

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 acceptable 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 Companies 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 (NWBGLG et al)	General	Revision Requested	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. 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. 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	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	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. • 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.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Soneil Markham Inc. (2 County Court Boulevard)	General	Needs Discussion	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. 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.	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	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. 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.	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	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.	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	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.	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	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.	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	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 - 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>	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/performances 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	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. 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.	Comment addressed - changed to "over 1 million"
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	p. 1-3	Revision Requested	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, 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	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 Soneil Mississauga Inc., OIA Soneil Queen 261 and Soneil Oakville Inc., OIA Soneil 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 Soneil Mississauga Inc., OIA Soneil Queen 261 and Soneil Oakville Inc., OIA Soneil 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 Shanyia 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 Soneil Mississauga Inc., OIA Soneil Queen 261 and Soneil Oakville Inc., OIA Soneil 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 Shanyia 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 'now' 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 Soneil 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. OP/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.	
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.	"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.	Marc De Nardis & Michael Gagnon on behalf of 1905372 Ontario Inc. (10785, 10750, 10807, 10917 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 Bramaalea 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.	2.1.21 Intensification also needs to be supported within the walkshed of frequent transit, otherwise you won't have the density that you are wanting for 15 minute neighbourhoods. 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	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 diredly 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 Bramaalea 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			

					Section 2.1.33(c) remains in place. 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.	
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	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 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 (MTSA) 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 MTSA's 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'Allesio 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-ento 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'Allesio 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--apfG-G44--Gf--the application, in aGGG-e-l-a-Rae-w4414e-pafG+e-s-ef Part 2.2-an-d-G-14aptec-3	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Clarendale 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 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 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(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.	
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.1.56f)		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.	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	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		Zum is 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)		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		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		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 DG 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 use these overlays on Schedule 5, do you mean Schedule 2? 2.2.3.a - The Urban Centre and Town Centre 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 that is 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 Voodoo 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 Dixie 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 there not 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)	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 (Queen) 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 Center 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 Center 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 Center 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 Center 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), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountnash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	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), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountnash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	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 route 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	For the Lands at 379 Orenda Road that are shown on Schedule 2 as Employment, in proximity to a Town Centre within the boundary of the Primary Major Transit Station Area, with the Steeles Avenue East along the frontage shown as Corridors and Primary Urban Boulevard, in our submission, the layers of designations, overlays and policies should be simplified in order to ease interpretation of the applicable policies.	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), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountnash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	2.2.40	Requires Clarification	For the Lands at 379 Orenda Road that are shown on Schedule 2 as Employment, in proximity to a Town Centre within the boundary of the Primary Major Transit Station Area, with the Steeles Avenue East along the frontage shown as Corridors and Primary Urban Boulevard, in our submission, the layers of designations, overlays and policies should be simplified in order to ease interpretation of the applicable policies.	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 connections are 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), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountnash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	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), 1 Presidents Choice Circle, 25 Cottrelle Blvd, 250 First Gulf Blvd, 55 Mountnash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovard Dr	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 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	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.2.59	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 Sharmya 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 Sharmya 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 access 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	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 addressed - the Mixed Use Employment Section has been updated to make it clear that Major Office is the predominant use in these locations.
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 be subject to Policy 2.2.123.	Comment Addressed - intent is to attract more mixed use development for particular area.
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 locations 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	Daraj Kelleher 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 90% 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	Daraj Kelleher 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	Daraj Kelleher 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 1-2 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	Daraj Kelleher 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 Jasirabski 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. o/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 Rainy 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.

2022/06/03	Gagnon, Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of Amex Developments Inc. (21 Queen Street East)	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 nor 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. Proposed Policy Modification: Delete Policy 2.3.48.	Comment received.
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	2.3.48	Revision Requested	Section 2.3.48 should be deleted or modified to state that review for all Design Priority Areas and Tall Building developments by the Urban Design Review Panel is voluntary and not required for compliance with the Brampton Plan and City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. The City's Design Panel are neither the approval authority, elected municipal officials, or City employees	Comment received.
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Dorr on behalf of 2556830 Ontario Inc (owner), 228 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue 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)	2.3.48	Revision Requested	Delete Policy 2.3.48	Comment received.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith Mackinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South	2.3.69	Revision Requested	A no net loss to community services and facilities is not reasonable given many of these uses are not within a landowner's ability to deliver such a use.	Comment received.
30-May-22	KLM	Keith Mackinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South	2.3.72	Requires Clarification	We are unclear how a "special school levy" would be applicable.	Comment received.
Sustainability and Climate Change						
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.98		2.3.98 District Energy is not useful for GHG reduction in Brampton because CHP is de facto incompatible with net zero (the accounting on biomass is concerning), and we lack access to large bodies of water like the Great Lakes to use for cooling (like in Toronto), as such mandating district energy systems is fundamentally counterproductive. District Energy also does not work well for linear development like on Boulevards	Comment received
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.100		2.3.100 In 2.3.98 you mandate district energy, and here you say "may identify potential district energy areas", these seem in conflict	Comment addressed - please review updated draft
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)	2.3.105	Requires Clarification	Is the City intending on applying standards to home construction that are greater than the building code?	Comment received - the CEERP target it to Achieve a 17% Ontario Building Code efficiency gain from 2016 levels
30-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	2.3.117		2.3.117 The City needs to change the heating by-law to be a heating and cooling by-law, because climate change is going to greatly expand when we will have cooling needs, both in amount needed, and time period needed, for example, we might see a need for cooling in May.	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	2.3.135	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.3.135 states "New programs and initiatives will be developed to encourage [emphasis added] the application of green infrastructure in new development and existing communities, especially in strategic growth areas, including but not limited to green, blue and/or cool roofs ..." and Policies 2.3.139 and 2.3.140 include similar language as to encouraging green, blue, or cool roofs, while Policy 2.3.136 states "The City will develop a Green Roof By-law that will provide guidance and regulate the implementation [emphasis added] of green roofs, or of alternative roof surfaces that achieve similar levels of performance to green roofs". We request clarification as to the encouragement of green, blue and/or cool roofs under Policies 2.3.135, 2.3.139 and 2.3.140 (which is preferred for flexibility) versus the future requirement for a green roof, or of alternative roof surfaces under Policy 2.3.136;	Comment received - green roofs are encouraged as part of development
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	2.3.135	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.3.135 states "New programs and initiatives will be developed to encourage [emphasis added] the application of green infrastructure in new development and existing communities, especially in strategic growth areas, including but not limited to green, blue and/or cool roofs ..." and Policies 2.3.139 and 2.3.140 include similar language as to encouraging green, blue, or cool roofs, while Policy 2.3.136 states "The City will develop a Green Roof By-law that will provide guidance and regulate the implementation [emphasis added] of green roofs, or of alternative roof surfaces that achieve similar levels of performance to green roofs". We request clarification as to the encouragement of green, blue and/or cool roofs under Policies 2.3.135, 2.3.139 and 2.3.140 (which is preferred for flexibility) versus the future requirement for a green roof, or of alternative roof surfaces under Policy 2.3.136;	Comment received - green roofs are encouraged as part of development
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 Bovaird Dr	2.3.135	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.3.135 states "New programs and initiatives will be developed to encourage [emphasis added] the application of green infrastructure in new development and existing communities, especially in strategic growth areas, including but not limited to green, blue and/or cool roofs ..." and Policies 2.3.139 and 2.3.140 include similar language as to encouraging green, blue, or cool roofs, while Policy 2.3.136 states "The City will develop a Green Roof By-law that will provide guidance and regulate the implementation [emphasis added] of green roofs, or of alternative roof surfaces that achieve similar levels of performance to green roofs". We request clarification as to the encouragement of green, blue and/or cool roofs under Policies 2.3.135, 2.3.139 and 2.3.140 (which is preferred for flexibility) versus the future requirement for a green roof, or of alternative roof surfaces under Policy 2.3.136;	Comment received - green roofs are encouraged as part of development
03-Jun-22	BLD	Sophie Lin	2.3.167	Requires Clarification	Section 2.3.167. The term "adaptation checklist" is not a defined term; this requirement is unclear.	Comment Addressed- It is a checklist to summarize the level of resilience planning undertaken for a development project to improve the ability of buildings to withstand the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. This includes but not limited to, ensuring new development is constructed in a way that mitigates flood events, improves thermal resilience, and extends the duration of back-up power generation
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)	2.3.167	Requires Clarification	What exactly is an "adaption checklist" and why are these required as part of a development application?	Comment Addressed- it is a checklist to summarize the level of resilience planning undertaken for a development project to improve the ability of buildings to withstand the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. This includes but not limited to, ensuring new development is constructed in a way that mitigates flood events, improves thermal resilience, and extends the duration of back-up power generation
03-Jun-22	Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.	Andrew Walker and Michael Gagnon on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group (owner)	2.3.167	Revision Requested	Section 2.3.167 speaks to requiring an 'Adaptation Checklist' for all planning and development activities to address expected regional climate impacts. The policy does not identify what the 'Adaptation Checklist' consists of or the criteria meant to satisfy/complete it. The 'Adaptation Checklist' is not a defined term in the Draft 'new' Official Plan. As currently conceived, the policy in Section 2.3.167 is vague and its spirit and intent is not clearly understood.	Comment Addressed- it is a checklist to summarize the level of resilience planning undertaken for a development project to improve the ability of buildings to withstand the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. This includes but not limited to, ensuring new development is constructed in a way that mitigates flood events, improves thermal resilience, and extends the duration of back-up power generation
30-May-22	KLM	of Four X Development Inc., Mustque Development Inc., Pencil Top Development Inc., Metrus Central South, Metrus Construction and	2.3.178	Revision Requested	We are supportive of LID's however they should be permitted within future City owned infrastructure without penalty to the developer. As an example, LID's in a park should be permitted without a deduction in parkland credit.	Comment received- this comment has been provided to the staff leading the Parkland Dedication Bylaw Strategy. They have identified this is being looked into
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	2.3.180		Policy 2.3.180 states "The City will, prior to the approval of any site-specific development proposal, require the approval of a functional servicing report and a stormwater management plan..." In our submission, "Where appropriate" should be added before "The City will", since requiring such studies may not be applicable under all circumstances, such as for minor expansions to existing buildings.	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	2.3.180	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.3.180 states "The City will, prior to the approval of any site-specific development proposal, require the approval of a functional servicing report and a stormwater management plan..." In our submission, "Where appropriate" should be added before "The City will", since requiring such studies may not be applicable under all circumstances, such as for minor expansions to existing buildings.	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 Mountainash Rd, 279 Orenda Rd, 10-40 Lagerfeld Dr and Vacant Lands at Lagerfeld Dr and Bovaird Dr	2.3.135	Requires Clarification	Policy 2.3.180 states "The City will, prior to the approval of any site-specific development proposal, require the approval of a functional servicing report and a stormwater management plan..." In our submission, "Where appropriate" should be added before "The City will", since requiring such studies may not be applicable under all circumstances, such as for minor expansions to existing buildings.	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)	2.3.167	Requires Clarification	Section 2.3.167 speaks to requiring 'Adaptation Checklist' for all planning and development activities to expected regional climate impacts. It is not clear what 'Adaptation Checklist' means and how does each planning and development activity supposed to understand or know the expected regional climate impacts. This policy is too vague and not clear in what is intended.	Comment Addressed- It is a checklist to summarize the level of resilience planning undertaken for a development project to improve the ability of buildings to withstand the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. This includes but not limited to, ensuring new development is constructed in a way that mitigates flood events, improves thermal resilience, and extends the duration of back-up power generation

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.	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.	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.	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 7927959 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 7927959 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.	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 (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Housing and Social Matters (Section 2.3.226 and 2.3.244)	Revision Requested	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 2566830 Ontario Inc (owner), 226 Queen Street East and 10-12 June Avenue	Housing and Social Matters	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	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.	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		<p>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."</p> <p>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."</p>	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			<p>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.</p>	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	<p>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.</p>	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	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	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		
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	<p>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.</p>	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	<p>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.</p>	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	<p>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.</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	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 if	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. 1/4 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 Pulls 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 Pulls 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		Needs Discussion	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			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 Complement, 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 Schoude 38, 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 PoliciesNew 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.

BRAMPTON PLAN - OFFICIAL PLAN -		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. 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.	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 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.
2022/06/14	Gagnon, Walker, Domes Ltd.	Michael Gagnon and Richard Domes on behalf of O/A Sonell Mississauga Inc., O/A Sonell Queen 261 and 263 Queen Street East	3.1.57	Revision Requested	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. 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.
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	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. 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 MTA 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 or greater 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	Table 4 identifies the 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.	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 Parters 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 Parters Inc.	Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Four X Development Inc., Mustique Development Inc., Panzi 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: • 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 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 to be reflected. 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		I can't find any references to Frequent Rapid Transit Routes 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		Kennedy, Sandalwood, and Chiquacousy are all planned for Züm lines which is not marked	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 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? Schedule 6 incorrectly identifies the site as an enhancement area and canyons, wet, and as such places it in conflict with Schedules 2, 4 and 5 which correctly identify 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 Schedule 8 – Road Right-of-Way Widths / Schedule 14 - Site & Area Specific Policies – In November 2021 City Council approved 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.	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		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. Schedule 9 requires amendment to identify the subject site as being under appeal.	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	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.
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	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 10		Shouldn't parklands in valleys like Archdekin Park be shown as Open Space on this schedule?	Comment received.
03-May-22	Member of the Public	Sylvia Menezes Roberts	Schedule 11		Is anyone ever going to fix that -30 McLaughlin Road isn't shown in any current Secondary Plan on GIS?	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	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	GSAI	Stephanie Matveeva on behalf of 2546781 Ontario Inc (owner), 4037 Countryside Drive	Special Study Area/Schedule 14	Revision Requested	Proposed removal of 4037 Countryside Road from Schedule 14 and Special Policy Area 2.	Comment addressed
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	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.
June 2/2022	Dentons Canada LLP	Katryna Vergis-May on behalf of CNR Company (owner)	Schedule (?)	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 25/2022	GSAI	Mark Condello on behalf of Castemore/Clarkway - Country Homes (owner)	Schedule 1 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.
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	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.
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	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.
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	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.
June 2/2022	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Marshall Smith on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc (owner) - 4320 Queen Street East	Schedule 4	Revision Requested	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