown in Table 3 of the RPOP. "Minimum growth forecasts" are pre-empting the proposed PPS. Planning beyond the 2051 horizon may only be done in specific areas/circumstances. Planning for Growth in the City Minimum Growth forecasts have been prepared to the year 2051. These population, housing, and employment forecasts, shown in Table 1, will be monitored and revised through future comprehensive reviews of this Plan. They will also be used by Brampton Plan to guide policy and land use decision making until 2051. Any changes to population, household and employment forecasts would require an amendment to this plan. 2.1.2.13 Minimum Growth forecasts are identified in the Region of Peel Official Plan to the year 2051 to conform to the requirements of the Growth Plan and to Connecting the GGH: A Transportation Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Table 1 of Brampton Plan identifies the minimum population, employment, and housing forecasts and changes would require an amendment to this plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Designated Greenfield Area	Revision Requested	Please incorporate a policy into the 'Designated Greenfield Area' section in Chapter 2 which satisfies RPOP policy 5.4.19.10: "Direct the local municipalities to incorporate official plan policies to plan for complete communities within Designated Greenfield Areas that create high quality public open spaces with site design and urban design standards that support opportunities for transit, walking and cycling and direct the development of high-quality public realm and compact built form."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 2.1.2.14	Revision Requested	This policy should speak to some of the specific subcomponents of RPOP 5.4.14 as there is a small portion of Brampton which is outside of the Regional Urban Boundary.	Comment received - the current policy references conformity with the Region of Peel Official Plan.

2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Boulevards and Major Transit Station Areas	Revision Requested	"Boulevards and Major Transit Station Areas: Primary Major Transit Station Area – areas that have existing or planned Rapid Transit and can meet or exceed the minimum density target." Suggest stating that "Primary Major Transit Station Areas are Protected in accordance with subsection 16(16) of the <i>Planning Act</i> ". This comment also applies to the Glossary definition in policy 5.18 of the draft BOP.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Boulevards and Major Transit Station Areas	Revision Requested	"Boulevards and Major Transit Station Areas: Planned Major Transit Station Area – areas which are intended to become Major Transit Station Areas and will be further delineated when infrastructure planning and investment, or changes in land use unlock potential." Please add that "Planned Major Transit Station Areas require further study and assessment prior to being delineated", in keeping with policy 5.6.19.6 of the RPOP. This comment also applies to the Glossary definition in policy 5.18 of the draft BOP.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 2.1.2.17	Revision Requested	Higher than regional minimum of 50%. Since it is a minimum, clarification is requested on why it is being changed to 60%.	Comment received - Through on the City's Growth Management Strategy and forecasting, it was determined that a higher target be established to align with the City Structure elements.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 2.1.2.18	Revision Requested	Policy wording seems confusing when referring to the "Built-Up Area in Strategic Growth Areas." Consider revising to clarify that there are SGAs within the BUA.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Table 2	Revision Requested	Consider adding references to the instances where minimum densities flexibility exists (i.e. MTSAs, SGAs, greenfields, etc.). Please clarify what Area 47 is in reference to. (1) Minimum densities have been set through the Secondary Planning process for Area 47, however, Brampton Plan provides flexibility to respond to market trends over the planning horizon to 2051 in MTSAs, Strategic Growth Areas, Designated Greenfield Areas, as identified in this plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	To be added	Revision Requested	Consider adding some of the content of RPOP 5.6.18.6 around changing the location of the UGC.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.2.24	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "The density target for the Designated Greenfield Area will be measured over the entire Designated Greenfield Area, excluding Employment Areas, the Natural Heritage System; designation, floodplain, rights-of-way for hydro corridors, energy transmission lines, highways, railways, and cemeteries." The comma after "Natural Heritage System" should be removed.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Image	Revision Requested	Chapter 2 page 15 the map of MTSAs is not labeled as anything and graphically looks different than Schedule 1. Consider making this a standalone schedule outside of the text of the Brampton Plan and to allow for easy identification of MTSAs (difficult to discern MTSAs in Schedule 1).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.2.29 (b)	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Where a City-initiated study of a Major Transit Station Area has not been initiated or approved by way of an amendment to Brampton Plan, the City may require the coordination of development applications between applicants, by way of a Secondary Plan, Precinct Plan and/or Area Plan approved by way of an amendment to Brampton Plan at the expense of the applicant. The applicable planning study will be subject to the applicable policies of the overlapping Centre or Boulevard, or other similar approaches to ensure an orderly, coordinated, and phased approach to the provision of Civic Infrastructure prior to or coincident with development." Suggest revising to: "Where a City-initiated study of a Major Transit Station Area has not been initiated or approved by way of an amendment to Brampton Plan, the City may require the coordination of development applications between applicants, by way of through the preparation and submission of a Secondary Plan, Precinct Plan and/or Area Plan. This study must be approved by way of an amendment to Brampton Plan at the expense of the applicant. The applicable required planning study will be subject to the applicable policies of the overlapping Centre or Boulevard, or other similar approaches to ensure an orderly, coordinated, and phased approach to the provision of Civic Infrastructure prior to or coincident with development."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 2.1.2.29 (d)	Revision Requested	Minimum density targets are noted in Table 2 of the Brampton Plan but policy 2.1.2.29.d notes Planned MTSAs require further study. Would be helpful in policy interpretation if the two specific Planned MTSAs were specified in the policy. Also this policy should be divided into sub-policy sections (e.g. i. ii. iii) to clarify the various components of policies in part d) and to also conform to RPOP policy 5.6.19.15 .	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.2.38	Revision Requested	"New or updated Secondary Plans will be prepared in accordance with the policies of Chapter 5." RPOP 5.6.20.14.16 establishes criteria for how secondary plans should be prioritized, advanced, sequenced, and approved on the basis of a staging and sequencing plan. Please incorporate this criteria into this policy section (or in Chapter 5).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	policy 2.1.2.43	Revision Requested	Consider revising Brampton Plan policy 2.1.2.43 so it speaks to DGA specifically either as a separate policy or in the DGA section to address RPOP 5.5.6. Consistent terminology may help with understanding how the Chapter 2 policies work with policies in 5.3 that speak to the "timing and progression of development in both the BUA and DGA" vs phasing and staging and prioritization. The intent of this policy is to better understand hierarchy of growth and that is not immediately clear in the polices. Clarification on whether the prioritization of growth is based on the same sequencing as secondary plan prioritization (2.1.2.36 and 2.1.2.39).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.1.2.45	Revision Requested	"The City must be satisfied that adequate Civic Infrastructure, in accordance with the policies of Part 2.2, can be supplied prior to any development proceeding and, where technically and economically possible" This policy is unclear - should this policy read: "The City must be satisfied that adequate Civic Infrastructure, in accordance with the policies of Part 2.2, can technically and economically feasibly be supplied prior to any development proceeding."?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Wayne Koethe	2.1.2	Revision Requested	Consider confirming density for employment areas, as per ROP 5.8.27. City draft policy 2.1.2.25 considers the DGA, but is there a broad policy to be applied as well in Section 2.1.2?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Wayne Koethe	2.1	Revision Requested	Typo fix is needed: "In addition to the housing growth allocation to 2051 identified in Part 2.1 of this Plan, a full mix and range of housing growth <u>much</u> occur in alignment with the City's housing targets"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Wayne Koethe	2.1.2	Revision Requested	Page 3-141, of the Draft OP States that "124,000 jobs will be created by 2051; however, section 2.1.2 states "Brampton is forecasted to grow by more than 140,000 jobs to the year 2051." This inconsistency needs to be addressed.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.1.2 City Wide Growth Management Framework, 2.1.2.1 f.	Revision Requested	Revise - Describing the Natural System as being made up of a Natural System and Water Resource System. Consider differentiating the labeling of the broader level "Natural System" and its subcomponent systems. Recommend labeling the broader system policy framework and elements as the "Natural System" and its subcomponent systems as the "Natural Heritage System" and "Water Resource System". E.g. "The Natural System is made up of a Natural <u>Heritage</u> System and Water Resource System and includes natural and water resource features and areas such as provincially, regionally and locally significant woodlands, rivers, valleylands, ..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.1.2 City Wide Growth Management Framework, 2.1.2.6 - second sentence	Revision Requested	Add - Consider labeling the natural heritage subcomponent of the broader Natural System as the "Natural Heritage System". E.g. "Natural <u>Heritage</u> System and Water Resource System features and areas will be maintained, restored, and enhanced for long-term sustainability of the systems."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.1.2 City Wide Growth Management Framework, Built-up Area, Preamble, Fourth Bullet	Revision Requested	Revise - Consider if the label and reference to Natural System should be "Natural <u>Heritage</u> System".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.1.2 City Wide Growth Management Framework, Designated Greenfield, 2.1.2.24	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - Delete comma after "Natural Heritage System".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.1.2 City Wide Growth Management Framework, Natural System, Preamble, First Paragraph, Second Sentence	Revision Requested	Clarify/ Revise - Consider if label for Natural System should be "Natural Heritage System" to differentiate the subcomponent from the broader Natural System policy framework. Consider rewording "...for- it's <u>the</u> long-term sustainability of the System." It is also recommended the Brampton Plan's preambles and policies for the Natural System clarify the relationship of the "Natural Heritage System" designation on Schedule 2 within the Natural System's policy framework. In several policies, the reference is to the Natural System designated on Schedule 2; however, the designation label on Schedule 2 is "Natural Heritage System". Further discussion with staff is recommended.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.1.2 City Wide Growth Management Framework, Natural System, Preamble, Third Paragraph,	Revision Requested	Revise - Consider if label for Natural System should be "Natural <u>Heritage</u> System" to differentiate the subcomponent from the broader Natural System policy framework.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.1.2 City Wide Growth Management Framework, Natural System, 2.1.2.35 Introductory and 2.1.2.35 a.	Revision Requested	Revise - The introductory sentence references "protection, enhancement and restoration of linkages" while 2.1.2.35 a. references "restoring, creating and protecting features and areas". For clarity, suggest rewording policy to include reference to " <u>features, areas and linkages</u> " in both the introductory sentence and clause 2.1.2.35 a. Policy 2.1.2.35 a. - consider if label for Natural System should be "Natural <u>Heritage</u> System" to differentiate the subcomponent from the broader Natural System policy framework.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 2.1.2.22	Revision Requested	The City will maintain, at all times: a. The ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 15 years through residential intensification and redevelopment; and b. Land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three-year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate intensification." - What does this mean? - How does the City intend to measure or monitor this? - What about upstream developments? What about downstream capacity? What about impacts to the existing community? - I think this statement needs to be substantiated starting with quantifying what 15 years of intensification growth could look like	Comment received - these questions are addressed through Chapter 5 and the Growth Management Program will work to implement this policy.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 2.1.1.1 Principles for the City Structure	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.1.1: "The City Structure will create complete communities across Brampton while grounded in the four pillars of sustainability..." Suggest removing the word "while" so that it reads better.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 2.1.3 Mobility Framework	Revision Requested	Policy 2.1.3: "Brampton's mobility system creates connections and provides opportunities for people and goods to move through and around the city in a safe and accessible way." Should state "safe <u>and</u> accessible".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.1.2.5	Revision Requested	Not all MTSAs have flexible policies. Further studies are required in accordance with RPOP Policy 5.8.36 to introduce non employment uses to applicable MTSAs. HLRT-20 Ray Lawson and HLRT-21 County Court are not included in the flexible policy. Suggest listing the MTSAs where the flexible policy would apply within the "Relationship with Major Transit Station Areas" and referencing section and criteria or removing reference to MTSAs.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.1.2.10	Revision Requested	Residential uses are not permitted in Employment Areas unless they overlap with an MTSA and applicable criteria is met via RPOP Policy 5.8.36. Suggest removing reference to "Employment Areas". Section "2.2 Employment Areas" can speak to policy requirements of accommodating residential in applicable MTSAs subject to further studies. 2.1.2.10 Both residential and employment growth will be located in Centres, Boulevards, <u>and</u> Corridors, and Employment Areas (subject to the policies in the Employment Area section that limit residential uses) in our City-Wide Growth Management Framework, including locations of existing or planned transit and community services and facilities.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Table 1 – Minimum Population, Employment, and Housing Units Growth Forecast	Revision Requested	Purpose of asterisk's beside "Employment" in table requires clarification.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.1.2.29 a)	Revision Requested	Not all MTSAs have flexible policies. Further studies are required in accordance with RPOP Policy 5.8.36 to introduce non employment uses to applicable MTSAs. HLRT-20 Ray Lawson and HLRT-21 County Court are not included in the flexible policy. Suggest listing the MTSAs where the flexible policy would apply within the "Relationship with Major Transit Station Areas" and referencing section and criteria or removing policy.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.1.1 d)	Revision Requested	Deletion of policy recommended. Policy suggests "Mixed Use Employment" is not part of "Employment Areas" which are protected in the RPOP against non-employment uses. Suggest meeting to discuss policy intention.	Comment received - RPOP policy 5.8.34 permits Mixed use employment within employment areas
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Permitted Mixed Use Employment Uses - Preamble 2-93	Revision Requested	Schedule 5 - Provincial Plans and Policy Areas contains a PSEZ overlay. Intended reference may be "Schedule 1 - City Structure".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/23	TRCA		2.1.2.24	Revision Requested	There appears to be a word or words missing from this policy where it states "...the Natural Heritage System, designation, floodplain."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.1.2.15	Revision Requested	This policy should be consistent with Bill 23 dealing with employment conversions since Regional MCR is not the only mechanism to consider employment land conversion requests.	Comment received - as Bill 23 is not yet in effect, Brampton Plan is not required to be consistent with the proposed policy set out in Bill 23.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.1.2.37	Revision Requested	The City <u>supports Employment Areas and infrastructure uses, where appropriate, will preserve and protect lands adjacent to highways, rail corridors, rail yards and major truck terminals for Employment Areas and infrastructure uses, where appropriate.</u>	Comment received - this policy is a conformity requirement with the Provincial Planning Statement and Region of Peel Official Plan.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.1.3.10 a	Revision Requested	What is the City's rationale for removing the future GO Station in Heritage Heights when City Council approved the Secondary Plan that desires the new GO Station in that planning area?	Comment received - as the Region of Peel Official Plan removed the future Heritage Heights GO Station per the Minister of MMAH's direction, this is a conformity requirement. The City notes that there are still policy references to the future GO Station in text, however the City cannot identify it as a Planned MTSA on schedules.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	Major Transit Station Areas and Boulevards	Revision Requested	For the Major Transit Station Areas and Boulevards and the Figure shown on Page 2-15, we request clarification as to the intention for showing the Bramalea GO MTSA as "Planned MTSA, Out of Scope (MZO)," which is inconsistent with the draft MTSA policies and land use schedules in Section 4	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.1.2.30 b & 2.1.2.43	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.1.2.30.b) states, "Where a City-initiated study of a Major Transit Station Area has not been initiated or approved by way of an amendment to Brampton Plan, the City may require the coordination of development applications between applicants, through the preparation and submission of a Secondary Plan, Precinct Plan and/or Area Plan." Policy 2.1.2.43 states "New or updated Secondary Plans will be prepared in accordance with the policies of Chapter 5." We request clarification as to whether the City's ongoing MTSA Project for MTSAs including the Bramalea GO represents the studies referenced in these policies, or if further studies are contemplated	Comment received - the ongoing MTSA study is the study referenced in this policy, which will conclude with the implementation of Zoning By-laws and Urban Design Guidelines for all the Primary MTSAs.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.1.2.27	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.1.2.27 states "Centres will be designated as Mixed-Use on Schedule 2 through subsequent planning studies to provide appropriate use, form, and intensity requirements." We request clarification in the context of the Canadian Tire Lands where there is a Town Centre overlaid with lands designated Employment Areas, that there is no intention to redesignate the lands as Mixed-Use on Schedule 2 through subsequent planning study	Comment received - the specific context in each center will be evaluated through subsequent studies to ensure land use compatibility, appropriate transition and sufficient protections for employment uses will be evaluated as part of that work.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.1.2.45	Clarification Requested	In the context of Policy 2.1.2.45 that states "Where a Secondary Plan does not yet identify the location of Precincts, Precinct boundaries will be determined in collaboration with the City and Region. The City may require the submission of Precinct Plans, as part of any Draft Plans and/or Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application within Centres, Boulevards, Major Transit Station Areas, and Corridors in accordance with the policies of Part 2.2 and Chapter 5", we request clarification that a Precinct Plan will not be required in all circumstances, and accordingly the policy language should be revised to include "where appropriate" before "development will be limited until a Precinct Plan"	Comment received - the policy is flexible and reflects that the City may require a Precinct Plan, but not in all circumstances.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Part 2.2)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2023/08/18	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto, Senior Manager Planning	Section 2.2.9 pg 103	Revision Requested	second last paragraph – speaks to preserving the NHS and thus supporting a 'net gain'. However, to achieve a net gain, suggest adding the term, "enhancing".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/18	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto, Senior Manager Planning	Section 2.2.9.38	Revision Requested	Support the use of offsetting in policy - suggest adding approval "with relevant agency" recognizing that CA's regulate wetlands and other hazard lands that may be impacted by offsetting. Also, wording should be included to the affect that the feature "can" be offset to begin with.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/18	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto, Senior Manager Planning	Section 2.2.9.55	Revision Requested	There is some concern with the wording allowing for development/site alteration within watercourses and valleylands if meeting criteria. Typically, under CA policies, development is prohibited within watercourses and valleylands. Unless the intent of this policy is related to natural channel design etc. rather than urban development. Suggest clarifying or only speaking to adjacent land. If another policy related to alteration to a watercourse is included here, suggest adding approval with relevant CA.	Comment received - Under the prohibited uses and activities, we include flood and erosion control projects as well as essential infrastructure, which would cover the natural channel design. The purpose of this specific policy would relate to the development itself.
2023/08/18	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto, Senior Manager Planning	Section 2.2.9.114	Revision Requested	It appears as though a word is missing after "Highly Vulnerable"....	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/25	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	2.2.3.15 (relates in part to 3.3.1.24, 5.5.10, 5.5.13)	Revision Requested	Recommend adding "support affordable housing targets & identify affordable housing opportunities (e.g., specific sites)" or language to that effect in the list of components for secondary plans in Urban Centres and Town Centres	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	Places of worship section (starts with 2.2.7.56)	Revision Requested	It is great to see supportive housing referenced as a possible auxiliary use, but it is recommended that affordable housing more broadly (including supportive housing) be identified in Brampton Plan policy as Accessory uses to Places of Worship, for which no amendment to zoning will be required. This will support faith communities to consider infill projects to increase affordable housing supply.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.2.3.15	Revision Requested	Please ensure that the secondary planning requirements for Urban Centres and Town Centres set out by policy 2.2.3.15 capture the comprehensive planning considerations for Strategic Growth Areas set out by RPOP policy 5.6.17.9. We encourage City staff to complete such comprehensive planning for all Strategic Growth Areas.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 2.2.4.10	Revision Requested	This policy may need to note when and how the delineation of Secondary MTSAs boundaries will take place to conform to RPOP policy 5.6.19.7 and 5.6.19.9. Some indication in 2.1.2.29 around requiring further study for planned MTSAs but unclear based on how policies are structured in Chapter 2 and 5.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.2.5.1	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Brampton Plan will plan for future growth and intensification that is supported by rapid transit, focusing on networks and systems that connect people and places, make transit viable, and to build great places within and across the city..." "To" should be deleted before "build great places".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.2.6.2 (c)	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Ensure that new development is compatible with the character and pattern of adjacent and surrounding development, while providing adequate park space and community services to residents. This means to locating and massing new buildings to provide a transition between areas of different development intensity and scale, as necessary to achieve the objectives of this Plan, through means such as providing appropriate setbacks and/or a stepping down of heights, particularly towards lower scale Neighbourhoods." See the suggested edits to the latter sentence.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.2.8	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Mixed-Use Employment areas are clusters of economic activity and provide a broad range of employment and employment-supportive uses, as well as limited opportunities for residential uses only within certain Major Transit Station Areas. The Mixed-Use Employment designation is generally be located on the periphery of Employment Area..." "Be" should be deleted from the latter sentence.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 2.2.8.20 (a)	Revision Requested	"The types of permitted services are of a scale that serve the local neighbourhood and employees working in designated Mixed-Use Employment such as grocery stores, civic uses, recreational, health and fitness uses and service commercial uses including but not limited to convenience commercial, retail, office and restaurants." This policy is unclear - maybe "and employees working in designated Mixed-Use Employment" should be deleted?	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.1 Designations and Overlays, 2.2.1.1 e.	Revision Requested	Revise - Should the reference to "Natural System" designation be "Natural Heritage System" designation? The designation label on Schedule 2 references "Natural Heritage System" as the designation label. The label "Natural Heritage System" is also used on Schedule 1. The policy framework for the Natural System appears to reference the Natural System policies as both an overlay and land use designation; however, this is not clear in the policies or schedules.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.8 Employment Areas, Permitted Industrial Uses, 2.2.8.9 and 2.2.8.10	Revision Requested	Revise/Conformity - Recommend relocating the land use compatibility policies 2.2.8.9 and 2.2.8.10 that are currently located in Part 2 Shaping Brampton, Section 2.2.8 Employment Areas into the Part 3.5 Land Use Compatibility section of the Plan. The key direction in the PPS is missing in the Part 3.5 Land Use Compatibility section and can be addressed by relocating the policy and refocusing the policies in the Employment Areas section to be specific to planning for Employment Areas.	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, Preamble, Third Paragraph	Revision Requested	Add - References importance of the Natural System to local residents and visitors. Suggest also adding a separate reference to the importance of the natural system to Indigenous Communities. The Regional Official Plan Section 2.1 Preamble provides an example of what could be incorporated in this section or in other sections of the Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, Preamble, Sixth Paragraph, First Sentence	Revision Requested	Clarify/Revise - Should the reference to the designation on Schedule 2 be "Natural Heritage System"?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, Preamble, Sixth Paragraph, Last Sentence	Revision Requested	Revise - Add " and Schedule 6B " after "that may be present but are not shown on Schedule 6A".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve? 2.2.9.30	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - Introductory paragraph is missing a comma after "restoration".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?, Identify, Protect, Restore and Enhance the Natural System, Preamble, Second Paragraph, Last Bullet	Revision Requested	Revise/Conformity - Revise "Natural features" to " Key natural heritage features" to align with the Greenbelt Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Identify, Protect, Restore and Enhance the Natural System, 2.2.9.31	Revision Requested	Revise - Should the reference to the land use designation on Schedule 2 be "Natural <u>Heritage</u> System"? Recommend the City comprehensively review the Natural System policy framework for clarity and consider how to differentiate the labeling of the Natural System and Natural Heritage System overlay and designation in the policies and on the schedules. If the City is retaining the current label Natural System for the policy framework and the Natural Heritage System label for the designation of protected Natural System features and areas on the schedules, consider rewording the policy. "The precise boundaries of the Natural System as designated <u>as Natural Heritage System</u> on Schedule 2 and shown in greater detail on Schedule 6A and 6B will be determined on a site-specific basis in accordance with the policies of this Plan and in consultation with the Conservation Authorities and other relevant public agencies." Consider reviewing the policies referencing the Natural System and Natural Heritage System throughout the Plan and revising accordingly to address issues related to clarity within the policies and schedules of the draft Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Identify, Protect, Restore and Enhance the Natural System, 2.2.9.32	Revision Requested	Revise - Recommend reviewing the ending clause in the second sentence for clarity e.g., "...and discourage discouraging the removal of natural features."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Identify, Protect, Restore and Enhance the Natural System, 2.2.9.37	Revision Requested	Revise - Recommend adding " <u>and protection standards</u> " after "in accordance with the policies..." to better align to provincial policies and Regional Official Plan and ensure that appropriate protection standards are addressed when removals are considered.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Permitted Uses and Activities, 2.2.9.49	Revision Requested	Revise/Clarify - The Natural System policy framework will need to address policy direction and mapping for the Water Resource System, including significant groundwater resource areas and highly vulnerable aquifers. This prohibition may be incorrectly interpreted if also considering it applies to the broad Water Resource System areas that are intended to be constraints to development and not areas to be protected from development. Since the Draft Brampton Plan proposes the label "Natural Heritage System" on the land use Schedule 2 and City Structure Schedule 1, should the permitted uses policy apply more specifically to the Natural Heritage System designation as mapped on the schedules. The City could consider rewording to the following, "2.2.9.49 Development and site alteration within the Natural System <u>as designated Natural Heritage System on Schedule 2</u> will be prohibited except for the following:..." Additional discussion on the City's approach is recommended.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Wetlands, 2.2.9.60 c.	Revision Requested	Revise - Recommend removing "The evaluation must be approved by the Province." The OWES wetland manual has recently been updated and no longer requires wetland evaluations to be approved by the Province. Changes to the manual came into effect on January 1, 2023.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Woodlands, 2.2.9.64 a.	Revision Requested	Revise - Recommend replacing "and/or" with " <u>or</u> " as the coordinating conjunction. The use of "and/or" is ambiguous and suggests that either option may be applied. Specifying that the criteria in a. and b. apply is a clearer interpretation.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Woodlands, 2.2.9.71	Revision Requested	Add - The City may wish to consider expanding the policy protection to core woodlands by incorporating the Region's criteria in Table 1 for core woodlands directly in the Brampton Plan rather than referencing the Regional Official Plan along with policies that permit exceptions to the prohibition of development and site alteration within Core Areas of the Greenlands System (e.g. minor development and site alteration, essential infrastructure, etc.).	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System, Preamble, First Paragraph	Revision Requested	Remove - Recommend revising third sentence to follow similar Preamble formats identifying the key schedules that relate to policies of the section. Recommended wording is provided, "Within the City of Brampton, about 202 hectares of land adjacent to the Credit River Valley in Northwest Brampton are designated as Protected Countryside on <u>Schedule 2</u> and identified as Natural Heritage System <u>as shown on Schedules 6A and 6B.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System, Preamble, Second Paragraph	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise first sentence to reflect the purpose of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside as described in the Greenbelt Plan. Recommended wording is provided, "Protected Countryside lands are intended to provide connections from the Niagara Escarpment Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan to the surrounding major lake system, to <u>enhance the spatial extent of agriculturally and environmentally protected lands</u> , protect wildlife habitat, provide for the movement of plants and animals, and maintain and/or enhance water resources."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System, Preamble, Third Paragraph	Revision Requested	Add/Conformity - Add the following sentence to reflect the policy intent and direction of the Greenbelt Plan and to provide reference to key features and key hydrologic areas which are missing in the Brampton Plan, " <u>Within the Natural System, the Protected Countryside policies of the Greenbelt Plan provide for the long-term protection of key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features, key hydrologic areas and their functions.</u> " Additional revisions addressing key hydrologic areas policies of the Greenbelt Plan are provided in other sections. The revisions are recommended to address conformity with the Greenbelt Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System, 2.2.9.96	Revision Requested	Add/Conformity - The Greenbelt Plan Natural System policies require identification of a Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System including key hydrologic areas, key hydrologic features and key natural heritage features. Key hydrologic areas, including significant groundwater resource areas and highly vulnerable aquifers are not shown on Schedule 6B. SGRAs and HVAs are required to be shown on a schedule to the Brampton Plan. Revisions to Policy 2.2.9.96 are requested as shown, "The Greenbelt Plan Natural System is shown on Schedule 6B <u>and Schedule 6C</u> . For those lands within the Greenbelt Plan Natural System, the applicable policies of the Greenbelt Plan will apply." A new Schedule 6C identifying significant groundwater recharge areas and highly vulnerable aquifers should be included in the Brampton Plan to conform to the Greenbelt Plan Water Resource System policies, source protection plans approved under the Clean Water Act, policy requirements in the Region of Peel Official Plan and policy direction in the PPS.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System, 2.2.9.99	Revision Requested	Revise/Add/Conformity - Revise the first sentence to include reference to "key hydrologic areas" as shown below. This revision is required to conform to the Greenbelt Plan. "All development and site alteration will be subject to the Natural System policies of the Greenbelt Plan. Within the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System overlay shown on Schedules 6A and 6B, <u>key natural features, and key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas</u> will be protected in accordance with the policies of the Greenbelt Plan, the Region of Peel Official Plan and this Plan." Alternatively, it is recommended that a separate policy addressing the Greenbelt Plan policies 3.2.4.1 and 3.4.2.2 be added to the Brampton Plan in the event that major development, as defined in the Greenbelt Plan, is proposed in the Greenbelt Plan Area.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Surface Water and Groundwater Resources, Preamble	Revision Requested	Add - Preamble indicates that Water Resource System features are shown on Schedule 6B. However, this schedule does not depict all of the Water Resource System components that should be identified and mapped in the Draft Brampton Plan. The CTC Region Source Protection Plan has been approved under the Clean Water Act and identifies significant groundwater recharge areas and highly vulnerable aquifers in Brampton with policy direction that municipalities shall have regard to the policies and mapping in their official plans. Similar references to SGRAs and HVAs should be addressed in the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System section of the Plan in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan. The policies of the Surface Water and Groundwater Resources section of the Draft Brampton Plan should reference the mapping of SGRAs and HVAs in the Plan and include a schedule depicting the areas to support interpretation of the policies of this section. Regional staff suggest this information could be added as a new Schedule 6C. Further discussion with staff is recommended.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Surface Water and Groundwater Resources, 2.2.9.113	Revision Requested	Add/Revise - This policy addresses SGRAs and HVAs but does not indicate where these areas are found in Brampton. Recommend revising the policy as follows and including a new schedule in the Brampton Plan to identify SGRAs and HVAs in accordance with the Clean Water Act, PPS, and Region of Peel Official Plan. "Where development or site alteration is proposed with a significant groundwater recharge area or highly vulnerable aquifer shown on Schedule 6C, a hydrogeological assessment may be required to demonstrate..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Surface Water and Groundwater Resources, 2.2.9.114	Revision Requested	Revise - Change "Highly Vulnerable" to "highly vulnerable aquifers". Recommend reviewing capitalization of terms that are defined in the Plan for consistent formatting.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	2.2 Our Strategy to Build an Urban City, 2.2.9 Natural System, What Do We Want to Achieve?; Watershed and Subwatershed Planning, 2.2.9.169	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise policy as shown, "Identify surface water features, and ground water features and areas, hydrogeologic functions, soil and geological conditions, fluvial sediment transportation regimes, and natural features and areas which are necessary for the ecological and hydrological integrity of the watershed;" The policy should provide direction that subwatershed studies identify water resource areas including significant groundwater recharge areas, ecologically significant groundwater recharge areas, and highly vulnerable aquifers.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Waste Management	Dave Youisif	2.2.8.5.C	Revision Requested	Not clear what the definition of "waste management facilities" is. If one is not included, suggest the following wording: "Waste management facilities: include but are not limited to landfill sites, transfer stations, community recycling centres and waste processing and recovery plants."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana OsojnickiIntermediate Planner	Policy 2.2.3.2 Foster Urban Places	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.3.2: "Centres are or will evolve to become highly mixed-use environment; with housing, services, and amenities serving a wide spectrum of lifestyles such as families, seniors, and young adults... Should state "environments".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana OsojnickiIntermediate Planner	Policy 2.2.7 Neighbourhoods	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.7: "Neighbourhood Centres will be also cluster cultural, community supportive and neighborhood supportive uses where possible into 'hubs' to promote accessibility, social equity and walkability..." Should read "Neighbourhood Centres will also cluster cultural, community supportive, and neighbourhood supportive uses where possible..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana OsojnickiIntermediate Planner	Policy 2.2.6.10 Health Care Facilities	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.6.10: "Medical office space, hospice, long-term care, seniors housing, assisted living, and other supportive uses are encouraged to be located in close proximity to Health Care Facilities to lessen the burden on the Health Care system, subject to the policies in the applicable Secondary Plan." We recommend adding supportive housing to this policy.	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana OsojnickiIntermediate Planner	Policy 2.2.7.55 Long Term Care Facilities	Revision Requested	In addition to the criteria established by policy 2.2.7.55 for determining the suitability of a site for use as a long term care facility, we recommend adding proximity to Health Care Facilities in keeping with policy 2.2.6.10.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.5.5 Where a Corridor overlay overlaps with an Employment or Mixed-Use Employment designations, the Employment and Mixed-Use Employment designation policies prevail.	Revision Requested	RPOP Employment Area policies always prevails over any overlay. Suggest deleting the policy and adding a policy in section "2.2 Employment Areas" outlining that Employment Area policies will always prevail over any overlay or designation in the event of an overlap or conflict and removing similar references through the chapter where employment areas is mentioned	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.4.11 When a Planned Major Transit Station Area is amended to a Primary or Secondary Major Transit Station Area by way of an amendment to the Region of Peel's Official Plan, the Mixed-Use Area designation will then be applied by way of an amendment to this Plan.	Revision Requested	See RPOP Policy 5.8.36. Mixed Use Area designation would only be applied to MTSAs located outside an Employment Area subject to further applicable studies.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8 Mixed-Use Employment areas are clusters of economic activity and provide a broad range of employment and employment-supportive uses, as well as limited opportunities for residential uses only within certain Major Transit Station Areas.	Revision Requested	Residential is not permitted within Mixed Use Employment designation. Suggested policy amendment: 2.2.8 The Mixed-Use Employment designation areas are clusters of economic activity and provide a broad range of employment and employment-supportive uses, as well as limited opportunities for residential uses only within certain Major Transit Station Areas in accordance with the policies in this plan and the Region of Peel Official Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.2 - 2.2.8.5	Revision Requested	The use of the term "Industrial Areas" as a designation in this section is unclear. Suggest meeting with staff.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.4	Revision Requested	See RPOP Policy 5.8.35. Mixed-Use Employment should have direct frontage onto a corridor supported by existing or planned rapid transit and accommodated in a mixed-use office building (among other criteria). Unless arterial roads have transit, Mixed Use Employment designation would not be permitted. Suggested changes: 2.2.8.4 The Mixed-Use Employment designation may permit a broader range of employment uses on lands that provide a land use buffer, as well as transition between Mixed Use Areas, Employment Areas and Neighbourhoods, subject to further planning studies. Development in Mixed-Use Employment Areas will shall front onto and provide address on arterial roads and Rapid Transit corridors to support and integrated land use and transit function of these corridors. The predominant permitted use in the Mixed Use Employment Area designation will shall be employment, with a focus on major office as the predominant use with and may include ground floor commercial uses. encouraged within office buildings.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.5 The following uses are permitted on lands shown as Employment Area on Schedule 5	Revision Requested	"Schedule 5 - Provincial Plans and Policy Areas" contains a PSEZ overlay. Intended reference may be "Schedule 1 - City Structure". Unclear if policy is in reference to "Employment Area" or the "Employment area" designation.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.7	Requires Clarification	Clarification required regarding policy intention.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.8 & 2.2.8.17	Revision Requested	Clarification required regarding policy intention. Policy 2.2.7.56 notes Places of Worship are only permitted in Mixed Use designations.	Comment received - Places of Worship are permitted in Mixed Use and Neighborhoods designations.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services		2.2.8.11	Revision Requested	Suggest referencing "Major Transit Station Area study" section for clarity of what the study entails.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services		2.2.8.14 b)	Revision Requested	RPOP Employment Area policies always prevails over any overlay. Suggest deleting the policy and adding a policy in section "2.2 Employment Areas" outlining that Employment Area policies will always prevail over any overlay or designation in the event of an overlap or conflict and removing similar references through the chapter where employment areas is mentioned.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services		2.2.8.14 c) All types of commercial, commercial recreation, hotels, convention centres, motels, and entertainment uses that support major office employment, including ground floor commercial uses, are encouraged within office buildings.	Revision Requested	See RPOP Policy 5.8.35. Lands designated Mixed Use Employment permit retail and commercial uses provided they are "accommodated in a multi story mixed use office building" Suggested revision: 2.2.8.14 c) All types of Commercial uses such as, commercial recreation, hotels, convention centres, motels, and entertainment uses that support major office employment, including ground floor commercial uses, are encouraged within office buildings. May be considered in multi story mixed use office building in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services		2.2.8.14 d) Retail, restaurant and other service uses may be permitted in these areas to support the function of Employment Areas. Such uses will be located on the periphery of the Mixed-Use Employment designation, adjacent to an arterial road.	Revision Requested	See RPOP Policy 5.8.30 criteria. Suggest the following edits or combining with 2.2.8.14 c): 2.2.8.14 d) Retail, restaurant and other service uses which are below the Major Retail threshold may be permitted in these areas to support the function of Employment Areas. Such uses will be located on the periphery of the Mixed-Use Employment designation, provide a buffer to sensitive land uses to maintain land use compatibility and maintain adjacent to an arterial road.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.16 New major retail developments that include one or more stores totaling 3,000 square metres or more of retail gross floor area or 1,000 square metres for individual units may only be permitted in the Mixed-Use Employment designation through an amendment to this Plan if:	Revision Requested	Major Retail is not permitted in Regional Employment Areas, including the Mixed Use Employment designation. See Policy RPOP Policy 5.8.34. An employment conversion would be required to permit any new Major Retail in an Employment Area, unless already permitted by a designation identified in the Employment Area of a local official plan. Policy should be revised to reflect or reference Brampton/Region employment conversion policies for any new Major Retail proposals in Employment Areas.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.18 Within the Mixed-Use Employment designation, where a Major Transit Station Area Study has been completed and approved through an amendment to this Plan, compatible new residential uses that do not conflict with the main employment uses may be permitted without the need for a Municipal Comprehensive Review process, subject to the relevant policies of this Plan.	Revision Requested	Not all MTSAs have flexible policies. Further studies are required in accordance with RPOP Policy 5.8.36 to introduce non employment uses. If the criteria is met, only mixed-uses would be permitted, not just residential. Suggest listing the MTSAs where the flexible policy would apply under another policy within this section. Other policies throughout can reference this section/ policy if needed. 2.2.8.18 Within the Mixed-Use Employment designation, where a Major Transit Station Area Study has been completed and approved through an amendment to this Plan, compatible new residential uses that do not conflict with the main employment uses may be permitted without the need for a Municipal Comprehensive Review process, subject to the relevant policies of this Plan and the Region of Peel Official Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.19 City-initiated Major Transit Station Area Studies will identify appropriate locations for retail, residential, commercial, and nonancillary uses within the Mixed-Use Employment designation in the applicable Secondary Plan, provided that: a. An overall net increase of jobs planned within the Major Transit Station Area is achieved. b. An employment land use designation is established to protect for major office uses, if appropriate. c. The viability of the surrounding Employment designation is protected from introduced sensitive land uses and includes appropriate mitigation measures and setbacks. d. Will strive to achieve a majority ratio of employment per hectare than population per hectare.	Revision Requested	Policy is missing criteria to permit non-employment uses in a MTTSA located in an Employment Area. Additionally, not all MTSAs located within an Employment Area are subject to RPOP Policy 5.8.36 (HLRT-20 Ray Lawson and HLRT-21 County Court). 5.8.36 Missing Criteria that addresses the following to the satisfaction of the Region: c) land use compatibility in accordance with provincial standards, guidelines, and procedures d) an overall net increase to the total jobs planned for the Employment Area within the delineated boundary; e) how the viability of adjacent Employment Areas will be protected from the impacts of sensitive land uses, including mitigation measures and at the direction of the local municipality, an assessment of various environmental considerations such as impact on local airsheds; f) the mix and ratio of jobs by type (e.g. office, manufacturing, institutional); g) that higher order transit is planned for the Major Transit Station Area within the planning horizon; h) the development of complete communities and transit-supportive densities including employment uses; and i) demonstrate how transit-supportive employment densities will	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	2.2.8.25 The areas designated Employment and Mixed-Use Employment on Schedule 5 are adequate to accommodate growth for the next 30 years based on the growth forecasts established in Part 2.1 of this Plan. On that basis, Brampton Plan does not permit the conversion of lands within Employment Areas to non employment uses over the horizon of this plan, except in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan. If a conversion is supported through a Municipal Comprehensive Review process, the City will advocate for a percentage of these lands to be a mix of affordable or rental housing.	Revision Requested	See RPOP Policy 2.8.29 a). Important to separate lands that are part of Regional Employment Area subject to conversion versus those outside not subject. Suggest adding the following: The Employment Areas in the Region of Peel Official Plan areas designated as Employment and Mixed-Use Employment on Schedule 5 are adequate to accommodate growth for the next 30 years based on the growth forecasts established in Part 2.1 of this Plan. On that basis, Brampton Plan does not permit the conversion of lands within Employment Areas to non employment uses, such as Major Retail, residential, and other sensitive land uses not ancillary to the primary employment use, over the horizon of this plan, except in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan. If a conversion is supported through a Region of Peel Municipal Comprehensive Review process, the City will advocate for a percentage of these lands to be a mix of affordable or rental housing.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services		2.2.8.26 The conversion of lands within Employment Area designation to non-employment uses may only be considered through a Municipal Comprehensive Review undertaken by the Region of Peel, or as part of an MTTSA Study outside of a Municipal Comprehensive Review, that demonstrates that:	Revision Requested	Reference to MTTSA Study is not required in this policy as it's respective criteria under RPOP 5.8.36 is spoken to in Brampton Plan policy 2.2.8.19. 2.2.8.26 The conversion of lands within Employment Area designation to non-employment uses may only be considered through a Municipal Comprehensive Review undertaken by the Region of Peel, or as part of an MTTSA Study outside of a Municipal Comprehensive Review, that demonstrates that:	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/23	TRCA		2.2.8.28.a.	Revision Requested	We recommend adding the policy as follows, "...through appropriate integration of buffers from the Natural System and Natural Hazards."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

2023/08/23	TRCA		2.2.9.58	Revision Requested	While the PPS prohibits development and site alteration in Provincially Significant Wetlands (PPS - 2.1.4) it does not speak to associated buffers. Some flexibility should be provided for development within the 30 metre buffer. For example, minor reductions have been permitted where supported by technical studies prepared to the satisfaction of the City of Brampton and local Conservation Authorities. Flexibility is also needed for existing development/redevelopment	Comment received - this flexibility is covered in policy 2.2.9.60 of the Plan.
2023/08/23	TRCA		2.2.9.60	Revision Requested	A minimum size criterion for wetlands would not seem to be necessary. Given the lack of minimum size criteria under the current policy regime, along with TRCA not identifying minimum sizing related to the regulation, the intent of this policy may be misinterpreted. As such, TRCA staff recommend leaving minimum size criteria out of the OP update.	Comment received.
2023/08/23	TRCA		2.2.9.60	Revision Requested	The requirement to evaluate wetlands can be challenging when portions of the wetland are not within a proponent's ownership and/or access is unavailable. As such, it may be useful to develop policies that would treat all wetlands equally. This would simplify the process related to wetland designation but would likely mean that all wetlands would require a 30-metre buffer. Separate policies could then be created for wetlands that have been determined by Brampton staff to have a lower ecological sensitivity for a buffer reduction, which could be considered on a case-by-case basis. This would allow for the differences in principle of PSW/LSW protections to be implemented without the requirement for an OWES evaluation.	Comment received - accommodating for different sensitivity levels of wetlands is addressed through the requirement for an unevaluated wetland to be evaluated by a qualified persons in policy 2.2.9.32.
2023/08/23	TRCA	Adam Miller, Associate Director Development Planning and Permits	Natural Heritage System 2.2.9.32 (c)	Revision Requested	We note that a hierarchical approach should be applied when considering off-setting/compensation policies. We recommend policy 2.2.9.32 (c) states that if mitigating impacts is not possible, removal/compensation measures may be considered in consultation with local Conservation Authorities.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Employment Areas	Policy 2.2.5.5 and 2.2.5.11.a and other similar policies that speak to which policies "prevail".	RPOP Employment Area mapping and policies always prevail. Throughout Chapter 2 there is referencing of "prevailing" policies. It's important to make clear that Employment Area policies and mapping under the RPOP will always prevail. A general policy can be added to "2.2 Employment Areas" outlining that notwithstanding any policies in this plan, Employment Area policies and mapping will always prevail over any overlay in the event of an overlap or conflict.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
09/29/2023	Kaneff	Kevin Freeman	Mississauga Road Corridor	2.2.9.58	Draft policy 2.2.9.58 continues to state that "development and site alteration will not be permitted in Provincially Significant Wetlands and associated 30 metre buffers". We respectfully request that the policy language be revised for consistency with the PPS to allow for development within the 30m PSW buffer where it has been justified and supported through the submission of an Environmental Impact Study.	Comment received - this flexibility is covered in policy 2.2.9.60 of the Plan.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Street Network, pg 2-36	Revision Requested	Remove the picture that shows the multi-modal pyramid. This picture implies the importance of each transportation mode whereas the text in that section speaks to the value of multi-modal planning. The pyramid shows singular modal use in a hierarchy that may not correspond to the text.	Comment received.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.2	Revision Requested	The building typology images need to be revised to reflect the policies.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.3.5	Revision Requested	In addition to secondary plans, permitted land uses should also be determined through precinct planning. "...Other uses may be permitted in, as determined through the respective Secondary Plan and Precinct Plans."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.6.18	Revision Requested	The designation of <u>new</u> mixed-use commercial sites will be conducted through a Secondary-Level Plan, as determined by a Market Study to identify the appropriate amount of commercial space required to be maintained on the site.	Comment received - mixed-use commercial sites will ensure protection of existing commercial areas and allow the evolution of a mix of uses to come there, as well as enable new mixed-use commercial sites
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.7	Revision Requested	The image showing 5-minute walk should be removed and only show the 15-minute walking neighbourhoods.	Comment received.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.7.4. b	Revision Requested	Strike out text is unclear "Massing, scale and height of the dwellings or building additions should be consistent with the host neighbourhood, the geographic area equivalent of roughly a 5-10 minute walk from the subject site."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.7.4. h	Revision Requested	The City should confer with Bill 23 to ensure that this policy is consistent since site plan requirement may exempt for ARU's in Bill 23.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.7.12. c	Revision Requested	The two images are not clear and seems to be the same image.	Comment received - the image demonstrates the level of access expected for lower-order and higher-order streets. The lower-order street shows multiple access points for properties along the street, whereas the higher-order street does not.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.7.30	Revision Requested	It is not clear from this policy if a gas station with a convenience store is not considered a stand-alone use. If not, this policy needs to be revised since as is, a gas station will not be permitted in Brampton.	Comment received - the policy does not state that stand-alone Motor Vehicle Commercial is not permitted, but that it is discouraged. Ideally, MVC would be integrated with surrounding uses as referenced in policy.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.8.16	Revision Requested	New major retail developments should not be subject to an OPA since Schedule 2 of the Official Plan does not have a land use designation called 'Major Retail' so it is not clear what would be the intent of an Official Plan Amendment. "New major retail developments that include one or more stores totaling 3,000 square metres or more of retail gross floor area or 1,000 square metres for individual units may only be permitted in the Mixed-Use Employment designation through an amendment to this Plan if: and in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan if:"	Comment received - Major Retail is not identified as a land use, but rather as a permitted use within the Mixed-use Employment land use that requires an Official Plan Amendment if over the size threshold identified in policy.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	2.2.9.164	Revision Requested	for consistency and clarity: "All infrastructure within the Natural System of the Greenbelt will be required to comply with the policies of the Greenbelt Plan. Stormwater management facility is permitted in the Greenbelt outside of the Key Natural Heritage Feature."	Comment received - stormwater management facilities are infrastructure, and all infrastructure must comply with policies of the Greenbelt Plan. The Greenbelt Plan covers where infrastructure may or may not be permitted within the Greenbelt.
2023/10/02	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler	2.2.8.16	Revision Requested	As per our previous comment letter, we continue to request that a policy be added that recognizes existing shopping centres and ensures their ability to expand and develop over time without being subject to Policy 2.2.8.16. We understand that the intent behind this policy may be to encourage more mixed uses or smaller commercial units. However, shopping centres are carefully planned by their operators to ensure an attractive mix of store types and sizes that complement one another and serve the intended market. This market changes over time resulting in changes to demand in the types and sizes of commercial establishments. Shopping centres must be able to respond to such changes in short order. This is particularly crucial to existing planned shopping centres such as the 410/Steeles Lands which were planned on the basis of not have gross floor area caps. We request that the following policy be added to clarify that Policy 2.2.8.16 does not affect new buildings within existing shopping centres. <i>Policy 2.2.8.16 does not apply to development within existing shopping centres</i>	Comment received - this policy does not affect new buildings within existing shopping centers. It only applies to new major retail developments, as is referenced in the policy.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.3	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.3 for the Centres states, "Bramalea GO will build upon the Bramalea GO Station, and its location along the Kitchener-Toronto Innovation Corridor to attract residents and offices, to support the thriving employment area." In our submission, "residents and offices" should be revised to "residents and employment uses, including offices," for consistency with the Revised Draft MTSA policies considered by Planning Committee on August 28, 2023	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.3.1	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.3.1 states, "Each Urban Centre and Town Centre will be subject to a Secondary Plan or Major Transit Station Area study, which will establish a vision for each Centre." We note that the lands at 379 Orenda Road are identified within the Bramalea GO MTSA and the Brampton Mobility Hub Secondary Plan Area (#9). Similar to our comments above, we request clarification as to whether the City's ongoing MTSA Project for MTSA's including Bramalea GO represents the MTSA study referenced in the policy, or if further studies are contemplated to establish the land use vision in these areas. In addition, we request clarity on the applicability of policies for land that are identified within both a Secondary Plan and Major Transit Station Area	Comment received - the ongoing MTSA study is the study referenced in this policy, which will include future amendments to the Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan to implement detailed MTSA policies.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.3.3.b	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.3.3.b states, "Prioritize Sustainable Mobility. Centres will encourage comfortable and enjoyable active transportation facilities, especially with direct connections to Rapid Transit stations, while discouraging uses, site design and building forms that create reliance on private automobiles." For Centres that are overlaid on Employment Areas, we request clarification that the redevelopment or expansion of existing employment uses will not be discouraged, and that opportunities for infill on these lands in these intersections will be maintained	Comment received - policy 2.1.2.38 clarifies that Employment area policies and mapping prevail over any overlay in the event of a conflict. This sufficiently addresses the concerns with Centres overlaid on Employment areas, and the continued permissions to redevelop and expand existing employment uses.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.3.16	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.3.16, states "Each Urban Centre and Town Centre will be subject to a Secondary Plan, in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan ..." Similar to our comments above, we request clarification as to whether the City's ongoing MTSA Project for MTSA's including Bramalea GO represents the "additional planning studies" referenced in the policy or if further studies are contemplated	Comment received - the ongoing MTSA study is the study referenced in this policy, which will include future amendments to the Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan to implement detailed MTSA policies.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.4.4	Recommendation	Policy 2.2.4.4 states "Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will redevelop as higher density mixed-use areas, focusing on residential and employment intensification for the existing Community and Employment Areas respectively, that they overlay." With the Draft Official Plan intended to be implemented over the long term, we suggest that "over the long term" be added before "will";	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.4.9	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.4.9 states "Development along either side of Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will achieve a high level of design excellence in conformity with the Urban Design policies of this Plan [to]: ... i) Offer a variety of formal and informal gathering spaces through the provision of recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community services." In our submission, "where appropriate" should be added before "offer a variety", since the formal and informal gathering spaces may not be appropriate under all circumstances, including for Employment Areas	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.4.9	Recommendation	Policy 2.2.4.9 continues, "p) On large lots, establish a grid-pattern of public streets and publicly accessible mid-block pedestrian connections, or in special circumstances private streets, to create smaller human-scaled blocks to facilitate development and/or redevelopment over time." We suggest "where appropriate" be added before "On large lots," since a grid-pattern of public streets and publicly accessible mid-block pedestrian connections may not be appropriate under all circumstances, including for Employment Areas	Comment received - the recognition of what is feasible on a site-by-site basis would be a consideration when implementing this policy.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.4.10	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.4.10 states, "The Zoning By-law, together with Site Plan Control, and other regulatory tools as appropriate, will include requirements for maximum lot coverage, minimum landscaped area, minimum lot size, building setbacks, height, front and side yard setbacks, massing, floor area, roofline, materials, as appropriate ..." for lands along Urban Boulevards. In our submission, "materials" should be deleted	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.4.15	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.4.15 states "Lands within Primary Major Transit Station Areas will be developed in accordance with the applicable Secondary-Level Plan designation to generally meet the following objectives: ..." We request confirmation as to whether the policies are intended to be updated to reflect the City's ongoing MTSA Project, for which we provided comments dated August 22, 2023 on behalf of Choice, and request clarity on the applicability of policies for lands that are identified within both a Secondary Plan and Major Transit Station Area;	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document. Secondary Plans will be updated to provide detailed policies for each MTSA, in accordance with Brampton Plan MTSA policies and schedules.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.6.16	Clarification Requested	"Policy 2.2.6.16 states, "Commercial sites are designated as Mixed-Use on Schedule 2 to permit residential uses as an alternative to, or to support, existing retail space and to implement the goals of this Plan." Policy 2.2.6.17 states, "Mixed-use commercial sites have been designated as Mixed-Use on Schedule 2 and require additional studies to ensure their long-term preservation of commercial and retail functions." We request clarity on the anticipated timing and the intended scope of these studies, and whether opportunities for infill or expansion for existing commercial-only sites will be protected"	Comment received - anticipated studies will be completed either through secondary level planning studies or where redevelopment applications come in ahead of city-initiated studies, there would be a requirement that the relevant commercial function is determined and maintained through a market study. This will help determine opportunities for infill or expansion for existing commercial sites, new commercial sites, and a greater mix of uses (non-commercial).
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.7.4	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.7.4 states, "Unless located within a Centre, Boulevard or Corridor overlay identified in Schedule 1, redevelopment within Mature Neighbourhoods indicated on Schedule 12, will have additional consideration for the following: ..." We request clarity as to the intent and purpose of applying the Mature Neighbourhoods overlay to lands that are located within a Centre, Boulevard, or Corridor overlay, and/or for lands designated Employment Areas	Comment received - the Mature Neighbourhoods policies apply in areas outside other overlays; where Mature Neighbourhoods intersect with other overlays (e.g., Centre, Boulevard, Corridor, etc.), the other overlay and/or MTSA policies will apply.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.1.2.a and 2.2.1.2.d	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.1.2.a) states "The Urban Centre and Town Centre are conceptual overlays which indicate the City's principal locations for growth, accommodate important regional amenities, and provide for the greatest mix of uses, intensity, form, and scale in Brampton. The exact boundaries for these areas will be determined through their respective Secondary Plan processes", and Policy 2.2.1.2.d) states "Within the Planned Major Transit Station Area overlay, development will be limited until a Precinct Plan is in place to guide development and to protect the area for transit-supportive densities, uses and active transportation connections. We request clarification as to whether the City's MTSA Project for MTSA's including Bramalea GO represents the Secondary Plan process referenced in the policy or if further studies are contemplated.	Comment received - Bramalea GO is not a planned MTSA, it is a Primary MTSA, and this policy is not applicable. At this time, there are no further studies contemplated within Primary MTSA's.
10/02/2023	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	2.2.4. (p. 2-47 & 2-48)	Revision Requested	Boulevard Descriptions should be modified reflect their limits as illustrated on Schedule 1 City Structure. Primary Urban Boulevards: Queen Street, through Downtown to Bramalea Road Between Mississauga Road and Bramalea Road Huronario/Main Street, through Uptown and Downtown South of Downtown Steeles Avenue, through Uptown to Bramalea Road Between McLaughlin Road and Bramalea Road Secondary Urban Boulevards: Queen Street East, east of Bramalea Road Between Bramalea Road and Highway 50 Steeles Avenue, west of McLaughlin Road, and between Highway 410 and Torbram Road Bramalea Road and Torbram Road	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	Table 5 (p. 2-37)	Clarification Requested	Table 5 Summary of Building Typologies by Designation and Overlay indicates that for various designations "additional planning studies" may be required to "identify appropriate locations for Low-Rise Plus, Mid-Rise, and High-Rise buildings". We request clarification as to whether the City's MTSA Project for MTSA's including Bramalea GO represents the "additional planning studies" referenced in the policy or if further studies are contemplated. In addition, we request clarification for the "Support Corridor" designation and what is intended for the "Up to Low-Rise Plus", since there is no lower category than "Low-Rise" and there are no "additional permissions" indicated	Comment received - the Low Rise Plus category permits up to and including 4 full storeys, as detailed in Table 4. The "additional planning studies" in this policy makes reference to the ongoing MTSA study.

10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.3	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.3 for the Centres states "Bramalea GO will build upon the Bramalea GO Station, and its location along the Kitchener-Toronto Innovation Corridor to attract residents and offices, to support the thriving employment area." In our submission, "residents and offices" should be revised to "residents and employment uses, including offices";	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.3.1	Revision Requested	Policy 2.2.3.1 states "Each Urban Centre and Town Centre will be subject to a Secondary Plan or Major Transit Station Area study, which will establish a vision for each Centre." Similar to our comments above, we request clarification as to whether the City's ongoing MTSA Project for MTSA's including Bramalea GO represents the "additional planning studies" referenced in the policy or if further studies are contemplated. In addition, we request clarification as to there are circumstances where there will be both a Secondary Plan and Major Transit Station Area study	Comment received - the ongoing MTSA study will include future amendments to the applicable secondary plans, to implement detailed policies for each MTSA
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.3.3.b	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.3.3.b states "Prioritize Sustainable Mobility. Centres will encourage comfortable and enjoyable active transportation facilities, especially with direct connections to Rapid Transit stations, while discouraging uses, site design and building forms that create reliance on private automobiles." For Centres that are overlaid upon Employment Areas, we request clarification that employment uses such as warehousing will not be discouraged	Comment received - policy 2.1.2.38 clarifies that Employment area policies and mapping prevail over any overlay in the event of a conflict. This sufficiently addresses the concerns with Centers overlaid on Employment areas, and the continued permissions to redevelop and expand existing employment uses.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.3.5	Request for Revision and Clarification	Policy 2.2.3.5 (formerly 2.2.7) states "The following uses may be permitted within Urban Centres and Town Centres as shown on Schedule 1: a. A broad range of uses in keeping with the Mixed-Use designation, including but not limited to residential, commercial, office, cultural, major and local institutional, hospitality, entertainment, recreational and other related uses may be permitted. Other uses may be permitted, as determined through the respective Secondary Plan ... d. New parking facilities within Centres will be integrated within buildings and structures. Parking may also be facilitated on street. Where the land use of an existing mall site is transitioning, surface parking may be permitted on a case-by-case basis." In the Response to our comments for the First Draft Official Plan, Staff note "Comment Addressed - existing permissions will continue. However, if they are within an overlay, redevelopment will require conformity with Brampton Plan. If lands are within an MTSA in an employment area, the Mixed use Employment designation will prevail and continue to permit employment uses. The Mixed Use Employment have been updated as part of the second draft release, please review and provide comments if further clarity is required." For the Canadian Tire Lands that are shown on Schedule 1 as Employment Areas and shown on Schedule 2 as split designated Mixed-Use Employment (at the southwest quadrant of Steeles and Bramalea) and Employment, we request clarification as to the designated Mixed-Use Employment and suggest that clarity be	Comment received - the Town Center designation is applicable to both the Mixed-Use Employment and Employment designated lands within it. The specific context in each center will be evaluated through subsequent studies to ensure land use compatibility, appropriate transition and sufficient protections for employment uses will be evaluated as part of that work.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.3.11 & 2.2.3.13	Request for Revision and Clarification	Policy 2.2.3.11 states Growth and development within Urban and Town Centres will primarily occur through redevelopment and intensification, comprised of compact, high-quality buildings. Growth and development will contribute to vibrancy, and high quality urban living within Centres by: ..." and Policy 2.2.3.13 States "For development proposed on large lots, a grid-pattern of public streets and publicly accessible mid-block pedestrian connections or in special circumstances private streets, will create smaller human-scaled blocks to facilitate development and/or redevelopment over time." In the context of the policies, for the Canadian Tire Lands that are shown on Schedule 1 as Employment Areas and shown on Schedule 2 as split designated Mixed-Use Employment (at the southwest quadrant of Steeles and Bramalea) and Employment, we request clarification as to whether the Town Centre designation is only applicable to the lands designated Mixed-Use Employment. In addition, in our submission for Policy 2.2.3.13 "will create" should be changed to "should create" to provide for flexibility to account for context and operational aspects	Comment received - the Town Center designation is applicable to both the Mixed-Use Employment and Employment designated lands within it. The specific context in each center will be evaluated through subsequent studies to ensure land use compatibility, appropriate transition and sufficient protections for employment uses will be evaluated as part of that work.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.3.16	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.3.16 states "Each Urban Centre and Town Centre will be subject to a Secondary Plan, in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan, that will: ..." Similar to our comments above, we request clarification as to whether the City's ongoing MTSA Project for MTSA's including Bramalea GO represents the "additional planning studies" referenced in the policy or if further studies are contemplated	Comment received - the ongoing MTSA study is the study referenced in this policy, which will include future amendments to the Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan to implement detailed MTSA policies.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.4	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.4 for Boulevards states "The framework for new development on each Boulevard will be established by Secondary-Level Plans and City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines created in consultation with the local community." Similar to our comments above, we request clarification as to whether the City's ongoing MTSA Project for MTSA's including Bramalea GO represents the "additional planning studies" referenced in the policy or the scope of additional studies that are contemplated	Comment received - the ongoing MTSA study is the study referenced in this policy, which will conclude with the implementation of zoning by-laws and design guidelines for all the Primary MTSA's.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.4.3	Clarification Requested	Policy 2.2.4.3 states "The following policies apply to Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards shown on Schedule 1: a. A broad range of residential, retail, office, cultural, institutional, hospitality, entertainment, recreational and other related uses may be permitted. Residential uses may only be permitted on lands designated Mixed-Use Employment in accordance with the policies for the Mixed-Use Employment designation within certain Major Transit Station Areas, subject to the outcomes of the respective Major Transit Station Area study. ... g. The design of new development will consolidate and where achievable, relocate parking and service areas underground or to where they are not visible from streets and pedestrian areas. New accessory surface parking lots along Primary Urban Boulevards will be discouraged and will not be permitted to front along a Primary Urban Boulevard. h. Single use buildings are permitted on portions of the Secondary Urban Boulevard that are not within delineated Centres." We request clarification as to the applicability of Secondary Urban Boulevard overlay where there is an underlying designation is Employment Areas and the permitted uses would include single-use warehouse uses and associated parking, such as those proposed for the Canadian Tire Lands under the Phase 1 application for Site Plan approval	Comment received - the policies in section 2.2.4 detail the permitted uses for Boulevards and MTSA's.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.4.4	Recommendation	Policy 2.2.4.4 states "Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will redevelop as higher density mixed-use areas, focusing on residential and employment intensification for the existing Community and Employment Areas respectively, that they overlay." With the Draft Official Plan intended to be implemented over the long term, we suggest that "over the long term" be added before "will"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.4.9	Revision Requested	<p>Policy 2.2.4.9 states "Development along either side of Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will achieve a high level of design excellence in conformity with the Urban Design policies of this Plan, including relevant Secondary-Level Plans, and in accordance with the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines and area specific Urban Design Guidelines, to: ...</p> <p>i) Offer a variety of formal and informal gathering spaces through the provision of recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community-led services ... p) On large lots, establish a grid-pattern of public streets and publicly accessible mid-block pedestrian connections, or in special circumstances private streets, to create smaller human-scaled blocks to facilitate development and/or redevelopment over time."</p> <p>In our submission, for i) "where appropriate" should be added before "offer a variety", since the formal and informal gathering spaces may not be appropriate under all circumstances, including for Employment Areas and for p) "where appropriate" should be added before "On large lots" since a grid-pattern of public streets and publicly accessible mid-block pedestrian connections may not be appropriate under all circumstances, including for Employment Areas</p>	Comment received - the recognition of what is feasible on a site-by-site basis would be a consideration when implementing this policy.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.4.10	Revision Requested	<p>Policy 2.2.4.10 states "The Zoning By-law, together with Site Plan Control, and other regulatory tools as appropriate, will include requirements for maximum lot coverage, minimum landscaped area, minimum lot size, building setbacks, height, front and side yard setbacks, massing, floor area, roofline, materials, as appropriate, having regard for: ..." In our submission, "materials" should be deleted</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.4.15	Clarification Requested	<p>Policy 2.2.4.15 states "Lands within Primary Major Transit Station Areas will be developed in accordance with the applicable Secondary-Level Plan designation to generally meet the following objectives: ..." We request confirmation as to whether the policies are intended to be updated to reflect the MTSA Project, for which we provided comments dated August 22, 2023 on behalf of Canadian Tire (see Appendix A)</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	2.2.4.19	Revision Requested	<p>Policy 2.2.4.19 states "Where new development includes parking as an accessory use, such parking will be located mainly underground or, if within the principal building, not fronting a public street." In our submission "will" should be changed to "should" in order to provide for flexibility to account for site context and operational aspects, including for employment uses</p>	Comment received.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.6.16	Clarification Requested	<p>Policy 2.2.6.16 states, "Commercial sites are designated as Mixed-Use on Schedule 2 to permit residential uses as an alternative to, or to support, existing retail space and to implement the goals of this Plan." Policy 2.2.6.17 states, "Mixed-use commercial sites have been designated as Mixed-Use on Schedule 2 and require additional studies to ensure their long-term preservation of commercial and retail functions." We request clarity on the anticipated timing and the intended scope of these studies, and whether opportunities for infill or expansion for existing commercial-only sites will be protected</p>	Comment received - anticipated studies will be completed either through Secondary-level planning studies or where redevelopment applications come in ahead of city-initiated studies, there would be a requirement that the relevant commercial function is determined and maintained through a market study. This will help determine opportunities for infill or expansion for existing commercial sites, new commercial sites, and a greater mix of uses (non-commercial).
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.4.9	Revision Requested	<p>Policy 2.2.4.9 states "Development along either side of Primary and Secondary Urban Boulevards will achieve a high level of design excellence in conformity with the Urban Design policies of this Plan [to]: ... i) Offer a variety of formal and informal gathering spaces through the provision of recreation open spaces, city parks, urban plazas, and community-led services." In our submission, "where appropriate" should be added before "offer a variety", since the formal and informal gathering spaces may not be appropriate under all circumstances</p>	Comment received - the recognition of what is feasible on a site-by-site basis would be a consideration when implementing this policy.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	2.2.4.10	Revision Requested	<p>Policy 2.2.4.10 states, "The Zoning By-law, together with Site Plan Control, and other regulatory tools as appropriate, will include requirements for maximum lot coverage, minimum landscaped area, minimum lot size, building setbacks, height, front and side yard setbacks, massing, floor area, roofline, materials, as appropriate ..." for lands along Urban Boulevards. In our submission, "materials" should be deleted</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 3)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Sarah Powell, Health Planning Facilitator	Section 3.5.2	Revision Requested	Section 3.5.2.1- in addition to this text- could you also include that objectives of the Healthy Development Framework will be incorporated into the design and planning for the entire municipality?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Kayle McMillen, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.4.2	Revision Requested	<p>3.4.2 Sustainable Mobility Walking (3.4.2.8): Consider including a statement that would encourage new residential developments to provide pedestrian easements or MUPs to connect people to the surrounding AT network in a direct and convenient way.</p> <p>Goods movement 3.4.1.20 or Vision Zero section 3.4.3.2 Consider adding a statement that would ensure safety considerations (i.e. intersections and off ramps) are integrated into the planning of high trucking areas to protect vulnerable road users from potential conflicts.</p> <p>Micromobility and Emerging Technologies 3.4.2.38 Consider adding a statement such as ""The City will develop regulations and policies to support the safety of micromobility users (i.e. speed caps, helmet use)."" *Matt might have already made a similar comment"</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Sebastian van Gilst, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.3.1.2a	Clarification Requested	How will the housing targets "be encouraged"? Will there be an incentive program? "50% of all new housing be encouraged to be affordable to low-income households and 50% moderate-income households"	Comment received - Housing targets are encouraged through comments provided on development applications and incentive programs.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Sebastian van Gilst, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.3.1.3	Recommendation	This is great! I would recommend the City be more explicit in how often (or when) they will "...review and update targets for market and non-market housing" and be more specific regarding the targets for shelters and transitional housing will be.	Comment received - Targets for market and non-market housing will be updated through the Secondary-level planning process.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Sebastian van Gilst, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.3.1.9	Revision Requested	This is wonderful and needed! As above, it would be great if the language was more specific as to a minimum (or maximum) amount of additional land that the City is aiming to acquire to meet needs of residents	Comment received - this will be specified through the Secondary-level planning process.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Sebastian van Gilst, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.3.1.25	Clarification Requested	How much is "...an appropriate amount of affordable housing is provided.."? It might be beneficial, for clarity, to be more explicit and possibly quantify this.	Comment received - the City-wide Housing Needs Assessment will help identify this as well as the Housing Assessment Reports conducted through Secondary Level planning process.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Sebastian van Gilst, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.3.1.28	Clarification Requested	How will the City "...encourage..." energy savings strategies? Is there an incentive program planned?	Comment received - This will be done through incentives and development application commenting. As stated, this policy is connected to the energy efficiency policies in the Sustainability and Climate Change section of the Plan.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Sebastian van Gilst, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.3.1.29	Clarification Requested	How will the City "...encourage..." the utilization of Regionally owned land and buildings for affordable housing? It would be important to be more specific in the language around this policy	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health-Built Environment	Matthew Aymar, Research & Policy Analyst	Section 3.4.35	Statement	Great to see a section on transportation equity! You may find the Victoria Transportation Institute's resource for Evaluating Transportation Equity entitled 'Guidance for Incorporating Distributional Impacts in Transport Planning' to be helpful: https://www.vtpi.org/equity.pdf	Comment received
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1	Revision Requested	Grammar edit (removes s in "meets"): Brampton needs a significant and diverse supply of housing in order to meet its growth projections, as well as offering greater housing choices that meet the needs of Brampton residents.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1 Housing Targets	Revision Requested	Paragraph seems wordy. Could be split into two?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	Table 1 - - Brampton Housing Targets 2021-2026 Ownership	Revision Requested	Could we change "Region of Peel" as method to achieve new ownership housing that is affordable to low income households? Perhaps say "Service Manager"?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	3.3.1.4	Revision Requested	"aim to establish" targets for housing typologies... recommend stronger/more decisive language "will establish"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1.7	Revision Requested	Wonder if there is an opportunity here to reference addressing barriers facing marginalized groups and creating equity.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	3.3.1.7	Revision Requested	Housing Services supports this policy; recommend slight wording adjustment - "Allowing all designations that include residential uses to <u>permit</u> emergency shelters"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1.9	Revision Requested	In addition to acquiring surplus lands, could also collaborate to co-locate housing on these lands without changing ownership.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	3.3.1.10	Revision Requested	The City will support the Peel Housing Corporation <u>and the Service Manager for housing</u> in the provision of affordable housing <u>on Peel Housing Corporation lands</u> . No amendment to this Plan or to the City's Zoning By-law will be required <u>for-to undertake development or redevelopment on lands owned by the Peel Housing Corporation, Region of Peel as Service Manager or any successor agency to undertake development</u> on a temporary or permanent basis.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1.17	Revision Requested	Consider adding language that prioritizes locations with convenient access to existing or planned transit.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1.20	Revision Requested	opportunity here to reference inclusion and equity and voices of marginalized groups?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	3.3.1.23	Revision Requested	In addition to references to Region of Peel, add references to Service Manager (with respect to donation of land/units) - to acknowledge dissolution to the best of our ability	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	3.3.1.24	Revision Requested	Recommend adding "Details regarding housing affordability targets and site opportunities" or words to the effect to the list of what the guidelines may specify	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	Page 3-109	Revision Requested	Suggest "Region of Peel Official Plan" instead of Region of Peel?: Within the context of Brampton Plan, affordable rental housing and affordable home ownership are defined by the Region of Peel.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	3.3.1.27	Revision Requested	should "maximum affordability term" actually be "minimum affordability term"?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1.29	Revision Requested	Consider changing the word "encourage" to be "collaborate with" such that the sentence reads "The City will collaborate with the Region to utilize the inventory of Regionally owned land and buildings to identify opportunities for the development of affordable housing."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	Pages 3-116 to 3-119	Suggestion	Opportunity to encourage affordability of ARUs? And incorporating language around: option of ARU rough-ins, including providing separate entrances, fire and safety requirements (such as fire separation of separate entrance), larger basement windows, and adequate ceiling heights as part of pre-construction sales. Where feasible, design elements to accommodate future safe, legal, and livable ARUs should be considered. Opportunity to support retrofits of existing units to support/create ARUs?	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	3.3.1.65	Statement	Region supports this policy	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 3.3.1.4	Clarification Requested	There is an additional town centre identified in Brampton Plan around the Mount Pleasant MTA than what is noted in Schedule E-2 of the RPOP that identifies nodes/centres. In the RPOP, nodes/centres are identified differently than the MTAs, and sometimes there is overlap. Many of the same policies apply. Clarification requested on the inclusion of an additional Node/Town Centre in the Brampton Plan.	Comment received - identified by public through vision process that this is an important node in brampton.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 3.1.1.8	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "To promote and strengthen the identity and character of the city, Design Priority Areas. These areas will be differentiated from the remainder of the City to recognize the different contexts they might represent across the City Structure..." The first sentence is unclear. Is something missing? Also, "areas" should be lowercase in the second sentence.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 3.3.1.14 (c)	Clarification Requested	"The supply of relatively affordable missing middle housing is supported in low-rise and low-rise plus built forms, such as Additional Residential Units, multiplexes, multi-tenant housing and small apartments, in order to support the evolution of healthy walkable 15-minute neighbourhoods by: c. Discouraging new low-rise housing forms within Major Transit Station Areas, Town Centres, Boulevards and Corridors." It is confusing how discouraging new low-rise development within Strategic Growth Areas supports the supply of relatively affordable missing middle housing in low-rise and low-rise plus built forms. This policy may need to be reworded.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 3.3.1.14 (c) and elsewhere	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - Suggest capitalizing "Low-Rise" and "Low-Rise Plus" when referring to the building typology defined by the Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 3.4.2.48	Revision Requested	"Minimum parking requirements may be eliminated, and maximum parking limits and shared parking requirements may be established by the Zoning By-law, in Centres, Boulevards, and Major Transit Station Areas and other areas determined by Council." Instead of "determined by Council", we suggest stating "determined by the City" or "through staff recommendations and Council endorsement", as recommendations from staff would precede Council making decisions about parking regulations.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 3.6.1.15	Revision Requested	Consider revisions below supporting intensification as it related to RPOP 5.6.17.10. 3.6.1.15 The remediation, development, redevelopment and adaptive reuse or infill of contaminated lands, brownfield and greyfield sites will be encouraged to support intensification in accordance with the Human-Made Hazards policies of this Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Wayne Koethe	Wastewater pg 3-55	Revision Requested	This section should reference the "Region's Water and Wastewater Master Plan for the Lake-Based System" similar to draft City policy 3.2.6.10 b.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Section 3.1 Nurturing Strong and Connected Communities, Sustainability: A Green City, 3.1.1.5	Revision Requested	Revise - Correction in the reference to the Sustainability and Climate Change policies. Suggest rewording to: "...support renewable and low-carbon energy systems, and ensure wise use of materials and resources at-per in accordance with the Sustainability and Climate Change policies of this Plan."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Section 3.1 Nurturing Strong and Connected Communities, Sustainability: A Green City, 3.1.1.6 a.	Revision Requested	Revise - Recommend including "promoting use of high albedo surface materials" in the list of ways that the City will minimize urban heat island impacts. E.g. "Minimizing the urban heat island impacts of paved surfaces, large roof surfaces, and other hardscape areas by contributing to the urban forest through tree plantings, <u>promoting use of high albedo (cool) surface materials</u> , incorporating enhanced softscape landscape treatments and providing on-site parks and open spaces;"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	Section 3.1 Nurturing Strong and Connected Communities, City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines, 3.1.1.15 i.	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g., "Require sensitive design that supports protection, restoration, and enhancement of the <u>Natural System environment</u> ; and,"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	Section 3.1 Nurturing Strong and Connected Communities, Streets and Blocks, 3.1.1.22 f.	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise for clarity and so that language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g., "Support the protection of and minimize impacts to the <u>natural-heritage-system-and-water-resource-system Natural System's features</u> and their functions <u>and incorporate the Natural Heritage System into future land use planning</u> ." The clause 'and incorporate the Natural Heritage System into future land use planning' is unclear and possibly unnecessary if the direction is included in Chapter 2 or in the policies addressing secondary planning, precinct planning and area planning.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	Section 3.1 Nurturing Strong and Connected Communities, Landmarks, Views and Skylines, 3.1.1.33	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "When a development includes parks, <u>the natural-heritage-system features within the Natural System</u> and open space uses, the street network will be designed in a manner that provides views and access to these features."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change; Plan, Implement, Engage, and Monitor, 3.2.1.8. k.	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "Identification, protection, restoration and enhancement of <u>natural-heritage Natural System</u> features and areas that have become more sensitive to development pressures due to climate change."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.2 Green Communities, Second paragraph	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "protected and connect <u>natural-heritage-Natural System</u> features, local food production, and circular economies."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.2 Green Communities, Third paragraph	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "Through the preservation of the <u>Natural-Heritage-System</u> and..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.2 Green Communities, 3.2.2.1 e.	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "Protection, restoration and enhancement of the <u>Natural System-natural-heritage-system</u> and urban forest, and ecosystem connectivity;"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.2 Green Communities, 3.2.2.1 e.	Revision Requested	Revise - Review and confirm terms used to differentiate the Natural System and its subcomponents so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "The protection, restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System will be promoted to improve air and water quality."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.6 Civic Infrastructure, Wastewater, 3.2.6.16 a.	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "Appropriate protection, conservation and mitigation of the <u>Natural heritage System's</u> features, functions, and linkages in which sanitary sewerage facilities may be located;"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.6 Civic Infrastructure, Stormwater Management, 3.2.6.25 (NEW)	Revision Requested	Add/Conformity - Add the following new policy between 3.2.6.24 and 3.2.6.25, to address conformity with the Regional Official Plan Policy 2.6.20.20 that stormwater generated by other road authorities are considered and comprehensively managed when planning new development, " <u>Policy 3.2.6.25 The City will ensure that stormwater drainage from road and highway infrastructure under the jurisdiction of other road authorities will be considered and comprehensively managed during the development of stormwater management plans for new development.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.6 Civic Infrastructure, Stormwater Management, 3.2.6.28	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. Is this referring to the designation on Schedule 2? "Stormwater management facilities should not be located within the natural heritage system and/or within significant natural heritage features. In limited circumstances, stormwater management facilities may be located adjacent to, but not within, natural <u>system heritage</u> -features, where..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.6 Civic Infrastructure, Stormwater Management, 3.2.6.30	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan.. E.g. "Where stormwater management facilities are proposed adjacent to <u>natural heritage-Natural System</u> features, an Environmental Implementation Report is required to demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on the feature or its ecological function in accordance with the Natural <u>Heritage</u> System policies of this Plan. These facilities (e.g., quantity, quality, erosion, infiltration, etc.) should be oriented, designed and constructed to contribute to and complement the adjacent natural heritage features, functions and linkages. These facilities will be naturalized to complement the adjacent natural features and area."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.6 Civic Infrastructure; Power, Telecommunications, and Other Cabled Services, 3.2.6.47	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "Telecommunication facilities are permitted in all land use designations except where, but not limited to, such factors as land use compatibility, <u>natural-heritage-locations where Natural System</u> features or environmental considerations would otherwise preclude such an installation."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.6 Civic Infrastructure, Integrated Waste Management, 3.2.6.56 d	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "The protection of the <u>Natural Heritage System</u> ;"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	3.2 Sustainability and Climate Change, 3.2.6 Civic Infrastructure, Mineral Aggregate Resources, 3.2.6.62	Revision Requested	Revise - add the word "in" after "Provincial Greenbelt Plan Area". E.g. "Shale extraction is permitted, without amendment to Brampton Plan in the North West Brampton Urban Development Area as identified in the Region of Peel Official Plan and in the Provincial Greenbelt Plan Area <u>in</u> accordance with the policy direction..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	3.4 Mobility and Connectivity, 3.4.1 Increasing Connectivity, 3.4.1.5	Clarification Requested	Clarify - Should the reference be "Natural System" or "Natural Heritage System"?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.5 Health ad Wellness, Parks and Open Space Amenity Design, 3.5.1.7 g.	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise so language is consistent with the Natural System policies of the Plan. E.g. "Incorporate and conserve natural features and green infrastructure to protect and enhance the ecological services and benefits they provide to the community and <u>Natural Heritage System</u> ;"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	3.5 Health ad Wellness, 3.5.2 Public Health and Well-Being, Land Use Compatibility,	Revision Requested	Revise/Add - Consider moving and/or consolidating the land use compatibility policies that are currently located in Part 2 Shaping Brampton, Section 2.2.8 Employment Areas into this section. The key direction in the PPS is missing in the Part 3.5 Land Use Compatibility section and can be addressed by relocating the policy to this section and refocusing the policies in the Employment Areas section to be specific to the planning for Employment Areas. Suggest adding the following new policies to the Land Use Compatibility section after Policy 3.5.2.8: <u>"Policy 3.5.2.9 Major facilities and sensitive land uses will be planned and developed to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, to minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects from odour, noise, and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety and to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures."</u> <u>"Policy 3.5.2.10 To ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of existing or planned industrial, manufacturing or other uses that are vulnerable to encroachment, the planning and development of any proposed adjacent sensitive land uses are only permitted if the following are demonstrated in accordance with provincial land use compatibility guidelines, standards, and procedures:</u> <u>a. There is an identified need for the proposed use;</u> <u>b. Alternative locations for the proposed use have been</u>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	3.5 Health ad Wellness, 3.5.2 Public Health and Well-Being, Land Use Compatibility,	Revision Requested	Revise - Suggest relocating the "Major Facilities" text box from the Employment Area policies of the Plan to this section to combine with the "Sensitive Land Uses: text box: <u>"Major facilities means facilities which may require separation from sensitive land uses, including but not limited to airports, manufacturing uses, transportation infrastructure and corridors, rail facilities, marine facilities, sewage treatment facilities, waste management systems, oil and gas pipelines, industries, energy generation facilities and transmission systems, and resource extraction activities."</u>	Comment received
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	3.5 Health ad Wellness, 3.6 Jobs and Living Centres, 3.6.1 Economic Development, 3.6.1.6	Revision Requested	Revise - Due to the revisions made to the policy, it needs to be further amended for clarity. E.g. "The City will work with neighbouring municipalities and adjacent municipalities to support and enhance the Agricultural System and agri-food network through food systems planning, agri-food strategies and policy initiatives."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6	Revision Requested	"Water supply in Brampton is accomplished provided by the Region of Peel through a system of ..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6	Revision Requested	Suggest adding as 2nd paragraph to ensure consistency with Wastewater Section: "Two major water treatment facilities are located in the City of Mississauga near Lake Ontario that treat water supply from Lake Ontario. These plants, A.P. Kennedy and Lorne Park will periodically require upgrades and expansion as new development continues. Similarly, water mains, pumping stations and storage facilities that transfer water from the lake to Brampton will require upgrades in accordance with the Region's Water and Wastewater Master Plan for the Lake Based-Systems."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6.10, bullet b	Revision Requested	Add at the end of the sentence: "The design of water supply and distribution facilities will be ... and the Region's water design standards and specifications."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6.10, bullet e	Revision Requested	Suggest revising to: "where municipal water and wastewater services are not available, planned or feasible and where policies under the Greenbelt Plan, Regional Official Plan and other relevant planning authorities allow, private communal water and private communal wastewater systems may be permitted subject to Region of Peel requirements. The use of individual on-site water, individual on-site wastewater services and partial services shall only be permitted under the circumstances outlined in the latest Provincial Policy Statement."	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6	Revision Requested	RE: "In Brampton, sanitary sewer services are provided in cooperation with the Province through the South Peel Service Agreement" - Is this accurate? Until the Region dissolves it should read "In Brampton, sanitary-sewer municipal wastewater services are provided by the Region of Peel who is responsible for wastewater treatment, trunk sanitary sewers, local sanitary sewers, force mains and sewage pumping stations. " - 2nd paragraph: "Similarly, the sanitary sewers and pumping stations collecting flow from Brampton that ultimately drain to these Etobicoke Creek (East Peel) trunk from the Lakeview wastewater treatment facilities, and the Credit River (West Peel) trunk from the Clarkson wastewater treatment facilities will require upgradings in accordance with the Region's Water and Wastewater Master Plan for the Lake-Based Systems."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6.16 a	Revision Requested	RE: "appropriate protection, conservation and mitigation of the natural heritage system features, functions, and linkages in which sanitary sewerage facilities may be located;" - Sentence seems to be missing a verb ... perhaps add "will ensure" at the beginning?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6.16	Revision Requested	RE: bullet c: add at the end of the sentence: "Sanitary sewer collection systems designed on the basis of ... and the Region's wastewater design standards and specifications."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6.17	Revision Requested	Suggest removing bullets b and c as these were already addressed in Section 3.2.6.16 bullet c.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.2.6.17, last bullet	Revision Requested	Suggest revising to: "where municipal water and wastewater services are not available, planned or feasible and where policies under the Greenbelt Plan, Regional Official Plan and other relevant planning authorities allow, private communal water and private communal wastewater systems may be permitted subject to Region of Peel requirements. The use of individual on-site water, individual on-site wastewater services and partial services shall only be permitted under the circumstances outlined in the latest Provincial Policy Statement."	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Section 3.3.1.63, bullet g	Revision Requested	Suggest revising to: "access to municipal water and sanitary-wastewater services"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Transportation Planning, Transportation Planning	Afroz Hasan	Part 3.4 Table 3	Concern	Table 3 identifies Steeles Avenue as a Primary MTSA with BRT. The Region would like to note that the Province and Metrolinx have not confirmed BRT along the corridor. The Regional OP Schedule F1 identifies Steeles Avenue as "Other Rapid Transit". Furthermore, before BRT can be implemented along the corridor the protection of Goods Movement needs to be addressed.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Transportation Planning, Transportation Planning	Afroz Hasan	Part 3.4	Revision Requested	The headline targets of 25% trips made by transit and 11% trips made by AT are not consistent with the Region's STS mode share goals. Include reference to the Region's 2041 goal and acknowledge the difference.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.3 Housing and Social Matters: What Does It Mean?	Revision Requested	"For Brampton, housing is integral part of our great community, playing an important role in the City's workforce strategy and age-friendly strategy..." Should state "housing is <u>an</u> integral part of our great community..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1 Housing Targets bubble	Revision Requested	Consider including universal accessibility or barrier-free units instead of saying housing that meets the needs of people with disabilities. Or include both references.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.3.1.35 Multi-Tenant Shared Housing	Revision Requested	Policy 3.3.1.35: "The City will aim to preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing available to single persons (including students, seniors, newcomers, etc.) by considering the provision of new multi-tenant houses." What is meant by "considering the provision of new multi-tenant houses"? Does this mean that the City is exploring the option of building this type of housing? Consider replacing "considering the provision" with "exploring the provision".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.3.1.3 Multi-Tenant Shared Housing	Revision Requested	A period is missing from the end of this policy.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	3.3.1.18	Suggestion	Opportunity to reference barrier-free units and universal design?	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.3.1.37 Multi-Tenant Shared Housing	Revision Requested	Policy 3.3.1.37: "Multi-tenant housing may be allowed within 400 metres from Support Corridor transit routes and 800 metres from the Rapid Transit Network shown on Schedule 3. this will enable appropriate..." "This" should be capitalized. A period is also missing from the end of this policy.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policies 3.1.1.59 to 3.3.1.61 Supportive Housing	Revision Requested	To conform to RPOP policy 5.9.46, please add a policy to the 'Supportive Housing' section which speaks to supporting the development of supportive housing in locations with convenient access to existing and planned infrastructure (i.e., transit) and support services.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.3.1.62 Residential Care Homes & Policy 3.3.1.12 Housing Diversity	Revision Requested	Policy 3.3.1.62: "The City will permit residential care homes for more than 10 persons located in any area designated Major Institutional and Neighbourhoods on Schedule 2 and in the applicable Secondary Plan, subject to the policies of this Plan. No residential care homes will be permitted to locate in hazardous lands or hazardous sites." Policy 3.3.1.12: "Residential care homes, supportive housing and retirement communities will be permitted in all land use designations and overlays that allow residential uses, subject to the built form policies of this Plan." These policies should be rectified (perhaps combined into one policy) to reduce confusion for readers.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Preamble to 'Lodging Houses' section	Revision Requested	Lodging Houses (preamble): "Brampton Plan policies, Zoning By-law and Business License By-law for lodging homes will comply with Federal and Provincial legislation and work to expand permissions across the city." Consider translating this sentence of the preamble to a directional policy - i.e., "The City will review requirements and consider expanding permissions for Lodging Houses to ensure alignment with the Ontario Human Rights Code and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." This type of policy direction would satisfy the intent of RPOP policy 5.9.47.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Preamble to 'Single Room Occupancy Housing' section	Revision Requested	"SROs can be either standalone new buildings, integrated into new developments, or repurposed from existing buildings." This sentence is stated twice in the first and third paragraph of this preamble.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policies 3.3.1.41 and 3.3.1.42 Single Room Occupancy Housing	Revision Requested	These two policies both intend to permit SROs in all designations that allow residential uses subject to the criteria of the applicable designations.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Preamble to 'Age-Friendly and Accessible Housing' section	Revision Requested	Age-Friendly and Accessible Housing: "All forms of housing is planned to be provided throughout Brampton..." Should state "all forms of housing <u>are</u> planned to be provided..."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	3.4.2.43 Street Network	Revision Requested	Policy 3.4.2.43: "The City may require the inclusion and integration of multi-modal transit and ridesharing facilities in new development projects and ensure accessibility to all transit users." This policy is unclear to us. Should it state "to ensure accessibility to all transit users"?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.4.2.61 Parking	Revision Requested	We recommend adding additional age-friendly elements to the parking lot design standards set out by policy 3.4.2.61, including passenger pick-up and drop-off areas, reserved parking for seniors, and seating/indoor waiting areas. These changes would help to satisfy Recommendation 40 of the Peel Region Age-Friendly Planning Built Environment Assessment - Final Report.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.5.1 Parks and Open Space	Revision Requested	"A high quality of life is supported for all residents by encouraging initiatives that improve social and special equity, ensure that residents have access to health and social services, and promote high quality parks and open spaces." "Special equity" may be a typo. Is this meant to be "physical equity"?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.5.1.32 Neighbourhood Parks	Revision Requested	To satisfy the direction of Recommendation 73 of the Peel Region Age-Friendly Planning Built Environment Assessment - Final Report, we recommend that the provision of seating be added as a requirement for Neighbourhood Parks established by policy 3.5.1.32.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.5.1.36 Urban Parks	Revision Requested	To satisfy the direction of Recommendation 73 of the Peel Region Age-Friendly Planning Built Environment Assessment - Final Report, we recommend that the following design criteria for Urban Parks be added to policy 3.5.1.36: "Be designed and programmed for all age groups and abilities, and accessible to all residents."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 3.5.1.37 Urban Parks	Revision Requested	To satisfy the direction of Recommendation 73 of the Peel Region Age-Friendly Planning Built Environment Assessment - Final Report, we recommend that the following design criteria for Urban Squares be added to policy 3.5.1.37: "Be designed and programmed for all age groups and abilities, and accessible to all residents."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	3.1.1.1	Revision Requested	Urban Design Guidelines are not policy documents but a guide to development. Using the term 'consistency' in the Official Plan treats the Urban Design Guidelines as a policy document so intent should be to have regard for the guidelines. "All new development within the City will be evaluated through the Five Design Lenses and on the basis of its conformity with the policies of this Plan, as well as its regard for consistency with the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines."	Comment received - The use of the term "consistency" in the Official Plan implies that the guidelines should be taken into consideration but is not a conformity requirement. However, using "consistency with" implies the development must align with the principles and recommendations laid out in the guidelines to a significant extent, and that deviations from the guidelines would require a strong justification for the reasons for these deviations. The aim here is to ensure that development aligns closely with the design and planning objectives set forth in the guidelines.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	3.1.1.21	Revision Requested	The City should not include Urban Design standards that are typically included in the Urban Design Guidelines as policy or performance standards in the Official Plan. The Official Plan already speaks to the importance of Urban Design Guidelines on land use planning so this clause ought to be removed that does not take away the spirit/intent of this policy. "Pedestrian movement, safety, and pedestrian-scaled spaces will be achieved by using finer and more connected grid design, and walkable block sizes. Wherever feasible, blocks should be designed between 80 to 120 metres in length and depth. To ensure permeability, blocks should not exceed 200 metres in length and/or depth. "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	3.1.1.49; 3.1.1.56; 3.1.1.50 a.; 3.1.1.57	Remove policies	This belongs in the Urban Design Guidelines and not in an Official Plan. Having this in the Official Plan means that any site specific relief will trigger an Official Plan Amendment which is not the intent of creating a living Official plan document.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	3.1.2.22	Remove policies	This is a dangerous precedent to establish as an Official Plan policy since the City would be allowing the School Boards to dictate the timing of these agreements and levies that will hold up the City authority to draft plan approve subdivisions. It should be removed since these are addressed through school board comments at planning application process or as a condition of Draft Plan approval	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	3.2 headline target	Revision Requested	The City will strive to reduce Reduce community-wide emissions by 30% from 2016 emission levels by 2030 and establish a pathway to reduce emissions by at least 80% by 2050 to meet or exceed federal and provincial targets. The City and its partners will plant 1 million new trees by 2040.	Comment received - the identified targets are based on the City's Community Energy & Emissions Reduction Plan and the City's One Million Trees program; both of which are approved and endorsed by Council.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	3.2.5.8	Revision Requested	The City and its partners will plant one million new trees in Brampton by 2040. The City will encourage tree planting by all sectors of the community that contributes to the achievement of the City's urban forest goals and targets	Comment received - the identified target is based on the City's One Million Trees program which is approved and endorsed by Council.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	3.2.6.62 - 3.2.6.68	Revision Requested	These policies ought to be removed since all lands in Brampton are designated for urban development and these policies are redundant to the PPS and the Growth Plan. The introductory to the Brampton OP already speaks to consistency to the Provincial policies so it is not necessary to have these policies in the OP.	Comment received - this policy is a conformity requirement to the Region of Peel Official Plan, as per the ROPA 32 settlement.
2023/10/02	MHBC	Gerry Tchisler	3.2.3.9	Revision Requested	This language of the policy should also be updated to indicate that it is not the developer that is intended to be the proponent of the proposed district energy systems. 3.2.3.9 The City will develop District Energy Ready Guidelines and will require study the establishment of district energy systems to be incorporated into in all major growth and intensification areas including Centres and Boulevards. Where the feasibility of district energy has been demonstrated, new development in these district energy areas will be designed to be district energy ready.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	3.3.1.29	Clarification Requested	According to Section 3.3.1.29, the residential rental demolition and conversion policy only applies to the redevelopment of large sites with a residential component designated 'Mixed-Use'. Through this correspondence we ask that Staff to verify our interpretation that the subject site (80 Scott St - JTS Properties) is exempt from the rental conversion and demolition policy	Comment received - the referenced policy 3.3.1.29 is not related to rental conversion and demolition. This policy is an encouragement policy to support the provision of new rental housing through redevelopment of large sites.
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Chapter 3	Recommendation	We continue to recommend that a policy be included specifying scenarios where exemptions from Inclusionary Zoning are permitted including: Development, Site Plan Approval, Plan of Subdivision, Plan of Condominium, or Building Permit Applications received on or before the date of adoption of Brampton Plan.	Comment received - this will be identified through an Official Plan Amendment for implementing Inclusionary Zoning.

2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	3.3.1.29	Clarification Requested	According to Section 3.3.1.29, the rental conversion and demolition policy only applies to the redevelopment of large sites with a residential component designated 'Mixed-Use'. We ask that Staff to verify our interpretation that the subject site (507 Balmoral) is exempt from the rental conversion and demolition policy.	Comment received - the referenced policy 3.3.1.29 is not related to rental conversion and demolition. This policy is an encouragement policy to support the provision of new rental housing through redevelopment of large sites.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	3.1.1.6	Revision Requested	"Policy 3.1.1.6 states, "All new development will facilitate environmental sustainability and climate change mitigation and adaptation by incorporating innovative, adapted and resilient design features into the design of the built environment, including: ..." In our submission "through measures such as" should replace "including" in order to clarify that the measures may not be required in all circumstances"	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	3.1.1.41	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.1.41 states, "Development will locate and organize vehicle parking, vehicular access and ramps, loading, servicing, waste storage, storage areas, and utilities to minimize their negative visual impact from the street or detract from pedestrian connection and improve the safety and attractiveness of the public realm, the site and its surrounding context." We suggest "where feasible" be added before "will" in order to provide for flexibility where screening vehicular activity from the street may not be possible, particularly in the case of infill development;	Comment received.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	3.1.1.59	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.1.59 states, "Recognizing the role that commercial, institutional and employment lands can provide in contributing to a sense of place, the design of non-residential development will conform with all of the applicable and relevant policies of this Plan, with particular focus on all of the Urban Design and Land Use Compatibility policies of this Plan, and will: a. Minimize surface parking in Employment Areas." In our submission, "Where appropriate" should be added before "minimize" in order to provide for flexibility to account for context and operational aspects where underground parking may not be feasible	Comment received.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	3.1.1.6	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.1.6 states "All new development will facilitate environmental sustainability and climate change mitigation and adaptation by incorporating innovative, adapted and resilient design features into the design of the built environment, including: ..." In our submission "through measures such as" should replace "including" in order to clarify that the measures are not required in all circumstances	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	3.1.1.59	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.1.59 states "Recognizing the role that commercial, institutional and employment lands can provide in contributing to a sense of place, the design of non-residential development will conform with all of the applicable and relevant policies of this Plan, with particular focus on all of the Urban Design and Land Use Compatibility policies of this Plan, and will: a. Minimize surface parking in Employment Areas;". In our submission, "Where appropriate" should be added before "minimize" in order to provide for flexibility to account for context and operational aspects, including for warehouse uses where underground parking is not feasible	Comment received.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	3.4.2.48	Revision Requested	Policy 3.4.2.48 states "Minimum parking requirements will be eliminated, and maximum parking limits and shared parking requirements may be established by the Zoning By-law, in Centres, Boulevards, and Major Transit Station Areas and other areas determined by the City." In our submission, the establishment of any maximum parking limits should include consideration as to operational requirements for uses, including commercial uses as well as employment uses such as warehouses	Comment received.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	3.1.1.6	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.1.6 states, "All new development will facilitate environmental sustainability and climate change mitigation and adaptation by incorporating innovative, adapted and resilient design features into the design of the built environment, including: ..." In our submission "through measures such as" should replace "including" in order to clarify that the measures may not be required in all circumstances	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	3.1.1.41	Recommendation	Policy 3.1.1.41 states, "Development will locate and organize vehicle parking, vehicular access and ramps, loading, servicing, waste storage, storage areas, and utilities to minimize their negative visual impact from the street or detract from pedestrian connection and improve the safety and attractiveness of the public realm, the site and its surrounding context." We suggest "where feasible" be added before "will" in order to provide for flexibility where screening vehicular activity from the street may not be possible, particularly in the case of infill development	Comment received.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	3.1.1.59	Revision Requested	Policy 3.1.1.59 states, "Recognizing the role that commercial, institutional and employment lands can provide in contributing to a sense of place, the design of non-residential development will conform with all of the applicable and relevant policies of this Plan, with particular focus on all of the Urban Design and Land Use Compatibility policies of this Plan, and will: a. Minimize surface parking in Employment Areas." In our submission, "Where appropriate" should be added before "minimize" in order to provide for flexibility to account for contexts where underground parking may not be feasible	Comment received.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 4)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicky	Mississauga Road Corridor (Bram West) (v)	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Not permitting non-employment uses, including residential, uses and other non-complementary employment uses, unless identified through an amendment to the Secondary Plan through a Major Transit Station Area study;" The comma should be deleted between "residential" and "uses".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicky	Mississauga Road Corridor (Bram West)	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - Mississauga Road Corridor (Bram West): "A major reason is that this area has a well-developed transportation network, excellent accessibility to Lester B. Pearson International Airport and proximity to major markets in the United States via the Provincial highway system." The word "is" is missing between "major reason" and "that this area".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Special Land Use Policy Areas	Revision Requested	Number 9 identified as special policy area in Schedule 12 is not noted in chapter 4. Is this found elsewhere in the BOP? Also, SPA #9 seems to be covering a specific property. Is this intentional or an error? There are also no specific boundaries for SPAs in Schedule 12 but addresses can be found in Chapter 4. Consider revising Schedule 12 to identify boundaries/insert map of numbered SPAs.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Employment Areas	Chapter 4 - Special Study Areas - Mississauga Road Corridor (Bram West) v) Not permitting non-employment uses, including residential, uses and other non-complementary employment uses, unless identified through an amendment to the Secondary Plan through a Major Transit Station Area study;	Suggest rewording to outline the need to address RPOP Policy 5.8.36, as follows: Not permitting non-employment uses, such as Major Retail, residential, and other sensitive land uses not ancillary to the primary employment use, including residential, uses and other non-complementary employment uses; unless identified through an amendment to the Secondary Plan in accordance with Region of Peel Official Plan Policy 5.8.36 (or reference Brampton Plan 2.2.9.19) through a Major Transit Station Area study;	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Employment Areas	Chapter 4 - Special Land Use Policy Areas and Schedule 12 - Special Policy Areas	Special Policy Area numbers do not align with numbers on Schedule 12.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
09/29/2023	Kanef	Kevin Freeman	Mississauga Road Corridor	Special Land Use Policy Areas and Schedule 12	According to Schedule 12, specific sections of the Mississauga Road Corridor have been identified as a Special Policy Area to limit the scope of employment uses that would otherwise be permitted by the 'Employment' land use designation. It is our understanding that the primary function of the Mississauga Road Corridor Special Policy Area is to support office and research/development uses, and limited high performance prestige industrial uses, only if served as an accessory use to office, research, and development uses. We would like to better understand the rationale for the inclusion of this Special Policy Area, the limitation on land use, and the implications that this may have on future employment-related development opportunities. The redevelopment potential of our lands has been limited by a restrictive 'Office' designation in the current Official Plan and 'Office Centre' designation in the Bram West Secondary Plan. We respectfully request that the policy language for the Mississauga Road Corridor Special Policy Area be revised as follows: The primary function of the Mississauga Road Corridor Office Centre will be protected and enhanced by: a) Aligning with the Mixed-Use Employment designation in this Plan and the Office Centre designation in the Bram West Secondary Plan, the following employment uses are permitted: i) Office, research and development uses facilities; ii) Limited High performance and prestige industrial uses, and only if served as an accessory use to office, research, and development uses;	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
09/29/2023	Kanef	Kevin Freeman	Mississauga Road Corridor	Special Land Use Policy Areas and Schedule 13	Further to the above, policy 'c)' of the Mississauga Road Corridor Special Study Area notes that the primary function of the Mississauga Road Corridor Office Centre will be protected and enhanced by "prescribing specific urban design policies, including requirements for high-quality architecture, streetscape and landscape treatments as well as appropriate massing in order to provide a sense of arrival and destination". We would like to note that under Bill 23, architectural design details and landscape design aesthetics were removed from the scope of site plan control . We respectfully request that the policy language be revised for consistency with Bill 23.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Corridor Protection	Revision Requested	a) Corridor Protection Area – Heritage Heights Secondary Plan and Bram West Secondary Plan i) Consent to sever, minor variance, subdivision, site plan and zoning applications and applications for approval of mineral aggregate operations within the Corridor Protection Area coincident with the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan will not be approved if it is determined that the development proposal may unduly restrict planning or construction of the north-south transportation facility as contemplated by this Section. ... v) Prior to the release of lands for development within the designated Corridor Protection Area in the Bram West area, jurisdictional matters and financing mechanisms related to appropriate north-south transportation facility and Bram West Parkway facilities must be addressed to the satisfaction of City Council. vi) Prior to any development within this Corridor Protection Area or any abutting area (including Secondary Plan Areas 51, 52 and 5352), but excluding the lands east of Heritage Road in the Bram West Secondary Plan, the City must be satisfied that the alignment, Environmental Assessment, property and capital budgeting for a "North South Transportation Corridor" has been completed and approved.	Comment received.
10/02/2023	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Chapter 4 Land Use Policy Areas	Revision Requested	Chapter 4 Special Land Use Policy Areas be updated to include the Special Land Use Policies that apply specifically to the subject site (10196 Bramalea Road) (Section 4.14.3.21 – Area 22 of the 2006 Brampton Official Plan).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	Member of the Public	Les Molnar	4.2.1.20	Clarification Requested	I had thought that the advent of the LRT would increase the price of our homes in the County Court area, but now that we discovered the 2040 Plan in the Spring and the proposed massive towers and townhouses all around this area, plus the planned replacement of the Community bounded by Hwy 10 and Kennedy Rd, south of Steeles with low, mid and high rise buildings I am not so sure that our housing value will increase over time. How is Section 4.2.1.20 in your Plan consistent with Older, Mature Neighbourhoods like the one mentioned above?	Comment received - the policy direction set out in 2.2.7.4 is consistent with Mature Neighborhoods. There is no policy or section 4.2.1.20 in Brampton Plan.

10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Azar Davis	page 4-14	Clarification Requested	<p>MTSA subsection c) on Page 4-14 states, "Lands designated 'Office Mixed-Use' are intended primarily for office uses, including hotels, motels, conference/ convention centres and may also contain mid-rise or high-rise residential uses ...". Further to our comments submitted on August 28, 2023, we continue to seek clarification as to whether the existing industrial use on 379 Orenda Road will be recognised as a permitted use and be afforded opportunities for infill and expansion. As previously stated, there is no expectation on the part of either Weston Foods or Choice that this well-established and important industrial employer will vacate the lands in the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>Comment received - the MTSA policies have been updated to recognize the continuation of uses that are currently permitted by the Zoning By-law. Notwithstanding the land use designations and the minimum floor space index in Table 11, new buildings, expansions, and/or alterations may be permitted, where it can be demonstrated that it does not preclude the desirable planned redevelopment of the MTSA, including the consideration to improve multi-modal access and connectivity through-out the MTSA. The previous expansion cap of 10% has been deleted from the Transition policies.</p>
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	page 4-12	Request	<p>"The Major Transit Station Areas policies state on page 4-12 "Note to Final Draft: The draft policies contained within this Section are subject to change and further refinement prior to Council adoption as part of the City's ongoing Major Transit Station Area Study. Schedule 13A-N is to be included as part of the Final Brampton Plan". We request that the draft policies be released for review and comment prior to their concurrent adoption with the Draft Official Plan planned for November 4, 2023. We note that on behalf of Canadian Tire, we provided the enclosed comments dated August 22, 2023 for the City-initiated MTSA Project (see Appendix A)"</p>	<p>Comment received - the MTSA webpage has been updated with the draft policies and schedules.</p>

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Chapter 5)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
08/25/2023	Peel Public Health- Built Environment	Sarah Powell, Health Planning Facilitator	Section 5.5, Section 5.8, Section, Section 5.11, Section 5.12	Revision Requested	As per Section 7.5 of the Regional Official Plan, a health assessment is required with the submission of development applications, with the results being shared to local council and the objectives of the Healthy Development Framework should be implemented in the planning of the municipality. We recommend including language within this section which speaks to ensuring the objective of the HDF are met in the development review process and requiring these assessments for every development application.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	5.11.17	Revision Requested	Reference to Table 8 but cannot find the actual table.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	5.3.8	Revision Requested	Consider adding c) consideration to developments contributing to housing targets	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Paul Lewkowicz, Principal Planner	5.4.2	Revision Requested	Consider using term "equity-deserving" and "equity-seeking".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning and Development Services	Madison Van West, Specialist	5.5.13	Revision Requested	Consider adding "location of lands identified for affordable housing" or similar to the list of Secondary Plan content.	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Roman Kuczynski	Policy 5.1.2	Revision Requested	(same comment as before carried over) The Growth Management Program will assist in determining the staging, timing, and relative priority (not sure what it means possibly simply "phasing"; section 5.3 is titled "Development Phasing") of development and growth-related infrastructure.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 5.1.3	Clarification Requested	Is the 'functional master plans' in 5.1.3 referencing Regional or local Master Plans?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.3	Revision Requested	Please ensure that the policies in BOP 5.3 address the considerations for growth management and phasing strategies set out by RPOP policy 5.5.6, such as the improvement of live-work relationships, unit mix, and housing targets, a range of employment types, priority areas for development, prolonging agricultural uses as long as practical, and the sustainable rate of employment growth related to population growth.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 5.3.2	Revision Requested	To address RPOP 5.5.6, consider the following revisions: The City will endeavour to ensure that transportation facilities, schools, health care facilities, and any other essential public services and facilities are available or will be available prior to occupation as part of the development approval process.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 5.3.5	Clarification Requested	Are development priorities the same as phasing strategies? The Brampton Plan speaks to development priorities and phasing/staging through the Growth Management Program and 5.3 Development Phasing. Clarification on whether this policy is speaking to the establishment of development priorities by the City or landowners? Requesting general clarification between the GMP and other phasing policies in the plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 5.3.8	Clarification Requested	Does this policy suggest that the City may require financial phasing in the future, or is this direction to landowners?	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Policy 5.5.10	Clarification Requested	Requesting some clarification between how the GMP section and other phasing policies in the plan work together/separately. Brampton Plan 5.5.10 seems challenging from an implementation perspective. If phasing is done as a background study based on when secondary plans are done, does this not inherently prioritize secondary plans in the order they are completed? Perhaps this is a policy wording issue?	Comment received -
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Secondary Plans	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Secondary Plans establish local development policies to guide growth and change in defined areas of the City, such as new neighbourhoods Designated Greenfield Areas and Strategic Growth Areas, and are adopted as amendments to this Plan. Secondary Plans may be prepared for established, partially developed, or undeveloped areas in order to conform to an overall community development concept and approved planning policies." We suggest explicitly stating that secondary plans establish local development policies to guide growth and change in Designated Greenfield Areas for clarity purposes.	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.5.10	Revision Requested	"Background studies required for any Secondary Plan will align with the scope, land area, and intent of the Secondary Plan, and the City may identify the need to undertake additional studies. Background studies will address matters such as:..." It should be noted in this policy that the background studies should be completed to the satisfaction of the City, as per RPOP policy 5.6.20.14.17.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.5.10	Revision Requested	Please modify policy 5.5.10 to capture the background study requirements established by RPOP policy 5.6.20.14.17. The agricultural impact assessment for lands abutting/adjacent to agricultural areas in the Agricultural System is not included in policy 5.5.10. Also missing are the detailed requirements for the aggregate resource impact assessment, climate change adaptation plan, and the subwatershed study.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.5.13	Revision Requested	Please add stormwater management and proposed employment uses as matters which secondary plans should contain policies to address in policy 5.5.13, as per RPOP policy 5.6.20.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.6.20.12	Revision Requested	In keeping with RPOP policy 5.6.20.12, please add a policy to policy 5.6 which requires that area plans implement the policies of any new secondary plans and the recommendations of the subwatershed study on a sub-area basis.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.7.1	Revision Requested	<p>The City will undertake a detailed comprehensive planning study for each designated Primary Major Transit Station Area shown on Schedule 1. The recommendations for each Primary Major Transit Station Area will be implemented through amendments to the applicable Secondary Plan, and will address: (...)</p> <p>i. Protection and mitigation against natural and human-made hazards in accordance with the policies of this Plan, which shall include an assessment of the need for proposed sensitive land uses and alternative locations in the municipality;</p> <p>j. Strategies to support low carbon integrated energy systems;</p> <p>k. Protection, preservation, enhancement of the street network, and conservation of places and/or landscapes of cultural heritage value;</p> <p>l. Connections to the Active Transportation Network, with priority placed on connections to the Rapid Transit station;</p> <p>m. A phasing plan or strategy, in conformity with function master plans to ensure Civic Infrastructure and services are delivered in a manner that supports complete communities, including open space and accessible public amenities;</p> <p>n. Strategies to support increased multi-modal access and connectivity to local and regional transit services in support of transit service integration; ..."</p> <p>See suggested edits above. Please also incorporate goods movement considerations into this policy as per RPOP policy 5.6.19.10.</p> <p>This policy could also be expanded upon to address RPOP policy 5.6.19.14 regarding redevelopment of surface parking lots</p>	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Future policies	Revision Requested	RPOP policies 5.6.19.7, 5.6.19.9 (b and c), and 5.6.19.10 (c, d, e, f, g, j, l, m, and n) should be satisfied by the recently circulated MTSA policies.	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	5.12 Planning and Development Controls, Subdivision of Land, 5.12.24	Revision Requested	Revise - Include reference to the Regional Official Plan and Provincial Plan's as Greenbelt Plan severance policies apply within the Greenbelt area. See ROP Policy 7.4.9."Consents must comply with any relevant policies of this Plan, Provincial Plans and the Region of Peel Official Plan. "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	5.12 Planning and Development Controls, Subdivision of Land	Revision Requested	<p>Add - Consider adding new Policy 5.12.XX after Policy 5.12.29 as follows:</p> <p>5.12.XX Consents to sever a lot may be permitted to enable the securement of lands for natural heritage conservation purposes by a public authority or a non-government conservation organization, provided that:</p> <p>a. The consent will avoid fragmentation of the Natural System's features and areas, where possible;</p> <p>b. The acquired and retained lots are in compliance with the Zoning By-law;</p> <p>c. When deemed necessary, a restrictive covenant or conservation easement is placed on title of the land to be held for conservation purposes prohibiting development of the land for non-conservation uses in perpetuity.</p> <p>Definitions for non-government conservation organization are also recommended to be included in the Glossary in conjunction with the policy. Definitions are provided in the Region of Peel Official Plan as follows:</p> <p>Non-government conservation organization: a non-profit conservation body independent of any government such as a land trust, conservancy or similar not-for-profit agency that is governed by a charter, articles of incorporation or letters patent that has as one of its primary purposes the protection of natural heritage features, functions and values. The organization must have registered charitable status.</p>	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Employment Areas	Chapter 5 - Implementation and Measurement	<p>"Major Transit Station Area study" is referenced as a requirement to introduce non employment uses within a MTSA. There should be a distinction made between the study required under RPOP Policy 5.6.19.10 and the study required under 5.8.36.</p> <p>A separate study outlining the requirements of RPOP Policy 5.8.36, where applicable, should be referenced in "Chapter 5 - Implementation and Measurement".</p>	Comment received.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Employment Areas	5.7.1 q)	Suggested revision to ensure all Employment Areas are protected. q. Protection of existing Employment Areas;	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	5.5.13	Revision Requested	The City will, prior to the approval of an Official Plan Amendment implementing a development concept for a new Secondary Plan area, require that a subwatershed study or other environmental studies be initiated and substantially advanced undertaken for the affected subwatersheds. Such studies will be comprehensive documents subject to the participation and the approval of the appropriate agencies and include a discussion of the impact or potential impact on water quality and quantity including impacts on private well supplies from alternative development scenarios, the relationship of the study area to the watershed, and proposed mitigation measures.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	5.12.32	Revision Requested	The City's formal site plan application process is very comprehensive and detailed including the requirement for renderings, elevations, floor plans of a single site whereas the Urban Design Brief (UDB) deals with two or more development blocks. As such, the UDB should be required a Zoning By-law Amendments applications but not for site plan applications. Most sites would typically be necessitate rezoning and it would be more appropriate to require UDB at rezoning stage.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Schedules)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	All Schedules	Revision Requested	<p>The eastern municipal boundary of Brampton, in the area of Highway 407, follows Highway 50 rather than the right of way owned by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and is not consistent with the boundaries shown on RPOP schedules. Please revise to align with RPOP boundaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding the boundary at the east side of Brampton at/around the intersection of the Brampton, Vaughan, and Toronto municipal boundaries The Regional boundary south of Steeles Ave East follows a right-of-way owned by the Ministry of Transportation Ontario all the way to the CN railway, where the City of Brampton & City of Toronto boundaries line up with each other. Where as both the Brampton & Toronto boundaries follow the centre line of Highway 50 instead. Peel's boundary was established by the historic Peel County and Toronto-Gore Township boundaries defined in the mid 1800's. The realignment of Highway 50 (Peel RR 50/York RR 24) did not change the administrative boundary of Peel or Brampton. 	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	All Schedules	Revision Requested	<p>The municipal boundary of Brampton in the northeast corner does not align with boundaries shown on RPOP schedules. Please revise to align with RPOP boundaries.</p> <p>Regarding the boundary at the northeast corner of Brampton (at Mayfield Rd & Hwy 50):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peel's mapping follows the geographic township boundary (Toronto Gore & Albion), which is along the centreline of the original road allowance. This follows legal advice that the boundary was not adjusted southward when Mayfield Rd was realigned south in the early 1970s nor when Mayfield Rd was adjusted northward to meet Albion Vaughan Rd in the late 1990s. The Province's Municipal Boundary - Lower and Single Tier dataset shows the same alignment but it appears that Brampton follows the southern realignment of Mayfield Road that was done in the early 1970s. 	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 1 and Schedule 5	Revision Requested	The polygons for the Urban Growth Centres in Schedule 1 and Schedule 5 provided in WSPData_20230809.gdb are different. These should be reviewed and made to align with the Region's delineation of the UGC.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 1	Revision Requested	The boundary of the UGC in Schedule 1 cuts through parcels in several locations. This requires further review.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 1 and Schedule 5	Revision Requested	The Urban Growth Centre boundaries presented in Schedules 1 and Schedule 5 of the Brampton OP do not align with Region's delineation of the UGC. This appears to be largely due to differences made about following parcel fabric or ROW centrelines when creating the polygons. This requires further review.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 1	Revision Requested	<p>The primary MTSAs have been delineated. Is it necessary to mark these locations with points and polygons on the Schedule?</p> <p>Several primary MTSAs have 2 points indicating the location of the MTA (Ray Lawson, Gateway Terminal, Brampton GO, Central Park (Bramalea Terminal)).</p>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	The pdf of Schedule 5 shows that portion of the Greenbelt that is in the DGA in western Brampton, along Winston Churchill Boulevard. However, this hasn't been removed from the GIS polygon.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	DGA shown on Schedule 5 of Brampton's OP deviates from the DGA shown on Schedule E3 of RPOP north of Steeles Avenue and east of Churchville Road. Several parcels not in the DGA on Peel's schedule are include in Brampton's delineation of the DGA. This relates to a later comment on the BUPA.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	There are slight variances between the boundaries of the DGA shown on Schedule E3 of the RPOP and the DGA shown on Schedule 5 of Brampton's DGA throughout. This includes the DGA not aligning with the Regional boundary to the east and west and the northern city boundary. Please review line work to ensure consistency with DGA in Peel's schedules and with Regional and Municipal boundaries.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	The BUPA, as shown on Schedule 5 of Brampton's OP, follows Highway 50 in the area of Highway 407. This causes the BUPA to extend into Toronto in one location and not extend to the Regional boundary in other locations. This is related an earlier comment about the Brampton municipal boundary following Highway 50 rather than the Ministry of Transportation right of way. Please revise to align with RPOP.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	BUPA shown on Schedule 5 of Brampton's OP deviates from the BUPA show on Schedule E3 of RPOP north of Steeles Avenue and east of Churchville Road. Several parcels in the BUPA on Peel's schedule are not included in Brampton's delineation of the BUPA. This is related to the earlier comment of the DGA. Please revise to align with RPOP.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Brent Kuefler	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	There are slight variances between the boundaries of the BUPA shown on Schedule E3 of the RPOP and the BUPA shown on Schedule 5 of Brampton's DGA throughout. This includes the BUPA not aligning with the Regional boundary to the east and west and the southern and northern city boundaries. Please review line work to ensure consistency with BUPA in Peel's schedules and with Regional and Municipal boundaries.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	Consider changing colours or increasing colour variation on this map. Some elements are difficult to discern.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Various	Revision Requested	Please provide clarification on DUC, UC vs UGC in map. Some Provincial terminology is identified on mapping but not reflected in policy. For ease of interpretation and consistency, consider using Provincial terminology also found in the RPOP.	Comment received - UGC is provincially significant and DUC's were publicly identified urban centers through the Vision 2040 process.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	Is there a link between the DGA in Schedule 5 and precinct plans based on geography? Background information on identifying these geographies would be helpful to better understand DGA and precinct policies.	Comment received - Precinct Plans are to be identified through separate processes.

2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Schedule 1	Revision Requested	Schedule 1 City Structure - Add - Add a "Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside" hatch symbol within the Greenbelt Plan Area similar to the hatch symbol shown on Schedule 2 along with the following notation also from Schedule 2: "Any lands within the Provincial Greenbelt Area are not part of the urban area and are subject to the policies of the Greenbelt Plan". The depiction of the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside would be consistent with the depiction of the Parkway Belt West and addresses conformity with the Greenbelt Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Schedule 5	Revision Requested	Schedule 5 - Add - Add a "Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside" hatch symbol within the Greenbelt Plan Area similar to the hatch symbol shown on Schedule 2 along with the following notation also from Schedule 2: "Any lands within the Provincial Greenbelt Area are not part of the urban area and are subject to the policies of the Greenbelt Plan". The depiction of the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside would be consistent with the depiction of the Parkway Belt West and addresses conformity with the Greenbelt Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Schedule 6a	Revision Requested	Schedule 6A - Conformity - The mapping of the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System Overlay is incorrect and does not conform to the Greenbelt Plan. The Greenbelt NHS Overlay should extend to the entirety of the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside Area within Brampton. Please refer to the Greenbelt Plan Schedule 4 and Region of Peel Official Plan Schedule B-5 mapping illustrating the correct depiction of the NHS Overlay. This is a conformity requirement of the Greenbelt Plan that will need to be addressed in the Draft Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Schedule 6a	Revision Requested	Schedules 6A and 6B - Add - Water Resources System - Schedule 6A and 6B's identification of the Water Resources System is not consistent with the Clean Water Act, Provincial Policy Statement or the Region of Peel Official Plan. A separate Schedule 6C is recommended for the purpose of identifying significant groundwater recharge areas and highly vulnerable aquifers and ensuring the identification of the City's Water Resource System is comprehensively mapped. The following are vulnerable areas approved in source protection plans under the Clean Water Act that should be identified and mapped in the Brampton Official Plan as components of the City's Water Resource System. GIS mapping data can be provided through the source protection data portal or by the Region. Corresponding references to the new Schedule 6C in the text of the Brampton Plan to reference the mapped vulnerable areas shown on the schedule is also required. The addition of the mapping is a conformity requirement under the PPS, Clean Water Act and Region of Peel Official Plan. - Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (note: SGRA mapping has been provided to the City based on mapping included in the Region of Peel Official Plan and Source Protection Assessment Reports approved under the Clean Water Act) - Highly Vulnerable Aquifers (note: HVA mapping has been provided to the City based on mapping included in the Region of Peel Official Plan and Source Protection Assessment Reports approved under the Clean Water Act)	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Schedule 6b	Revision Requested	Conformity - The mapping of the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System Overlay is incorrect and does not conform to the Greenbelt Plan. The Greenbelt NHS Overlay should extend to the entirety of the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside Area within Brampton. Please refer to the Greenbelt Plan Schedule 4 and Region of Peel Official Plan Schedule B-5 mapping illustrating the correct depiction of the NHS Overlay. This is a conformity requirement of the Greenbelt Plan that will need to be addressed in the Draft Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Growth Management Program, Section 5.1.3:	Revision Requested	Suggest revising to: "The GMP and any associated strategies will b. Contain the criteria for staging development to facilitate the orderly, fiscally responsible and efficient progression of development that is guided by a system-wide Master Servicing Plan coordinated with the functional Master Plans;"	Comment received.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Water & Wastewater Program Planning	Laura Borowiec	Glossary - Urban Growth and Development	Revision Requested	Correct typo: "... municipal water and wastewater systems."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Transportation Planning, Transportation Planning	Afroz Hasan	Schedule 3b	Revision Requested	Peel's Comment Dated 2022-11-08 stands: Steeles Ave. is identified as "High Order Transit (BRT or LRT). This is premature as BRT/LRT has not been confirmed through the Metrolinx FRTN process. Please revise.	Comment received.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Waste Management	Dave Yousif	Schedule 9	Revision Requested	The drawing should provide labels for the individual waste management slides (name/type of operation; confirmation that site is closed, etc.) In addition, the figure excludes key operational waste management sites, which should be included. Suggest the figure be reviewed with Peel Waste Management staff to update (e.g., Peel Integrated Waste Management Facility at 7795 Torbram Rd; Heartlake Community Recycling Centre at 420 Rainside Dr; etc.)	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Schedule 2 - Designations and Schedule 1 - City Structure	Revision Requested	There are various boundary line discrepancies between Schedule 1 - City Structure and Schedule 2 - Designations shapefile, and RPOP Schedule E4 - Employment Area mapping. Fine tuning of these boundaries will be required. It is suggested City and Region staff meet to discuss alignment of employment area boundaries along parcels, roads, existing residential and natural hazard features.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/24	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Schedule 2 - Designations and Schedule 1 - City Structure	Clarification Requested	"Schedule 1: City Structure" and "Schedule 2 - Designations" are not in conformity with RPOP Schedule E-4 - Employment Area mapping. The attached PDFs titled "Brampton Employment Area Analysis - Map 1 - 7" outlines the discrepancies. Further clarification from the City is required regarding the exclusion of the subject Regional Employment Area lands. Suggest meeting with staff to discuss.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/15	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	Schedule 6A	Revision Requested	Wetlands should continue to be shown in two distinct groups, 1) PSWs and 2) all other wetlands. Should the City wish to create a third policy type to distinguish between sensitivities and/or size, then a third mapping group would be created to reflect that.	Comment received.
2023/08/15	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	Schedule 6A	Revision Requested	Please ensure that the wetland layer is the most updated mapping layer from CVC (and does not include SWM ponds).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

2023/08/15	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	Schedule 6B	Revision Requested	Wetlands should continue to be shown in two distinct groups, 1) PSWs and 2) all other wetlands. Should the City wish to create a third policy type to distinguish between sensitivities and/or size, then a third mapping group would be created to reflect that.	Comment received.
2023/08/15	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	Schedule 6B	Revision Requested	Please ensure that the wetland layer is the most updated mapping layer from CVC (and does not include SWM ponds).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/15	CVC	Dorothy Di Berto	Schedule 6B	Revision Requested	Regarding their depiction of 'valleyland and watercourse corridor' - what are the parameters being used to show the extent of the watercourse (i.e., what are the limits)? Is it based on floodplain, erosion etc.? It may be valuable to depict the true extent of the watercourse (i.e., the hazard component) to get a full sense of the natural hazard system.	Comment received - the valleyland and watercourse corridor mapping is based on data received from Conservation Authorities and uses the same parameters to show the extent of the watercourse as the CA data.
2023/08/25	TRCA		Schedule 1	Revision Requested	To ensure consistency throughout the OP, the 'Natural Heritage System' land use designation should be revised to 'The Natural System' on both Schedules 1 and 2.	Comment received - in order to remain consistent with the PPS, Schedules 1 and 2 refer to 'Natural Heritage System'.
2023/08/25	TRCA		Schedule 6A	Revision Requested	As per provincial requirements, TRCA's Water Resource System mapping includes Key Hydrological Areas (Significant Surface Water Contribution Areas, Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas, Highly Vulnerable Aquifers, and Ecologically Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas) and additional Key Hydrological Features (Seepage Areas and Springs). We understand the City is currently updating the draft Schedules to incorporate recent mapping of unevaluated wetlands, and other areas/features comprising the Water Resource System (the WRS mapping data was provided as per City's request).	Comment received.
2023/08/25	TRCA		Schedule 6A	Revision Requested	The Natural Hazards Section (2-156) states, "The floodplain is generally located within the valleyland and watercourse corridors as shown on Schedule 6A." However, there is no 'Valleyland and Watercourse' designation on the Schedule 6A. We recommend clarifying on Schedule 6A that the flood plain is captured under the 'Natural Heritage System' designation. As an alternative and in accordance with provincial policy, we recommend including 'Natural Hazards' as a separate overlay to capture flood plains, erosion hazards and slope instability. This would be especially important for cases where the floodplain is not captured within the valleyland and watercourse corridors.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/08/25	TRCA		Schedule 6B	Revision Requested	It is unclear why Heart Lake Conservation Area is identified as a "Waste Management Site". This property is a Kettle Lake, a former farm, as well as the location of former municipal wells for the City of Brampton.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
09/26/2023	Member of Public	James Reed	Schedule 9	Revision Requested	I believe the City is showing something they need not here. There should be nothing in terms of conformity from the RoP with regards to "overburden thickness". The RoP has Schedule D-2 (depicting HPMARA after ROPA 32 settlement) and Figure 20 (depicting waste management sites). I would suggest the City removes reference to overburden thickness on their Schedule 9 of Brampton Plan.	Comment received- the City does not see this as a major development impediment, but an important component in order to meet the settlement requirements of ROPA 32. The minutes of settlement from the LPAT Decision is translated into policy requirements reflected in the Region of Peel Official Plan policy 5.3.4.2.2 f v). This identifies that the City is required to provide mapping of known deposits of mineral aggregate resources. Schedule 9 ensures that this is effectively mapped and shown in the City of Brampton Official Plan.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Schedule 1	Revision Requested	The Heritage Heights area should have a notation on the schedule that the land use designations on this schedule will be updated through the Secondary Plan process since the location of the Town Centre and the category of Secondary Urban Boulevard may change through the Secondary Plan process.	Comment received.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Schedule 2, 3, 3C, 4, 5	Revision Requested	The note for the Heritage Heights area should indicate that the Streets Network will be further refined through 'Secondary Planning' and Precinct Planning.	Comment received.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Schedule 3B	Revision Requested	The Provincial Transitway shown on these three planning areas needs to have a note stating 'Subject to GTA West Corridor EA'. This way, the schedule distinguishes between already planned Transitway as opposed to currently planned transitway. Also, this Schedule should also show the 'proposed and Council endorsed' future GO Station in Heritage Heights.	Comment received. Regarding the GO Station in Heritage Heights: this is a conformity requirement with the Region of Peel Official Plan. Brampton Plan still makes reference to this GO Station in the text, however it cannot be included on schedules due to conformity.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	As per the policy comments contained herein dealing with the Corridor Protection Area, this schedule should reduce the Corridor Protection Area to coincide with the Provincial GTA West EA Focus Area of Analysis (FAA).	Comment received.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Schedule 9	Revision Requested	The Heritage Heights Secondary Plan has been approved by City Council (OLT appeal) that no party/appellant are challenging the future urban development of these lands. This is also designated in the Mount Pleasant SP area which is already planned and most developed. As such, it is not clear why the bedrock aggregate depth is shown on this schedule that only applies to the Heritage Heights area. The applicability of this designation and legend is not useful in the context of land use policies in the OP. It is recommended that this designation be removed.	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement to the Region of Peel Official Plan, as per the ROPA 32 settlement.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Schedule 11	Revision Requested	This schedule should have a note for the Heritage Heights Precinct Plan boundaries indicating that 'the Precinct Plan boundaries for the Heritage Heights SP area is subject to the approved and in-effect Heritage Heights Secondary Plan' since these boundaries may change through the OLT process.	Comment received - any changes as a result of OLT outcomes will be implemented at a later date, if required.
2023/10/02	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	Schedule 12	Revision Requested	The Corridor Protection area shown in these two planning areas (Heritage Heights and Bram West) should coincide with the Provincial GTA West EA FAA area.	Comment received.
2023/10/01	GSAI	Herman Wessels	Schedule 2	Revision Requested	In our opinion, given the Subject Property's (9400 Goreway Drive) context and history of the employment conversion, a more suitable designation overlay would be 'Mixed-Use Areas' on Schedule 2. This designation offers greater flexibility and aligns better with the goal of creating a 15-minute neighborhood and the generation of complete communities. To effectively plan for and utilize transit, nearby complete communities are required proximate to planned MTSAs and corridors. It is all the more important to provide for the elements of complete community on self-contained properties that have the opportunity to accommodate a mix of uses and higher intensity development in these areas.	Comment received.
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Schedule 2	Clarification Requested	Schedule 2 now designates the subject site (80 Scott Street) 'Neighbourhoods'. Through this correspondence we ask that Staff verify our interpretation of the land use schedule.	Comment received - the subject site (80 Scott St) is currently designated as Neighbourhoods.
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Schedule 1 & Schedule 2	Revision Requested	Schedule 1 City Structure and Schedule 2 City-Wide Growth Management be revised to re-designate the northeastern limits of the subject site (10196 Bramalea Rd) as 'Community Area' and 'Neighbourhoods'.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Schedule 6A	Revision Requested	Schedule 6A Natural Heritage System be revised to remove the northeastern limits of the subject site (10196 Bramalea Rd) from the 'Natural Heritage System' designation	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Schedule 6B	Revision Requested	Schedule 6B Natural System Features and Areas be revised to remove the northeastern limits of the subject site (10196 Bramalea Rd) from the 'Valleyland and Watercourse Corridor' and 'Woodland' designation	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Schedule 12	Revision Requested	Schedule 12 Site and Area Specific Policies be updated to include the Special Land Use Policies that apply specifically to the subject site (10196 Bramalea Rd) (Section 4.14.3.21 – Area 22 of the 2006 Brampton Official Plan).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	General	Clarification Requested	According to Table 5 lands designated Neighbourhoods on Schedule 2 will comprise of a Low-Rise building typology. Additional permissions include Low-Rise Plus within 400 metres of a Support Corridor shown on Schedule 3B. Lands with frontage along Secondary Urban Boulevards on Schedule 1 will comprise of Low-Rise Plus, and MidRise building typology. High-Rise buildings may be permitted subject to additional planning studies and other applicable policies in this Plan, and where located within a Major Transit Station Area (MTSA). Through this correspondence we ask that Staff confirm our interpretation that high-rise buildings (i.e., 13-storeys or greater) are permitted on the subject site (507 Balmoral Drive).	Comment received - this interpretation is incorrect. According to policy 2.1.2.1 b., high-rise buildings may be permitted on the subject site, subject to further studies.
2023/10/02	Gagnon Walker Domes	Marc De Nardis	Schedule 2	Recommendation	It is our recommendation that the aforementioned (Schedule 2) overlay (Support Corridor) be modified to a 'Corridor' or 'Secondary Urban Boulevard' overlay for the segment of Bramalea Road between Mayfield Road and Inspire Boulevard. The recommendation is supported by recently approved amendments to the local Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law for lands located south-east and south-west of the intersection of Inspire Boulevard.	Comment received - Streets overlays are identified based on relevant transit investments. If investments change, this will be updated.
10/02/2023	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Jonathan Rodger	Schedule 8	Clarification Requested	On Schedule 8, Proposed Energy Planning Districts, a portion of the Canadian Tire Lands is shown as within an Energy Planning District and District Energy Areas (subject to further refinement through the completion of future feasibility studies). We request clarification as to the intent and purpose of identifying Energy Planning District as there appears to be no associated policies in the Draft Official Plan	Comment received - the Energy Planning Districts and District Energy Nodes were identified through the City's CEERP. They are intended to help the City identify candidate areas for District Energy, primarily around major growth centres. This will be further refined once feasibility studies are completed. The Official Plan includes various policies related to both energy and district energy to support the implementation of these actions within the Energy Planning Districts
10/02/2023	MHBC	Oz Kemal	Schedule 8	Recommendation	It is appreciated that Schedule 8 has been updated to clarify that it demonstrates proposed energy planning districts. Until such time that the City has undertaken a feasibility assessment for each district energy area, it is recommended that interim policies be added that suggest that alternate green energy systems be considered for individual developments.	Comment received - this is addressed through the Sustainable New Communities Program, which now includes the mandatory IB-12 Energy Efficiency and GHG Reduction metric. The OP also includes policy e.g., 3.1.1.6 which speaks to promoting building design that achieves near net zero through the implementation of DE or renewable energy technologies
10/06/2023	MGP	Lauren Kapilongo	Schedule 2	Revision Requested	The Final Draft OP schedules appear to use an incorrect designation boundary for Block 140. The boundaries should match the block boundaries on Plan 43M-2092, as demonstrated by Schedule A of the in-force Brampton Official Plan. A copy of the M-Plan has been included as an attachment to this letter for ease of reference.	Comment received - After comparing the boundary of the relevant M-Plan and the designation boundaries on Schedule 2, there is no difference found between the two.

Draft Brampton Plan - Commenting Matrix (Definitions)

Date	Organization / Department	Commenter Name & Title	Section or Policy Reference	Nature of Comment	Comment	Brampton Plan - Staff Response
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Glossary	Revision Requested	Suggest bolding or italicizing defined terms throughout Official Plan to make interpretation of policies easier.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services		Glossary	Revision Requested	Suggest modifying definition of "accessory" to "ancillary" in the glossary to avoid confusion when "accessory use" (different definition) is used. Ancillary is used throughout chapter two but not defined in the glossary. See 2.2.8.6 for example.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Marsha Paley, Principal Planner	Cultural Woodland	Revision Requested	Recommend revising definition for "cultural woodland" as shown below: "Cultural Woodlands a treed vegetation community originating from, or maintained by, anthropogenic influences and culturally based disturbances; often containing a large proportion of non-native species and having <u>at least</u> 35 to 60 percent cover of coniferous or deciduous trees. Cultural woodlands may be second or third growth woodlands that occur on land where the forest was completely or partially removed at various points in time. These woodlands vary in composition and quality depending on the length of time that the forest has been re-establishing, the nature and duration of the land use while it was cleared, and the underlying environmental characteristics such as soil type, moisture, exposure and seed bank all of which influence natural succession processes and species composition."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Marsha Paley, Principal Planner	Dry Swale	Revision Requested	Delete and replace - Confirm if the term 'dry swale' is used in Brampton Plan. If not, revise the term to "Headwater Drainage Feature", which is a more up-to-date term to describe the feature and the term used in the Brampton Plan. If including a definition for Headwater Drainage Feature, suggest adapting the definition in TRCA's Living Cities Policies – " <u>Headwater Drainage Feature: means ill-defined, non-permanently flowing drainage features that may not have defined bed or banks. They are zero-order intermittent and ephemeral channels, swales and rivulets, but do not include rills or furrows. HDFs are assessed in accordance with recommended evaluation procedures and guidelines.</u> "	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Marsha Paley, Principal Planner	Ecological Buffer	Revision Requested	Revise - Ecological buffers may apply to both natural and water resource system features and areas. The following revision is requested "Ecological Buffer means areas that serve to protect natural <u>heritage and water resource systems</u> features and areas, and their ecological functions and processes, to maintain the ecological integrity of the Natural <u>Heritage</u> System through appropriate buffers."	Comment received - Natural Heritage features and areas remains in order to remain consistent with the PPS
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Marsha Paley, Principal Planner	Natural System	Revision Requested	Revise - Consider reviewing the terms used to define the Natural System's components and differentiating the terms used to describe broader Natural System policy framework and its components to be consistent with the Glossary definition. The Glossary definition is not consistent with the description of the Natural System in Chapter 2.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Marsha Paley, Principal Planner	Significant, part a)	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise definition for Significant to be consistent with the PPS and Regional Official Plan while recognizing the recent changes made to the OWES manual. "Significant means: a) in regard to wetlands, coastal wetlands and areas of natural and scientific interest, an area identified as <u>provincially significant by the municipality</u> using evaluation procedures established by the Province, as amended from time to time; ...".	Comment received
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Mark Head, Manager	Significant Groundwater Recharge Area	Revision Requested	Revise - Revise definition for Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (additional content adapted from Greenbelt Plan): <u>"Significant Groundwater Recharge Area is replenished through infiltration and seepage of water and where the recharge rate exceeds a specified threshold. Significant groundwater recharge areas include an area identified: a) as a significant groundwater recharge area by any public body for the purposes of implementing the Provincial Policy Statement, b) as a significant groundwater recharge area in the assessment report required under the Clean Water Act, 2006; or c) as an ecologically significant groundwater recharge area delineated in a subwatershed plan or equivalent study. Ecologically significant groundwater recharge areas are areas of land that are responsible for replenishing groundwater systems that directly support sensitive areas such as streams and wetlands."</u>	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Melanie Williams, Principal Planner	General	Revision Requested	Recommend including the following in the Glossary: Compatibility/Mitigation Study Energy Management Plan Integrated Energy Plan Intermittent Stream Permanent Stream Sustainable Assessment Tool Sustainable Score Thresholds Vulnerable Area (for water resource system)	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicky Intermediate Planner	Policy 5.18 Glossary	Revision Requested	Policy 5.18: " Age-Friendly means in a community, the policies, services and structures related to the physical and social environment are designed to help older adults "age actively." In other words, the community is set up to help older adults live safely, enjoy good health and stay involved." Could this definition be reworded for increased clarity? Please refer to the RPOP definition of "active aging": "the process of optimizing opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicky Intermediate Planner	Policy 5.18 Glossary	Revision Requested	Policy 5.18: " Healthy communities a broad and inclusive definition of health which refers to..." A word is missing - should state "healthy communities refers to" or something similar.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.

08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki Intermediate Planner	Policy 5.18 Glossary	Revision Requested	Policy 5.18: " Universal design means the design and composition of an environment so that it can be accessed, understood, and used to the greatest extent possible by all people regardless of their age, size, ability or disability." To conform to the RPOP definition of "universal design", please include "without the need for adaptation or specialized design" at the end of this definition. We also note that universal design refers to products and services, as well as environments.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ricardo Razao, Principal Planner	Glossary: Major Retail are large-scale or large-format stand-alone retail stores or retail centres that have the primary purpose of commercial activities.	Revision Requested	Major Retail is defined in the Glossary as a Provincial term. Through the MCR, Region staff established a threshold in accordance with Growth Plan Policy 2.2.5.7 b). Suggest amending glossary to reflect RPOP definition as approved by the Province. See RPOP policy 5.8.32 regarding Major Retail threshold. Region of Peel Official Plan, April 2022: Major Retail - large-scale or large-format stand-alone retail stores (of 1,000 square metres of gross floor area or greater) or retail centres (of 3,000 square metres of gross floor area or greater) that have the primary purpose of commercial activities.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Roman Kuczynski	Policy 5.18	Revision Requested	Designated Growth Areas means lands within settlement areas, but outside of delineated built up areas designated in an official plan for growth over the long-term planning horizon of this Plan provided in policy 1.1.2, but which have not yet been fully developed. Designated growth areas include lands which are designated and available for residential growth in accordance with policy 1.4.1(a), as well as lands required for employment and other uses." This comment from the previous draft was not addressed in the newest definition of "Designated Growth Areas." Suggest this definition be deleted as it could not be found in the body of the draft BOP.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.18	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - "Major Transit Station Area means the area including and around any existing or planned higher order transit station or stop within a settlement area..." Add "means" between "Area" and "the area".	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Ivana Osojnicki	Policy 5.18	Revision Requested	Special Policy Area means an area within a community that has historically existed in the flood plain and where site-specific policies, approved by both the Ministers of Natural Resources and Forestry and Municipal Affairs and Housing..." Is there a corresponding policy in the draft BOP re: requirements for development and site alteration within Special Policy Areas? This policy is required to satisfy RPOP policy 5.4.18.20.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Glossary	Revision Requested	Removal of 'Delineated' from Built-Up Area may be pre-empting the proposed PPS. Consider revising to align with direction in RPOP on policy terminology specifically Delineated Built-up Area throughout the Brampton Plan for ease of review and consistency. The definition of Built-up Area includes the Delineated Built Boundary but this is also not defined in glossary.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Glossary	Revision Requested	Strategic Growth Areas not capitalized in policies/sections 3.4.2.41, 2.1.1.1.e., 2.2, Support Transit Viability, Plan for Intensification. Clarification required on whether lower case SGA should have a different policy interpretation or if this is a housekeeping error.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Glossary	Revision Requested	Some definitions have been noted in the glossary but not used in the text of the Brampton Plan (i.e. Intensification corridor). Please revise to include glossary terms that have been used in policies and consider removing those that do not appear in the text. Also, the intensification corridor is defined differently than the Regional Intensification Corridor but policies in the Brampton Plan do not use the intensification corridor terminology. The Regional Intensification Corridor appears in mapping and not in policy text. Please clarify whether there is a need to include this definition. Consider instead including the Regional Intensification Corridor and some associated policies as noted in previous comments.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Glossary	Revision Requested	Compact built form definition should be added. It is identified as part of SGA definition and in chapter 2 and used in 2.2.3, 3.5.2.3 but not defined term in Brampton Plan.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Glossary	Revision Requested	Complete communities , consider adding "for people of all ages and abilities" and "access most necessities" and "services."	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Glossary	Revision Requested	Definition of " Development " includes additional component from Mining Act. Interested in understanding why this was added (wanting to understand background/context).	Comment received - this is a conformity requirement with the PPS.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Policy Development, Planning & Development Services	Virpal Kataure	Glossary	Revision Requested	The definition of Greenfield Density Target should be removed as it does not reflect the RPOP and not necessary/causes confusion with respect to Brampton's DGA target.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
08/25/2023	Region of Peel - Research & Analysis Team	Marsha Paley, Principal Planner	Housekeeping	Revision Requested	Housekeeping - Recommend reviewing Glossary to ensure terms are listed in alphabetical order (e.g., significant groundwater recharge area).	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	GSAI	Colin Chung, Jennifer Staden	fs' pg. 5-89	Revision Requested	This definition is not clear – suggest that 'fs' be spelled out as opposed to using an acronym.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.
10/02/2023	MHBC	Oz Kemal	Glossary	Revision Requested	In the Glossary, there is a chart to describe typology that only speaks to height. We recommend deleting this term and chart from the glossary section as it's already included in Table 4, under Section 2.2.2. If the term 'building typologies' is to remain, we would recommend that the definition provides the meaning of the phrase, which should be beyond just a building height.	Comment addressed - this has been identified and rectified in the updated document.