OVERVIEW:

- This report provides an information update and staff comments in response to the Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines circulated by Metrolinx for agency/stakeholder review in November 2010.

- Background discussion includes summary of previous staff comments and Council resolutions related to Mobility Hubs from April to September 2008, with regard to Green Paper #2, White Paper #2, and the Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

- The Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan currently identifies three Mobility Hubs in the City of Brampton: Downtown Brampton, Bramalea GO station, and Shoppers World. The Mount Pleasant Transit Village has been identified as a "Mobility Hub" in the City's Official Plan, but did not meet Metrolinx criteria for designating it as such in the Regional Transportation Plan (through classified as a Major Transit Station Area).

- The Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines document is a compendium of useful information on principles and practices that promote more sustainable development in the GTHA’s Urban Growth Centres and key transportation nodes.

- Implications and recommendations for transportation and development plans: Planning at Mount Pleasant and other hubs is to proceed as previously, applying the techniques and principles now in the Mobility Hub Guidelines.

- Further designation of mobility hubs may be sought based on revised plans for improved rapid transit service.

- The final Mobility Hubs Guidelines document is expected to be completed before Spring 2011.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. THAT the report from Henrik Zbogar, Manager, Long Range Transportation Planning, Planning Design & Development, dated December 23, 2010, to the Planning Design & Development Committee Meeting of January 31, 2011, re: Status Report: Metrolinx Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines, be received; and

2. THAT staff's comments on the draft Mobility Hub Guidelines, appended hereto, be endorsed as Brampton's official response to Metrolinx on this matter, including the continued request for Metrolinx to recognize Mt. Pleasant as Mobility Hub in the Regional Transportation Plan; and

3. THAT these comments also be circulated for information to the Region of Peel, the City of Mississauga, and the Town of Caledon.

BACKGROUND:

Mobility hubs, as described in The Big Move (Metrolinx's Regional Transportation Plan, Nov 2008), are major transit station areas with higher-order transit services and generally high development potential. Those found in Urban Growth Centres designated in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe are known as Anchor Hubs, with others classified as Gateway Hubs. The City of Brampton contains an Anchor Hub in the Downtown, centred on the Transit Terminal and Brampton GO Station, and Gateway Hubs at Shoppers World (Hurontario & Steeles) and at Bramalea GO Station. The City has also consistently highlighted the sustainable, transit-oriented development features of Mt. Pleasant Village, and sought $44 million in Quick Wins funding and its recognition in the RTP as a Gateway mobility hub.

Brampton staff provided extensive comments on the Metrolinx “Green Papers” leading up to The Big Move, including Green Paper #2: Mobility Hubs, summarized in the report to Committee of Council dated March 11, 2008. As stated in the report,

"The Mt. Pleasant Transit Village includes all of the ingredients of a “Successful Mobility Hub” as presented in the Mobility Hubs Green Paper:...The Mt. Pleasant mobility hub will serve as an interface for GO commuter rail, AcceleRide BRT, conventional transit service, alternative modes (pedestrians and cyclists), and automobiles."
The Mount Pleasant Village Mobility Hub concerns were reiterated in the staff report to the Planning, Design & Development (PD&D) Committee on Green Papers 6 and 7, dated April 4, 2008.

On June 2, 2008 staff reported to the PD&D Committee on the two Metrolinx White Papers. The Council Resolution of June 25, 2008 (CW240-2008) supported the general objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan and included the following specific recommendation:

- That Metrolinx support and recognize the Mount Pleasant Transit Village as exceeding the requirements of a Higher-Order Transit Hub and encourages its identification as a demonstration pilot project to provide a model for future new mobility hubs in developing areas and thus be shown on the test concept maps.

Staff also commented on the Draft RTP on September 25, 2008 and submitted the following request:

"...together with the identification of Mt. Pleasant as a Gateway Hub, Metrolinx Board be requested to broaden the programs within the capital improvement program and expedite its delivery."

While Mount Pleasant is not currently designated by Metrolinx as a Regional Mobility Hub, the Mount Pleasant Village Mobility Hub project was awarded $23 million on June 5, 2009, with two-thirds of the funding coming from the Provincial and Federal governments. Many of the mobility hub principles (pedestrian orientation, higher density, mixed uses, public space, enhanced transit service, transit oriented development) apply to Mount Pleasant, and the Infrastructure Stimulus Funding Strategy can be found in a Recommendation Report to City Council dated October 7, 2009.

Staff from the Planning, Design & Development department attended a Mobility Hubs workshop on March 23, 2010, where guiding principles were established to frame the Mobility Hub Guidelines. The document was intended to provide guidance for work between municipalities and Metrolinx on the creation and enhancement of mobility hubs to be not just multimodal interchanges, but community destinations and focal points accessible to both local residents and visitors.

**CURRENT SITUATION:**

Metrolinx released its Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines for review on November 1, 2010, with City of Brampton staff comments (Appendix A) submitted (as a draft
pending endorsement by Council) by the requested November 30, 2010 deadline.

In general, the Guidelines are meant to promote an efficient and effective transit system, to reinforce progressive provincial land use policies, and to be applied to major transit station areas with high development potential. The Guidelines contain suggested typologies, zones, densities, station features, parking strategies, pedestrian amenities, mode integration, public realm considerations, and implementation strategies.

The City of Brampton seeks clarification of mobility hub classification, regional transit and rapid transit definitions, active transportation options, performance indicators, the role of Metrolinx, performance indicator methodology, and further guidelines on funding and other tools for urban growth centre development.

Staff continues to emphasize the mobility hub characteristics of Mount Pleasant Village. Staff has also identified potential conflicts between engineering road design standards and urban objectives, as with the Ministry of Transportation’s Transit Supportive Guidelines that are also being finalized.

Staff comments also include the work done so far in Brampton, including an urban design vision for Downtown and the Central Area, current mobility hub studies, the higher-order transit study and new Shoppers World Terminal on Hurontario, and the Mount Pleasant Village planning initiative.

The Mobility Hub Guidelines are intended to serve as a resource document – not to create new requirements for municipalities, but to guide the development of municipal mobility hub master plans. The response from Metrolinx to City of Brampton comments should clarify whether a master plan will be a requirement for any planning support, and also whether performance measures will be used in any way other than for internal monitoring purposes within municipalities.

The Mobility Hub Guidelines, with the final document to be issued shortly, will assist in continuing to prepare the designated City of Brampton mobility hubs for planned development, particularly at the Shoppers World Terminal and the Downtown GO Station. Both of these locations are in the Hurontario Higher Order Transit corridor, for which preliminary design and engineering activities will soon be underway with Metrolinx and the cities of Brampton and Mississauga. In addition, the Downtown Terminal is currently served by the recently launched Züm bus rapid transit service, and will serve as a major transfer station on the future Queen Street Corridor Higher Order Transit facility, with the Metrolinx Benefits Case Analysis to begin shortly. Downtown Brampton and the Central Area along Queen Street have been the focus of many urban design and
planning studies, and are seeing increasing development densities and rapidly growing transit ridership.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS:

Near future redevelopment plans for Downtown Brampton bring the opportunity to apply mobility hub principles to the Downtown Transit Terminal and surrounding lands. Where feasible, parking will be reduced and restructured, and moved to other transit station areas in the City.

Metrolinx is working with City staff on developing the Downtown Mobility Hub and the Bramalea GO Gateway Hub, and on attracting funding for future redevelopment – including the future Hurontario and Queen Street higher order transit line and commercial development appropriate to both the historical context of the downtown and the potential status of the location as a destination for tourists, business travellers, and residents.

Metrolinx has indicated a willingness to re-evaluate certain major transit station areas (MTSAs) for designation as mobility hubs (MHs). In the meantime, staff will seek clarification of the significance of MH- versus MTSA-designation, and further guidance from other policy documents being developed, such as the Transportation Provincial Policy Statement. In addition, the vision for the Züm network has been revised, and an extension of the Queen line west to the Mount Pleasant GO station is being planned. This improved transit service would likely meet the requirement for two intersecting regional transit routes, making Mount Pleasant a Metrolinx-designated mobility hub. In any case, planning for the site will continue to apply the principles espoused in the Mobility Hub Guidelines, as Metrolinx has recommended for Major Transit Station Areas of local or regional significance.

CONCLUSION:

The City of Brampton Planning, Design & Development and Works & Transportation departments have submitted comments to Metrolinx on the Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines report published October 20, 2010. Staff will continue to work with Metrolinx on developing the Guidelines and on implementation at designated mobility hubs and major transit station areas. The carrying out of these guidelines through capital, secondary, and block planning processes is expected to fulfill the objectives of provincial legislation and of the Official Plan and Transportation and Transit Master Plan, encouraging the development of sustainable communities and the use of alternative modes of transportation, and
supporting the local economy through both short-term construction and the longer term creation of attractive places for living, recreation, and business.

Respectfully submitted,

Original Signed By

Adrian Smith, MCIP, RPP
Director, Planning Policy & Growth Management

Original Signed By

John Dorpett, MCIP, RPP
Commissioner, Planning, Design & Development

Appendices:

A. City of Brampton final staff comments on Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines

Report authored by: David Kuperman, Transportation Policy Planner (x42410)
November 30, 2010

Abril Novoa Camino
Metrolinx Policy and Planning
20 Bay St, Suite 600
Toronto ON M5J 2W3

Dear Ms. Novoa Camino,

Re: Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines

We appreciate having had the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Mobility Hub Guidelines, an effort for which Metrolinx is to be commended. These comprehensive guidelines present a wealth of information, and we expect that they will be a valuable resource to assist planners in working towards the goals and objectives of the province’s Growth Plan and Regional Transportation Plan. Information is provided on all steps of the mobility hub planning process, with useful summaries of benefits and applicability of different approaches throughout. The City of Brampton has already been applying many of the featured principles and planning strategies, discussed further at the end of these comments. As with our comments on the Ministry of Transportation’s Transit Supportive Guidelines, we believe it is imperative to move to the next level wherein this document becomes the basis for updating policies and standards, for inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary coordination. This process will allow pedestrian friendly, transit-supportive, and mixed-use development initiatives to be realized.

Consolidated comments from City of Brampton staff on the draft Guidelines released on October 20 follow below. As an overall comment, further clarification would be appreciated on the full purpose of this document, the role of Metrolinx in planning or funding studies and infrastructure, and any additional requirements for municipalities going forward as they relate to conformity/obligation in developing Mobility Hub Master Plans. Particularly helpful would be a better understanding of the relationship between the Mobility Hub Guidelines and the pending provincial Transportation Planning Policy Statement and any other companion documents that cover design, implementation, or funding.
GENERAL COMMENTS

1. Specific, metrics/standards should be included wherever possible to facilitate incorporation of suggested guidelines in local planning policy and documents. There is some inconsistency in the level of detail provided for the guidelines themselves. Some (e.g. Strategic Parking Management), include detailed information and concrete, specific standards. Others (e.g., complete streets, placemaking) tend to include less detailed information and offer only broad guidelines.

2. The context as well as the role of the Mobility Hub Guidelines should be clarified. To aid municipalities in implementation, which involves inter-departmental collaboration, the Guidelines should serve as the basis for updating formal engineering policies and standards, many of which appear in other Provincial documents.

3. The Guidelines should recognize the need not just for coordinated planning, but also for significant capital investment particularly in hard transit infrastructure, as part of the mobility hub framework.

4. There should also be consistency in using the pedestrian sheds – 400 m/5 minutes is used interchangeably with 500 m/5 minutes. As far as we know the standard in North America is 400 m/5 minutes.

5. It should be clarified what the requirements are for classification as regional rapid transit. Corridor length and connections should also be considered – Züm in Brampton connects Downtown Brampton to York University in Toronto, for instance. This criterion also affects classification of an MTSA as a mobility hub.

6. Several case studies are provided throughout the document; however, details regarding how the initiatives were implemented (i.e. applied policies or regulations) would be useful to assist other municipalities to bring about similar changes. Also, it would be useful to indicate the modes of transit available at all of the case study hubs.

7. Mount Pleasant Village in Brampton could be cited as an example of a mobility hub in progress or notable Major Transit Station Area (with GO Transit + Züm access, Transit Spine Road, numerous Community Spaces, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, higher densities) – perhaps under Placemaking (Chapter 5)?

8. Are any suggestions available on how to use developer incentives within the framework of the Planning Act, including Section 37 (mentioned in Chapter 8)?
ORGANIZATION

9. Within the “Seamless Mobility” section, there seems to be some overlap between the various guidelines and the organization could be improved. For example, it starts at the transit station scale in Objective 1, moves to the Mobility Hub scale in Objective 2, and then back to the transit station scale in Objective 3.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

10. I.III (Page 6): Why is the density target for Gateway Hubs 50 ppj/ha? Isn’t this the developing Greenfield target, so mobility hubs should have higher densities?

11. I.IV (Page 8): It appears that the Guidelines are designed to assist municipalities in developing “mobility hub master plans”. The document does not appear to clearly define the nature/content of these master plans versus incorporation of mobility hub objectives in other planning activities and instruments. Will such master plans be required for Metrolinx support? Will Metrolinx continue to initiate mobility hub studies, as has occurred with Cooksville and Bramalea GO station areas?

SECTION II – TYPOLOGIES, BOUNDARIES, ZONES AND SUGGESTED DENSITIES

12. II.I Mobility Hub Typology (Pages 14-15): The logic for classification of specific hubs in the GTHA is unclear and may be unnecessary. Giving labels to existing hubs may only serve to restrict the options considered in their development.

12.1 Can mobility hubs be classified under multiple typologies? Union Station is both a Destination and Urban Transit Node.

12.2 Why is Kipling an Urban Transit Node but Etobicoke Centre an Interchange? Are present or future conditions considered? Kipling is not currently heavily urbanized, but many transit connections will move to Kipling from Islington in the future. As a Brampton example, the Main Street and Steeles Avenue Gateway Hub is listed as a ‘Suburban Transit Node’ and is described as an auto-oriented form. The intent of the City of Brampton is to have that location become dense in urban form, and to be designed in a transit oriented manner, more characteristic of the “Emerging Urban Growth Centre” typology. People may construe from
this document that this area should be developed in a conventional 'suburban' form.

12.3 It may be best to eliminate the examples from this table, and avoid labelling GTHA mobility hubs, while adding typologies to the other examples given throughout the document. Municipalities will be reluctant to be categorized without knowing the implications.

13. Should the Mobility Urban Typologies be categorized and linked back to the framework of Anchor and Gateway Hubs? Is the intent of the typology to form a Mobility Hub Transect? Should there not be a co-related density target for each typology just as in Table ii.1?

14. **Table ii.1 – Suggested Densities by Transit Technology:** The transit mode share for subway seems to be the only category without a range. It is logical to assume that in places the mode share could be in excess of 60%.

**SECTION III – MOBILITY HUB GUIDELINES**

*Objective 1: Seamless integration of modes at the rapid transit station.*

15. **Theme 1 (Page 32):** Consider adding “Provide (weather-protected) pedestrian connections to nearby attractions.”

16. **Guidelines 1.1 and 1.2 (Pages 35-36):** Clarify meaning and technology requirements of local, regional, and rapid transit. As examples, Züm was funded as a Bus Rapid Transit project, and the Main and Steeles lines in Brampton are noted projects in the RTP.

17. The images of transit stations should focus on those that are well-integrated with the surrounding urban built form. We believe a simple, conceptual 3D diagram could illustrate the main concepts and elements.

*Objective 2: Safe and efficient movement of people…*

18. We are very supportive of the Complete Streets concept and are appreciative of the discussion within this chapter. We view the key measures of reduced travel speed and lane widths as well as other elements of road design geometry as fundamental to implementing this concept. The proposed guidelines recognize the importance of these features and call for the adoption of pedestrian-friendly vehicular geometry / design standards. However, it would be useful to expand
on this guideline by adding suggested specific figures for lane widths, etc. (or identifying good sources for alternative standards) in order to advance the adoption of appropriate standards. Please ensure that Approach 2.3.3 does not contravene approach 2.3.2 (roads should accommodate transit vehicles as well as pedestrians and cyclists where necessary).

19. Street lighting should be designed with consideration for pedestrian use and adequate for facial recognition, as it is often designed to provide sufficient lighting for vehicular travel only.

20. **Theme 2 (Page 41):** “Adopt road design standards that ensure safe movement of all road users.” Under what jurisdiction(s) do mobility hubs and mobility hub planning fall? How will traffic engineering standards and local municipal requirements be incorporated? While the City is responsible for right-of-way standards, many of them are modelled from Provincial documents. Will the Province issue new standards or additional detailed guidelines to enable municipalities to pursue revised alternative engineering standards?

21. **Approach 2.1.1 (Page 42):** Would a particular type of travel demand model be most appropriate – four-step/current regional, activity/tour-based, etc.?

22. **Guideline 2.2 (Pages 48-49):** TDM plans seem to fulfill most of the objectives of the ‘travel plans’ suggested. Please suggest working with and expanding TDM plans where they already exist.

23. **Approach 2.2.2 (Page 49):** “Funding for physical improvements...can be secured through existing capital programs or through negotiations in conjunction with Section 37 of the Planning Act, development charges and levies.” Will no additional Provincial or Metrolinx funding will be available?

24. **Guideline 2.3 (Page 50):** Where appropriate, a pedestrian zone width of at least 6.0 m, not necessarily within the right-of-way, has commonly been identified as a suitable guideline for locations with high levels of pedestrian activity. Generally, 40% of the right of way could be dedicated to pedestrian uses in a mobility hub area. However, in any case a good balance must be maintained between transit, pedestrian, and cyclist accommodation within and adjacent to the road right-of-way. Also, which roads (size, traffic volume) are good candidates for road diets and similar suggested modifications?

25. **Guideline 2.5 (Page 59):** Please provide additional guidance on types of bicycle facilities. For example, where are on-street (lane/Class II) versus off-street (path/Class I) facilities appropriate? How about Class III (signed routes)?
26. In general, transit should be recognized as having an important role in Complete Streets, along with pedestrian accommodation.

**Objective 4: Strategic parking management.**

27. We appreciate the recognition of the importance of strategically managing parking and the recommendations within this section, particularly those regarding the type, distribution and pricing of parking.

28. The guidelines for minimizing surfaced parking should be strengthened.

28.1 **Approaches 4.1.4 and 4.1.5** relate to the design of surface parking lots at transit stations. The guidelines should indicate that the preferred option is to have underground or structured parking at transit stations.

28.2 **Approach 4.4.5:** The table on page 85 shows very broad suggested parking requirement ranges. Additional details would be appreciated.

28.3 **Approach 4.6.1:** The section should be strengthened to state that underground or structured parking should be required in some types of mobility hubs rather than simply encouraging it.

Since the switch from surface to structure parking is key (and costly), additional guidelines related to the delivery and operation of structure parking would be useful, including consideration about design, construction, regulation, incentives, delivery and operation.

29. **Section 4.7:** On similar principles, upper levels of above ground parking structures should be lined with active uses along the street-facing frontage.

**Objective 5: A vibrant, mixed-use environment with higher land use intensity.**

30. The strategies and approaches should include more discussion on “urban form,” particularly the need for a very urban form at the transit station and immediate surrounding area with a gradation to existing residential neighbourhoods. We recommend that the issue of transit-oriented, compact, specifically urban form be identified as one of the key constituting elements of Mobility Hubs and not just included in the general Placemaking chapter. Such form will be flexible, accommodate a mix of uses, have a massing concentrated in the immediate vicinity of the Hub, and be well articulated, with the street-related, pedestrian-friendly base complementing the streets and squares. Appropriate transition to the surrounding stable areas, integration, and respect for local heritage should
also be recommended where appropriate. Specific illustrations and diagrams should show relevant examples including skyline, massing, at grade views, etc.

31. Chapter 2 introduced suggested densities for various types of transit modes. The discussion in Chapter 5 should link to those suggested density levels and include recommended minimum densities based on the type of transit proposed for the mobility hub (recognizing that other policies and the context of the mobility hub will also affect the appropriate density level). Density should be identified as a metric, with guidance emphasizing appropriate urban form.

32. **Approach 5.2.1** – The guidelines should define what is meant by “mid-rise,” “high-rise,” etc. in the specific local context

33. **Approach 5.2.3** – The guidelines should be strengthened to recommend *prohibition* of low-intensity, land-consuming uses rather than only discouraging them. Zoning should be used to prohibit non-transit oriented development near the centre of the mobility hub. Automobile oriented uses, such as drive-throughs and gas stations, should be prohibited in addition to warehouse and distribution uses.

**Objective 6: An attractive public realm.**

34. **Guideline 6.1:** The focus on pedestrian linkages in the wording of this guideline makes it similar to Guideline 1.3. To differentiate the two, it is suggested that the focus be on placemaking and an attractive public realm rather than linkages.

35. **Approach 6.1.1:** It would be useful to include widths for sidewalks and specific guidelines for how much of the right-of-way should be devoted to pedestrians (see also comment #21, above).

36. **Approach 6.1.3:** The guidelines should include discussion on how the type of open space and its design must reflect the surrounding context. For example, the primary zone of the mobility hub should have a highly urban form. The appropriate type and design of open space will be different there than in the tertiary zone. The focus should be on spaces, such as squares and plazas that are particularly urban in their design.

We recommend a specific section dealing with the importance of character and identity in identifying and marketing mobility hubs. It would discuss elements such as skyline, integration of heritage, local character, quality of development and detailing as well as way-finding and signage at the level of the area.
Objective 7: A minimized ecological footprint.

37. This chapter should acknowledge that the development promoted by the Guidelines is inherently sustainable. Sustainability is more than green roofs and should have an integrated, inter-disciplinary approach. The measures noted build on this to improve sustainability, but the inherent benefits of transit-oriented design should also be emphasized and illustrated: reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced heat island effects through use of transit and living close to transit, reduced VKT, etc. The TOD approach is complemented by micro measures like storm water management, green roofs, and integration of natural elements. LEED ND is a good measuring tool – any mobility hub development done properly should score very high.

Objective 8: Effective partnerships and incentives for increased investment.

38. Additional guidelines should be included on the process for preparing Mobility Hub Master Plans (such as public and stakeholder consultation). There should also be discussion on how such plans would fit in with a municipality’s planning framework and how they would be used in the planning approval process.

39. Developing specific, mobility hub/transit oriented development requires not only supportive policies, enabling regulation, comprehensive guidelines, incentives and updated standards but also a different delivery system. A new development system for transit oriented mixed uses is fundamental. Government agencies should also direct their investment in support for these hubs and appropriate infrastructure beyond transit needs to be planned including public amenities, utilities, streetscapes, parking structures, etc.

40. Additional details and information are suggested on the strategies and incentives, especially the financial strategies and incentives (such as TIF, municipal bonds, and infrastructure interim financing). The chapter lists many different strategies; however, the amount of information provided is often brief. More details or listing of resources where one could find more information would make them more useful. A good example could be Brampton’s Community Improvement Plan, where the Development Charge tool includes the downtown mobility hub and where incentives are tied to the quality of the design and performance (including increased scoring for areas in the immediate vicinity of the transit stops).

41. To increase transit mode share and build the ideal mobility hub, there should be some discussion about how to make public transportation a choice mode, and
about enhancing the travelling experience by meeting the diverse needs of users (social role of providing access to amenities as a total transit experience).

42. Brampton’s proposed Main Street North Development Permit System would be a better example of a DPS than Carleton Place as it is within a Mobility Hub. This DPS is in our opinion a good example of the integration of policies, regulation (zoning), urban design guidelines and implementation in a complete package (and a de-facto Form Based code). Information can be found at the following we link: http://www.brampton.ca/en/Business/planning-development/projects-studies/Pages/main-street-north.aspx.

43. **Approach 8.1.7 (Page 124):** Consider a way of counting condominium recreation facilities or other community amenities toward the parkland dedication requirement, rather than reducing the requirement.

**Objective 9: Flexible planning to accommodate growth and change.**

44. **Approach 9.2.1 (Page 139):** If mobility hubs are going to be compared using performance indicators, these indicators should be normalized or should somehow account for differences in mobility hub size and population and mode(s) of transit available, e.g. commuter rail/subway/LRT/BRT, etc. Also, who will be responsible for developing and reaching targets for mode share and other performance indicators? How will these measures be used in regional decision-making? How is it suggested that they be monitored?

45. **Approach 9.2.3 (Page 141):** Include local business revenues (or similar measure) in economic performance indicators.

**DEFINITIONS**

46. We recommend (as we did for the *Transit Supportive Guidelines*) clear definitions for Transit Adjacent, Transit Supportive and Transit-Oriented development as well as the inclusion of the term “urban design” as a key tool for good urban form and placemaking.

**MINOR COMMENTS**

47. Are blank pages necessary (for example, pages 2 and 12 of the document)?
48. I.I (Page 4): clarify 'approximately 10 minute/800 metre radius' – should be '10-minute walk/800 metre radius'.

49. I.II (Page 5, second full paragraph) should be “The provincial government has shown renewed commitment TO INVESTING IN the region's transportation…”

50. I.II (page 5, third full paragraph) should be “…content is mutually supportive; however, they serve different purposes.”

51. I.IV (page 8): Repetition: “many municipalities…are already well on their way…”).

52. III (Page 27): Theme One – “Minimizing Need and Supply of Commuter Parking.” Should supply be optimized rather than minimized after need is reduced?

53. II.III (Page 19): Tertiary Zone – “This zone, beyond 500 metres from the rapid transit station…”

54. II.IV (Page 23): “Wherever possible, the mobility hub should contain the highest development densities and the greatest land-use mixes in the mobility hub.” First ‘mobility hub’ reference should probably be ‘UGC’.

55. 2.2.2 (Page 49): ‘compliment’ under Indicators in diagram should be ‘complement’.

56. 8.1.5 (Page 124): Second bullet point – ‘Fastrack’ should be ‘fast-track’.

57. 8.3.3 (Page 128): Replace ‘are’ in final sentence with ‘is’.

58. 9.1.4 (Page 136) last point: Replace ‘with’ with ‘and’.

59. 9.2.4 (Page 141): Correct ‘Over al reduction in GHG…’ to ‘Overall reduction…”

BRAMPTON’S WORK TO DATE

Brampton has three Metrolinx-designated mobility hubs: Downtown Brampton (anchor hub), Shoppers World (gateway hub) and Bramalea GO Station (gateway hub).

In 2005, the City approved the Urban Design Vision for the Downtown and Central Area which included identification of the area surrounding the GO Station as a “Special Character Area”. The concept identified this as an inter-modal exchange and major redevelopment site. In 2006 the City rezoned most of the surrounding area for mixed
use transit-supportive forms with higher densities and introduced built form controls. In 2007 the Community Improvement Plan introduced incentive tools meant to encourage appropriate, transit-supportive urban forms. Currently Brampton is carrying out an internal study for the Downtown Mobility Hub in conjunction with the Hotel/Convention Centre study.

The Main/Steeles (Shoppers World) site has been studied through the Hurontario-Main Higher-Order Transit study as well as through internal work which includes development of a new transit terminal that will better integrate with current and future inter-regional BRT services on Hurontario Street and on Steeles Avenue.

Bramalea GO Station Mobility Hub study is now beginning, and Brampton staff has been working with Metrolinx staff to develop a study scope and terms of reference.

The City of Brampton, together with Federal government assistance, has also invested considerable effort into the planning, design, and development of Mt. Pleasant Village—a community that is being designed around the existing GO Station as the defining feature. Though not recognized in the Regional Transportation Plan as a “mobility hub,” the planning principles and execution of this community are very much consistent with the objectives of the Mobility Hubs Guidelines. We suggest that the inclusion of Mount Pleasant Village Mobility Hub as a case study would be a constructive addition to the Guidelines, to illustrate a unique typology that is not clearly captured in the document.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to continued cooperation with Metrolinx to advance the Regional Transportation Plan, and to work towards the finalization of the Mobility Hub Guidelines.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

Adrian Smith
Director, Planning Policy & Growth Management

Cc:  H. Zbogar
      J. Given
      K. Walsh
      S. Connor
      S. DeJager
      J. Corbett
      T. Mulligan