

City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

Response to Comments on Second Public Draft Zoning By-law (Released September 2024)

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
1	Mary Ann Burns	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)	Wednesday, November 13, 2024	While we appreciate the inclusion of a provision prohibiting Additional Residential Units (ARU) within the Natural System or Open Space Zones, we noticed several of our previous comments for directing development activities outside of natural hazards and that the erection of building and structures within a TRCA regulated area may require a permit from the applicable CA, have not been considered. We are concerned that the proposed zoning permissions in the CZBL could result in the unintended consequence of locating new or intensified development within hazardous lands and hazardous sites, inconsistent with the PPS and Region of Peel Official Plan and the City's OP policies.	Over time it is intended that hazardous lands/sites will be included in the NS zone. We are supportive of adding a general provision that will prohibit sensitive uses in hazardous lands and sites, as per Section 5.2.6 of the PPS. However as the areas are not mapped the City will need to apply this provision in the context of the CA regulation area.
2				We note that the CZBL proposes zone categories of Open Space and Natural System containing some TRCA regulated areas associated with valley and stream corridors and wetlands. There are notable discrepancies with some areas being zoned inappropriately as Residential without reflecting an existing flood hazard. In addition, there are many instances where the TRCA regulated area is not reflected. It is unclear if TRCA regulated areas are intended to be captured under the NS or OS zone as it is inconsistently used under both zones throughout the City.	The City is undertaking some updates to NS/OS/P zoning on public lands, and these mapping updates are reflected in the third draft Zoning By-law. Otherwise updating NS/OS zoning on private land is out of scope of this project and the delineation of these zones is based on current zoning (namely, the prior Flood zone is now the NS zone). These zones are carried forward from the existing zoning by-law and consolidated. Updates to the zoning could be considered through a separate study with appropriate consultation.
3				Within TRCA's jurisdiction, Brampton contains flood plain spill areas whereby flood waters spill out into urban areas and their extent and severity are required to be determined through flood studies. The second draft by-law still lacks reference to CA's determination of flood plain extent that may be outside of the proposed NS and OS zones.	We are supportive of referencing the regulation limit as a potential flag for a permit. Since the mapping is not under the City's jurisdiction and is updated from time to time, the City would prefer not to incorporate it into the by-law but it may be included in the City's interactive mapping as a convenience feature. We note the potential need for a permit from the Conservation Authorities is already captured under applicable law under the Ontario Building Code so this may be repetitive but can be useful as a flag for users who are unfamiliar with these requirements.
4				The CZBL should include a prohibition for certain uses within hazardous lands and hazardous sites for consistency with Section 5.2.6 of the PPS.	As above, WSP is supportive of this regulation and the third draft is updated.
5				Section 1.4.A Legan Non-Conforming Uses and 1.4.B Legal Non-Complying Buildings and Structures - Please provide provision to address the enlargement or intensification of a non-conforming use or a non-complying building or structure where they may be located within lands subject to flooding and erosion to prevent an increase in risk to persons and property. In addition, it should be stipulated that some development activities may be regulated by the conservation authority.	At this time we recommend generally retaining the proposed legal non-compliance / non-conformity provisions as providing an appropriate balance of allowing existing uses/structures to continue and expand. Non-conforming uses would not be permitted to expand without an application (such as a non permitted use in an NS zone). The use of the Regulation limit will help flag potential risks and a permit would be required for expansion. The City is unable to determine and would need to rely on the CA expertise so the reference to the regulation limit is preferred from an administration perspective.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
6				Section 1.5 Compliance with Other Legislation, By-laws and Regulations - Either here or in a separate provision, conservation authorities regulated area and permit regulation under the Conservation Authorities Act should be mentioned.	Section 1.5 does not make any specific reference to authorities in order to keep it broad and inclusive. Listing all of them would be inappropriate and create questions as to why some were excluded. Given we have added the regulation limit provisions no further changes are recommended.
7				Section 1.7.A Building Permits and 1.7.B Planning Applications - Under the Building Code Act, conservation authority permits are applicable law such that a municipality cannot legally issue a building permit until a CA permit or permit clearance has been obtained for development activities within a regulated area. Further, conservation authorities must provide comments on Planning Act applications to ensure that decisions under the Act are consistent with provincial natural hazard policies. Therefore, a direct reference to conservation authorities is recommended for both sections.	This is not required; there are other aspects of applicable law which are not mentioned here and the City prefers not to list them as the applicable law is stated elsewhere.
8				Section 4.2.A Accessory Building and Structures in Residential Zones - Similar to provision 4.2.B.5, include a provision to prevent accessory buildings and structures from being located within the NS or OS zone or otherwise as prohibited by the by-law.	This is not necessary. If portions of a lot are zoned NS or OS, then the permitted uses are limited to those uses permitted in those zones. The accessory residential uses would need to be located on the residentially zoned portion and would not be permitted in a constrained zone.
9				Section 4.2.B Additional Residential Unit - TRCA recommends an additional provision is added to this section: "An additional residential unit shall not be permitted within lands subject to flooding under regulatory storm conditions, as determined by the conservation authority having jurisdiction." To capture those areas subject to flooding that may be outside the NS and OS zones.	We are supportive of including a statement in this section to address the concern.
10				Proposed zoning and interactive mapping - Given our comments regarding the discrepancies between the proposed zoning maps and TRCA's mapping or regulated features and hazards, please ensure the most current TRCA layer regulation mapping is being used. In April, 2024, we provided our most recent layer to City GIS Staff.	Draft 3 is updated to include reference to the regulation limit which can be made available to the public on the interactive map.
11				Special Policy Area - SPA Mapping - The Avondale SPA should be delineated in the City's interactive mapping tool and referenced in the text of the CZBL. Please note that permitted uses within the SPA must conform to the provincially approved OP SPA policies.	The Avondale SPA is subject to further study and review. The policies for the SPA are not easily implemented in zoning. Since the policy is likely to change, it would be premature at this time to determine and incorporate zoning regulations.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
12	Jessica Jakubowski	Dentons (on behalf of Canadian National Railway Company)	Friday, November 1, 2024	CN continues to recommend a general provision to prohibit sensitive land uses within 300 m of a freight rail yard	We are concerned with the impact of the proposed provision on nearby existing businesses. The suggested approach would be an effective but highly restrictive means of implementing the PPS, rendering many existing businesses as legal non-conforming. We note that the D-6 guidelines state that the 300 m separation may not be achievable in existing, intensifying areas. As such the requested prohibition is not consistent with the D-6 guidelines which allow for more nuance than an outright prohibition. The language of the D-6 guidelines is suggestive that it is best applied on a case-by-case basis as development is proposed. We do not support the 300 m setback around the freight/intermodal yard given the context and that the City should use other mechanisms to assess/address development impact on the yard and vice versa. We are supportive of illustrating rail main and spur lines to assist in implementing the setback to rail lines as per other comments. Further discussion may be needed about mechanisms to support policies regarding the yard.
13				CN recommends to revise section 2.15.2a be revised to include a 15m setback for any building or structure from a lot line abutting any spur line. CN is also working on compiling the required GIS data to assist the City and its consultant in identifying the geospatial data location and type of rail infrastructure at the Brampton Intermodal and Malport Rail Yards, along with the spur, mainline and principal lines.	We are supportive of this request and we propose to update the provision to allow certain uses to be located to 0 m which is generally consistent with CN's recommendation and only affords flexibility to the structures that might need to be built close to the spur lines for unloading/loading purposes. These uses would typically also be subject to site plan control.
14				Add a new schedule depicting location of CN main and spur lines, and location of the freight rail yards with a 300 m Influence Area. CN is compiling the GIS data for the main and spur lines, as well as the freight and intermodal rail yards.	This information is proposed to be shown in an appendix, to support the associated provisions. Since it is subject to change, an appendix is recommended. Further coordination may be required to obtain the data.
15				Include a definition for Main Rail Line, Spur Rail Line, Freight Rail Yard, and Intermodal Rail Yard, refer to linked letter.	We have added main rail and spur line for clarity. The other definitions are not included per the responses to the other comments, as above.
16	Krystina Koops	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	Thursday, October 24, 2024	School Board's expenditure on minimum number of parking spaces equipped with electric vehicle supply equipment exceeds their available expenditure as their funding is limited for academic purposes. Their current practice is to provide rough ins for future connections as it's currently cost prohibitive to install them.	This is noted. The City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
17	Jiajing Chen	Canacre Ltd. on behalf of Infrastructure Ontario (IO) and Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>Policy 2.2.A.6.e states: All electric power facilities of Hydro One Inc. and Brampton Hydro Networks Inc. existing on the date of enactment of this By-law shall be deemed to conform with the requirements and restrictions pertaining to the applicable zone.</p> <p>Policy 2.2.A.6.e recommendation All electric power facilities of Hydro One Networks Inc. and Brampton Hydro Networks Inc. existing on the date of enactment of this By-law shall be deemed to conform with the requirements and restrictions pertaining to the applicable zone.</p>	We have updated the terminology to be broader as organization names change from time to time.
18				<p>The Infrastructure definition states: Shall mean the buildings, structures, and corridors forming the foundation for development including water lines, wastewater lines, oil and gas distribution mains, telecommunications lines and other cabled services, transit and transportation corridors, district energy lines without cogeneration, and local electrical power lines, but shall not include an energy generation facility or renewable energy system.</p> <p>Infrastructure definition recommendation: Shall mean the buildings, structures, and corridors forming the foundation for development including water lines, wastewater lines, oil and gas distribution mains, telecommunications lines and other cabled services, transit and transportation corridors, local and district electricity distribution and transmission lines without cogeneration, but shall not include an energy generation facility or renewable energy system.</p>	We have updated the definition.
19				<p>We would like to encourage a consistent approach to defining hydro corridors and electricity infrastructure facilities throughout the province. Accordingly, it is requested that the following language be considered for use throughout the Brampton Zoning By-law, including in the definition of “Infrastructure.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All references to Hydro One should be referred to as “Hydro One Networks Inc.” - All references to corridors used for the transmission and distribution of electricity should be referred to as “hydro corridors.” - All references to electricity infrastructure and facilities should be referred to as “electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems.” 	We have made revisions. Per above, we prefer not to refer to organizations specifically where possible and to be general.
20				<p>We request the addition of the following policy Section 10.2.E “Secondary uses, such as active and passive recreation, agriculture, community gardens, other utilities and uses such as parking lots and outdoor storage that are accessory to adjacent land uses, are encouraged on hydro corridor lands, where compatible with surrounding land uses. However, a proponent should be aware of the primacy of a hydro corridor is for electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems, and that secondary uses require technical approval from Hydro One Networks Inc.” The requested policy would provide flexibility for future uses on hydro corridor lands. The inclusion of this policy offers clarity with respect to the types of secondary uses that are possible on hydro corridor lands, in accordance with the Provincial Secondary Land Use Program. Having these policies in place will also streamline the number of municipal planning approvals that a proponent must seek when they apply to Hydro One/IO for a secondary use.</p>	This requested provision is more of a policy statement and would be challenging to enforce in zoning. Generally the city prefers that parking be located on the same lot as the associated uses, so that min parking requirements can be enforced over time. At this time it is recommended that that this approach be maintained.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
21				To ensure that there is flexibility for future secondary land uses along Hydro One hydro corridors, we request that agricultural use be listed as permitted for hydro corridors within the Utility and Transportation (UT) Zone. This will allow agricultural land uses to be permitted within hydro corridors in line through Hydro One and IO's Provincial Secondary Land Use Program without the need for a zoning by-law amendment, in line with Policy 3.2.6.52 of the Brampton Plan 2024. Additional information on the Provincial Secondary Land Use Program can be found at the following link: https://www.infrastructureontario.ca/en/what-we-do/real-estate-services/surplus-properties-sales-program-overview/hydro-corridor-provincial-secondary-land-use-program/	We support this approach as lands zoned UT will typically be under public ownership and there are other instances of agricultural zoning in the vicinity of these zones.
22	Tate Kelly	Infrastructure Ontario	Thursday, October 31, 2024	It is assumed Utility and Transportation uses are permitted in the UT Zone, but could be made clearer in Chapter 10, Table 10.1.1 of the Brampton Proposed Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2nd Draft, whether such uses are permitted.	We have updated the permissions so that it is clear that infrastructure may be the principal use. We also note that the third draft includes permission of some infrastructure in all zones in chapter 3.
23				<p>The proposed Utility zone only permits existing agricultural uses. We would request that the Utility zone be updated to permit existing as well as new secondary uses without the need for a zoning by law amendment, in line with Policy 3.2.6.45 of the Brampton Plan 2023</p> <p>Parcel A: Tomken Road and Highway 407 On August 9, 2023, Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 2006-249 was passed. As part of OPA 2006-249, Parcel A was designated under SPA 05 (Highway 410 and Steeles Avenue Secondary Plan) as General Employment 1 and Natural Heritage System. While we are supportive of the Natural System (NS) zone, we request that the remainder of Parcel A be zoned General Employment (GE) in-line with OPA 2006-249.</p>	<p>Agriculture is added. As above, the City prefers to obtain an application to assess other secondary uses such as parking.</p> <p>The base zone has been updated to the PE zone, which has replaced the existing base M1 zone as it allows for a similar range of uses. The exception zone has been carried forward. To expand permitted uses, an application should be made as rezoning for new uses in this area is out of the scope of the zoning by-law review.</p>
24				<p>Parcel B: Tomken Road and Highway 407 On March 22, 2022, Parcel B was removed from the Parkway Belt West Plan through amendment number 230. On August 9, 2023, OPA 2006-249 was passed which redesignated Parcel B from Provincial Highways to Industrial, and parts as Open Space. As part of OPA 2006-249, Parcel B was also designated under SPA 05 (Highway 410 and Steeles Avenue Secondary Plan) as General Employment 1 and Natural Heritage System. The Brampton Proposed Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2nd draft proposes to re-zone Parcel B from Agricultural (A) and A(P) to Utility and Transportation (UT) and (h)UT. We request that Parcel B be zoned General Employment (GE) and Natural System (NS) in-line with OPA-2006-249.</p>	As above, rezoning is largely outside the scope of the project and an application should be made. The UT zone was selected in place of the A zone given the proximity to Highway 407. While we are open to applying a Future Development zone or similar, Parcel B appears tied to the 407 ROW as a very large single parcel. Further input would be needed and we would be pleased to meet to discuss.
25				Chinguacousy Road and Highway 407 property IO manages a parcel at the northwest corner of Highway 407 and Chinguacousy Road (part of PIN 14085-0146). The parcel was once included within the Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP) however it was removed through amendment 103 on December 16, 1996. The parcel is designated Residential in the Brampton Plan, 2023. We request that the parcel be zoned Residential in-line with the Brampton Plan, 2023.	At this time, a UT zone is applied. This parcel appears very large and part of the 407 ROW. Rezoning is out of scope of this project and an application should be submitted. We are open to considering a UT or FD zone subject to further context about the parcel fabric. Generally we are preferring not to split zone parcels when making zone changes through this process and should tie any zone changes to the lot fabric. Further discussion may be needed to review options within the scope of this review process.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
26	Nick Gooding	Peel District School Board	Thursday, October 31, 2024	Table 3.1.1 Minimum and Maximum Parking Space Requirements #35 and #36, Portable parking spaces: The policy requirement for “plus 1 per each portable” is unreasonable as a variance would be required every time a portable is added to a school site. Please delete the “plus 1 for each portable” requirement in #35 and #36.	We are supportive of removing the reference to portables, however, the requirement will be changed so that min parking is based solely on Gross Floor Area which will include portables. The provision of parking should be commensurate with parking demand so if floor space is being increased, even on a temporary basis, there may be an additional parking need, so we prefer this approach of relying on the GFA.
27				Table 3.4.1 Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Equipped with Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment The Comment Response Matrix reply says “noted” in response to our Draft 1 comment. Please confirm that school boards will be exempt from this policy	This is noted. The City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.
28				Table 3.5.1 Minimum Bicycle Parking Requirements Please also remove the requirement for short-term bicycle parking.	The City has directed a strategy to facilitate a more balanced range of transportation options in Brampton Plan and in the City's recent Active Transportation Master Plan. In addition to requiring vehicle parking, as is traditional in zoning, the City is moving towards requiring bicycle parking. The City would like to require short term bicycle parking spaces for schools, as will be required for other institutional and for commercial and employment uses.
29	Kaitlin Webber	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson (MHBC), planning consultants for TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TCPL)	Friday, October 18, 2024	1. We request the Zoning By-law schedules show TCPL's pipelines as an overlay, similar to how they depicted in Schedule 2 of the 2023 Brampton Plan.	Given the pipeline is shown in Brampton Plan, WSP agrees it should be included in the zoning by-law for implementation of the associated policies. This is shown as an appendix for informational purposes and a setback requirement is identified in the general provisions in Section 3.
30				2. The TCPL provisions included in Section 2.4.1 of the draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law do not reflect TCPL's current setback standards. As such, we request that the policies be amended as follows (screenshot included in original submission)	We support this request and have made the requested changes.
31	Augustine Ko	Regional Municipality of York	Wednesday, October 16, 2024	We continue to not have any comments to provide.	Noted
32	Anuradha P	Rogers Communications Canada Inc.	Tuesday, October 8, 2024	We have reviewed the proposed area and do not have any comments or concerns at this time. Rogers currently has existing communications within this area. Please contact Rogers at gtaw.newarea@rci.rogers.com prior to the commencement of construction.	Noted
33	Josh Salisbury	Town of Halton Hills	Wednesday, October 30, 2024	The Town does not have any comments on this Draft of the Brampton New Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Please provide me with any future updates of the Comprehensive ZBL process.	Noted

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
34	Victoria Mortelliti	Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD)	Friday, November 8, 2024	2.9.1. c Model Homes and Temporary Sales Offices: We recommend revising the policy to remove the limit on the maximum number of model homes permitted.	The provision is fairly common and is similar to the existing provision. WSP recommends retaining unless BILD can provide other context on the issue. The item did not come up in the December 2024 meeting.
35				Table 2.4.1 Permitted Yard Encroachments in All Zones Stairs: We propose reducing the setback for stairs to 0.5m from the property line, instead of the current 0.6m. Balconies: We recommend including a provision to allow balcony encroachments into the front yard for back-to-back units. 2 Window Bays: We suggest increasing the maximum width for window bays to 4m (instead of 3m) and permitting them in interior side yards.	We support 0.5 m for stairs. City prefers a limit of 3 m for window bays and a percentage of dwelling width (front/rear yard encroachments). Support allowing in interior side yards although unsure of how frequent this would be utilized as windows and space are typically limited in the interior side yards. Revisions have been made in the third draft.
36				Section 3.4: Electric Vehicle Parking Provisions We recommend deleting the requirement for the "Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Equipped with Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment" and allowing it to be market-driven.	This is noted. The City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.
37				3.5. B Location of Bicycle Parking We recommend revising the policy to allow bicycles to be stored in a storage locker, provided that the minimum bike storage space requirement is met, along with additional space for general storage.	The City prefers not to allow bicycle parking requirements to be met in storage lockers.
38				3.5. C. 1 Bicycle Parking Space Dimensions We recommend the removal of the % requirement of vertical/horizontal bicycle parking spaces.	The City prefers to retain the requirement.
39				4.1. B Lot Requirements a. Revise the minimum lot area for single detached (R1) dwellings to 225 m ² . b. Given that the typical rear lane townhouse dwelling depth is 18m, revise the minimum lot area for rear lane townhouses to 100 m ² . c. Revise the minimum lot area for cluster townhouse dwellings on a per-unit basis. d. Set the minimum lot width for back-to-back townhouses on a per-unit basis.	We have made updated to these requirements. The min width for B2B townhouse dwellings should work for condominium developments and otherwise we also applied a per dwelling width requirement.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
40				Table 4.1.4: Residential Zone Building Location Requirements (RE, RH, R1, R1A, R1M, R2 and R2A Zones) In the second draft, the rear yard setback for R1/R1A has been increased to 7.5m, and the exterior side yard setback to 4.5m, up from 6m and 2m in the first draft. We propose retaining the original setbacks of 6m for the rear yard and 3m for the exterior side yard.	We proposed revisions based on the discussion. The City prefers a 7 m rear yard for privacy and landscaping but this can drop to 6 m where adjacent to parks. The exterior side yard is reduced for flexibility.
41				Table 4.1.5 Residential Zone Building Location Requirements (R3 Zones) We would like to discuss the minimum % requirements as we would like them reconsidered.	Noted; it was not discussed in the December 2024 meeting and we are open to receive further specific input.
42				Table 4.1.6 Residential Zone Building Height and Form Requirements (RE, RH, R1, R1A, R1M, R2 and R2A Zones) The permitted 3-storey building height may exceed 11m due to grading and the offering of units with unique designs, such as lofts. We recommend adjusting the maximum height from 11m to 11.6m to accommodate this variation.	WSP recommends including a limitation on height in storeys and in m. The 11 m height is already an increase over existing (which is typically 10.6 m) and needs to be considerate of existing neighbourhood context. The exception zones would supersede this. We have proposed a taller height of 13 m in the new 'greenfield' zone.
43				Table 4.1.8 – Residential Zone Site and Landscaping Requirements (RE, RH, R1, R1A, R1M, R2 and R2A Zones) We understand the need for a lot coverage requirement in the R1M (Residential Mature Neighbourhood) Zone. However, the proposed lot coverage requirements for the R1, R1A, and R2 zones are unnecessary and overly restrictive. Calculating the lot coverage for each lot is 3 time-consuming, and the building envelopes in these zones will already be effectively governed by the setback requirements.	We have generally removed lot coverage given the administrative challenges in favour of landscaped open space and to support the UDG.
44				4.2. D.3 Attached Private Garage Requirements The garage door setback for a single-car garage is 6m, while the setback for other garages is 5.75m. Could you please clarify why these requirements differ? We believe having a setback of 5.75m should be adequate.	We have made these standards consistent upon further review. The City prefers 6 m as providing a more adequate space for a vehicle and avoid overhang of vehicles onto sidewalks.
45				4.2. C Minimum Amenity Space Requirements We recommend revising the requirement for 8 to 200 units to 4m2 per unit.	We have updated to a simplified requirement of 5 m2 per unit and this can be achieved flexibly including within interior areas.
46				4.2. H Driveway Requirements for R1, R2, and R3 Zones [PENDING FURTHER REVIEW OF CITY-WIDE DRIVEWAY STANDARDS] – BILD would like to be involved in monitoring the proposal that comes forward.	The driveway standards are subject to separate study by the City, which is not complete, so the new ZBL incorporates the existing standards. An application would be needed at this time where alternative standards are proposed.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
47				<p>7.1. D Building Form The maximum building height for the Prestige Employment (PE) Zone was revised from unrestricted to “11m, 3 storeys” in the second draft. Additionally, the removal of the 7.2.D Height Exceptions from the previous draft prevents new industrial developments in the PE Zone from achieving a 36-foot clear interior height once structural elements like joists, steel, and roofing are accounted for. Modern industrial buildings typically require clear heights of 36 to 40 feet (11m to 12.2m) to meet current standards. To address this, we suggest increasing the maximum height to 13.7m, allowing for a 40-foot clear height plus a 5-foot allowance for structural components.</p>	<p>We have proposed updates to the height in the employment zones in light of the comments and in consideration of existing standards which should resolve the concerns.</p>
48				<p>7.1. E Site and Landscaping The minimum landscaped open space requirement for the Prestige Employment (PE) and Mixed Employment (ME) Zones has been increased from 20% to 25%. Typically, landscaped open space is maintained at 20%, and this increase will reduce the surface parking area, potentially impacting leasing feasibility. We recommend reverting the landscaped open space requirement back to 20%.</p>	<p>We have updated the requirements for LOS in the GE and PE zones. The ME zone is deleted in Draft 3 upon further review.</p>
49				<p>7.2. B Surface Parking Restrictions The current restriction allows parking areas between the building and public street to occupy a maximum of 50% of the street frontage. This limitation is challenging, as employees need accessible parking near the main entrance, and it could lead to inefficient and insufficient parking for tenants, ultimately impacting leasing potential. We recommend removing this restriction to allow for more practical and tenant-friendly parking layouts.</p>	<p>There is a desire to limit parking in front of the building in all circumstances and to require a portion of the site be occupied by a building. The third draft proposes some revisions to create more flexibility in light of the comments. Special allowance for existing buildings/parking areas in the GE zone to expand has been provided as these zones will typically be in the interior of the industrial areas where public realm design is less of a priority compared to sites that are adjacent to major roads.</p>
50				<p>Additional Considerations As per our meeting with Staff on October 22nd, we are asking that all existing and future greenfield single detached, semi-detached and townhouse designations be amalgamated into one easy to use zoning designation where all standards for all unit types fall within the new designation. We believe this is a great way to remove unnecessary zoning amendments when 4 markets change and force adjustments to product types. We heard positive feedback during our meeting that this approach makes sense and can certainly be explored. One of our members has also spoken with leadership in Planning, and there too the idea was very positively received. We look at this as a unique way to be nimble and speed up the delivery of much needed housing.</p>	<p>A new flexible greenfield zone is included in the third draft (R2G). This zone will only be applied through development applications and is subject to further review/updates as the City completes Secondary Plans, where this zone would potentially be applied. The City will continue to need separate zones with limited typologies as these zones are needed to address existing neighbourhoods and to implement Secondary Plan land use designations where typologies are restricted.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
51	Ryan Guetter	Weston Consulting on behalf of Atlantic Packaging Holdings Ltd. (195 Walker Drive & 1615 Clark Boulevard)	Thursday, November 7, 2024	<p>Based on our review, there are a series of uses contemplated within the PE zone that are of potential concern in the context of the Provincial changes to the definition of “Area of Employment”, which prohibits new standalone commercial and institutional uses, including offices, from Areas of Employment. As you are aware, the new definition of Area of Employment came into effect on October 20, 2024. Uses contemplated within the PE zone that are of potential concern include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Artisan Studio - Catering service - Dry cleaning and laundry establishment - Standalone office - Standalone convenience retail - Convention centre - Child care centre <p>Atlantic’s concern is that if the CZBL permits land uses such as standalone retail and offices that are prohibited in Areas of Employment, the employment area within which the AP Lands are located becomes at risk of losing its status as an Area of Employment under the provincial definition. If no longer located within an Area of Employment, the AP Lands and surrounding area would no longer be afforded provincial protections under the PPS and would become vulnerable to the encroachment of sensitive uses. At this time, we respectfully request that Staff consider and provide us with confirmation on how the new provincial definition for Area of Employment will be addressed in the CZBL. We further request that standalone commercial, institutional and office uses be removed from the list of permitted uses in the PE and GE zones in</p>	<p>Significant updates have been made to the 3rd draft in consideration of the PPS and to better reflect existing permissions. Our approach for implementing the new PPS is generally to implement in the Official Plan before making substantive changes to land use permissions in zoning. The zoning permissions in the new ZBL in the employment areas are reflective of existing permissions following the consolidation/simplification of existing zone categories. The PE and GE zones will be the zones applicable to the new Employment Lands definition under the 2024 PPS, and these zones have been updated and consistent with the PPS (e.g., office and sensitive land uses removed). The Provincial changes may affect how the employment lands are defined and delineated across the City, so any major zoning updates at this time would be premature and could be impactful to sites where there are limited permissions. Following the policy update, the City may further update permitted uses or the extent of employment area zoning. The City also has the opportunity to address PPS implementation through site-specific development applications. Based on this, the new ZBL will be consistent with the PPS.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
52	Rob McFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. On behalf of CP REIT Ontario Properties Ltd. And CPH Master Limited Partnership (collectively referred to as Choice)	Monday, November 11, 2024	<p>Choice owns a number of properties throughout Brampton, including the following (referred to as the “Choice Lands”):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Presidents Choice Circle (CP REIT Ontario Properties Limited); • 25 Cottrelle Boulevard (CPH Master Limited Partnership); • 250 First Gulf Boulevard (CPH Master Limited Partnership); and • 55 Mountainash Road (CPH Master Limited Partnership). <p>At this time, Choice does not have specific redevelopment intentions for the above sites, and seeks to maintain existing operations as well as opportunities for minor infill and expansion.</p>	Noted and responded to in more detail below

53		<p>In our submission, in order to avoid rendering existing conforming developments as non-conforming under the new By-law, it would be appropriate to add a “Vacuum” clause to the Draft By-law, where notwithstanding any other provisions of the new By-law, any lot and the location thereon of any building or structure, existing on the effective date of the new By-law, would be deemed to comply and would be permitted by the new By-law. In addition, it would be appropriate to provide an allowance for additions and alterations to legally existing buildings without rendering the existing development as non-conforming as a result of the addition or alteration. Section 1.4.B of the Draft ZBL does allow for lots, buildings, structures, and other features that do not comply to the zoning by-law to be altered or enlarged, but requires compliance “with all applicable requirements of this By-law and does not cause further contravention of any requirement herein”. Given the departure from the in effect zoning, we suggest the City review further for implications of legal non-compliance;</p>	<p>The City prefers to retain the approach of allowing legal non-complying buildings and structures to expand but only if they do not create further contravention. To move forward on implementing the City's new design and planning vision as per the new Official Plan, it would not be desirable to incorporate a clause that simply legalizes all existing uses and conditions. There are some uses likely approved through the Committee of Adjustment or long-established that no longer meet the City's policies, and the proposed clause would likely result in the long-term retention of uses that the City would like to see evolve over time.</p>
----	--	---	---

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
54				We understand that the first draft of the Zoning By-law withheld site specific zoning provisions. It is our client's expectation that site specific provisions will be maintained in the new Zoning By-law. We will continue to monitor draft releases to ensure site-specific provisions are appropriately implemented by the Draft Zoning By-law and suggest that it be provided for review;	We acknowledge that the site specific exceptions generally align with the policies of the Official Plan and recommend carrying forward the permitted uses and regulations of exception 2801, 2802, 1627, 2718 and 747.
55				Section 2.3B (formerly 2.3E) provides zoning standards for Drive Throughs and Motor Vehicle Washing Facilities, including provisions for minimum number of stacking spaces and the location of the stacking lane, whereas the current Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not generally regulate these matters. The Choice lands at 55 Mountainash Road are developed with uses that include multiple drive-throughs, and we are concerned that the configuration of the existing established site will be rendered legal non-conforming. We therefore suggest that transitional provisions be included for the existing number of stacking spaces and locations of existing drive-through and stacking spaces where they may be located within a front or exterior side yard;	We prefer to integrate new drive-through requirements as shown in the new by-law, in order to set new standards for these uses in the future. A set of zoning standards for these uses is common in zoning. Existing drive-throughs that do not meet these requirements can be altered or expanded provided they are now in conformity with the new requirements. The use itself is only rendered legal non-conforming if drive-throughs are not permitted in the zone or by the exception. If this is a non-compliance issue, the provisions of 1.4.B would apply. Minor revisions to Section 1.4.B have been made for improved clarity. Furthermore, if the site is subject to an exception that is retained, any standards existing in the exception will apply and supersede the general provisions.
56				Section 2.3.K (formerly 2.3O) provides zoning standards for seasonal garden centres, whereas the existing Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not provide similar provisions for this type of use. The lands located at 55 Mountainash Road accommodate a seasonal garden centre between April 15 to July 15, annually. The existing garden centre permissions for this site were established by a Minor Variance decision (A-2021-0008), and further permits a parking reduction while the garden centre is in operation. We have concerns that the new zoning standards would create non-compliance for the longstanding seasonal garden centre outside of the parking provisions accounted for by the Minor Variance decision, including the restricting the location of the garden centre. The 55 Mountainash Road garden centre has operated for several years in a similar configuration, without known issue or concern, and therefore we have concern with the introduction of new zoning requirements that will conflict with the current and longstanding operation of these lands;	Yes, it is the intent that the new Zoning By-law will introduce new seasonal garden centre requirements city-wide. If there are existing permissions that are more permissive than the new zoning, then the use would have a legal non-conforming status. The intent of this project is not to review or carry forward previous minor variances but to largely carry forward site-specific zones, where there has been a Council decision to amend the zoning. We would also note that the parking requirements in the new zoning by-law are significantly reduced compared to the previous zoning so it may be worth considering whether the variance would really be needed. We would request more information as to why the previous minor variance is required; we are open to incorporating it into the exception provided there is rationale that it meets the new Official Plan and intent of the zoning by-law.
57				Section 3.2.A of the Draft ZBL provides requirements for angled parking spaces, including that their dimensions be a minimum of 2.7m x 5.7m, whereas the current zoning by-law 270-2004 requires a minimum angular parking space dimension of 2.7m x 5.4m (Section 6.17.1). We suggest transitional provisions be included for existing parking stall dimensions that do not comply to the expanded requirement;	The standards are updated to 2.7 x 5.4 m in draft 3 so this should no longer be a concern.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
58				The bicycle parking requirements of Section 3.6 include a minimum long-term bicycle parking requirement for retail, personal service shop, or restaurant uses (among several other uses) at a rate of 1 per 300 sq.m gross floor area (for PRA 1), and short term bicycle parking at a rate of 1 per 300 sq.m of gross floor area. We seek clarification as to whether these rates are based on any specific technical background study / analysis, in particular as there is no current minimum requirement in Zoning By-law 270-2004, as amended by By-law 259-2020, and the appropriateness of long-term bicycle parking for certain uses, including the end-of-trip facilities; and	The proposed bicycle parking rates are based on best practice in other municipalities and will need to be monitored by the City over time to ensure they are advancing the City's mobility objectives. The background work driving these requirements is principally the Parking Master Plan which has general recommendations to update the zoning.
59				Section 3.6.D of the Draft ZBL provides provisions for "End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities for Non-Residential Uses", including that Bicycle Facilities would be required for non-residential uses that are required to provide more than 5 long-term bicycle parking spaces (which for retail uses is a retail use that is 1,500 sq.m GFA for greater based on the identified rates). The definition of a Bicycle Facility is as follows: "shall mean a dedicated area where showers, clothing lockers and private change rooms are provided for cyclists." We seek clarification as to the appropriateness of a requirement for potentially multiple areas dedicated to providing showers, clothing lockers, and change rooms for retail uses.	We have received various comments/concerns with these requirements and updates have been proposed in draft 3 to remove the shower/changing facility requirement.
60				Highway Commercial (HC) Zone is proposed to be applicable to 55 Mountainash Road. We note that 55 Mountainash was recently redesignated to Mixed Use within the Brampton Official Plan. The proposed HC zone is a significant departure from existing zoning and built form, and raises concern that the following uses (among others) are not proposed to be permitted in the HC Zone: o Commercial recreation o Financial Service o Health or fitness centre o Office o Outdoor Market o Personal service shop (including laundromat and dry cleaning and laundry distribution station) o Pet day care o Retail o Veterinary Clinic We seek clarification that the site-specific provision (747) applicable to 55 Mountainash Road will be carried through, including the uses that are identified as permitted uses;	We have carried forward site specific exception 747. Additionally, revisions to the zone consolidation have been completed as part of Draft 3, and the site is now zoned GC as the base zone.
61				Section 5.2.D.1 (formerly 5.2.B.1) provides direction for waste storage enclosures in Commercial Zones, including that waste storage enclosure are not to be in a front or exterior side yard, and shall be located at least 15m from any lot line abutting a residential, institutional, or open spaces use. Similar provisions do not currently exist in Zoning By-law 270-2004, and we are concerned that existing sites, including 55 Mountainash Road may be rendered legal non-conforming given the existing development pattern. We suggest that Section 5.2.D.2 be modified to expand the circumstances to which this section not apply, including for buildings that exist as of the date of the passing of the by-law; and	The City would like to implement modern standards for waste storage in the zoning by-law. For clarity we have added the provision that the new standards do not apply to existing uses and buildings and the storage requirements will apply to new GFA. If further discussion is warranted, please provide specific details as to how the proposed provisions would conflict with your current site configuration and the concerns with those conflicts.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
62				The HC Zone proposes a provision to require a minimum Landscape Open Space of 20%, whereas the current C3 zone applicable to 55 Mountainash requires a minimum landscape open space area of 8%, potentially rendering the site as legal non-conforming. We suggest a transition clause be added such that existing developed sites will not be subject to the more than doubled landscaped open space requirement.	The City would prefer to incorporate updated standards and acknowledges that some sites may be legal non-complying as they were developed under prior standards. The sites can operate and change provided this non-compliance is not further contravened per Section 1.4.B. However, in draft 3, we have also reduced the requirement to 15% in consideration of comments.
63				<p>Prestige Employment (PE) Zone is proposed to be applicable to three of the Choice sites, which are currently zoned Office Commercial (OC-2801), Industrial Four (M4-2802), Industrial Four (M4-1627), and Industrial One (M1-2718) under Zoning By-law 270-2004, as amended. Part of the Choice site at 1 President's Choice Circle is also proposed to be zoned Office Employment (OE), in addition to the PE Zone. The Choice sites are existing developed sites, including for warehousing use at 25 Cottrelle and 250 First Gulf Boulevard, and office use at 1 President's Choice Circle. We have concerns with Chapter 7 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lands in the PE and OE zones are proposed to be subject to a maximum lot coverage provision of 50%, whereas for all of the Choice sites proposed to be rezoned to PE, there is no current max lot coverage provision, which creates the potential for zoning non-compliance. We suggest that a transition clause be added such that existing buildings are not subject to the maximum lot coverage requirements; 	We have removed maximum lot coverage in the 3rd draft zoning by-law as it was redundant over landscaping and setback requirements, and to allow more flexibility. Please note that in draft 3, updates have been made to the translation of existing base zones to the new base zones to better retain existing land use permissions. The existing OC zone is replaced by a new OC zone in the third draft.
64				Lands in the PE zone are proposed to be subject to a minimum Landscape Open Space provision of 25%, whereas for all of the Choice sites proposed to be rezoned to PE, there is no current minimum landscape requirement that is a percentage of lot area, which creates the potential for zoning non-compliance. We suggest that a transition clause be added such that existing developed sites are not subject to the minimum landscaped open space requirements;	The City would prefer to incorporate updated standards and acknowledges that some sites may be legal non-complying as they were developed under previous standards. The sites can operate and change provided this non-compliance is not further contravened per Section 1.4.B. However, in draft 3, we have also reduced the requirement in consideration of comments.
65				Various width requirements for landscaped strips are proposed for the PE zone adjacent to all lot lines, whereas the minimum landscaped strip requirements applicable to the Choice Sites, do not specify landscaping at all lot lines, but rather to be provided in specific instances (for example lot lines abutting a street). We suggest that a transition clause be added such that existing developments, as of the effective date of the new Zoning By-law, will not be subject to the minimum landscape strip provisions;	Existing site specific exceptions 2801, 2802, 2718 & 747 are recommended to be carried forward, so any existing permissions would be retained. As above the provisions for legal non-compliance would apply.
66				Lands in the PE and OE zones are proposed to be subject to restrictions on the location of parking, including limiting the number of parking rows between a building and public street. In our submission, we suggest that the Draft Zoning By-law be revised to specify that the restriction only applies to new parking / parking areas, to account for existing developed sites that were not previously subject to this requirement	The City would prefer to incorporate updated standards and acknowledges that some sites may be legal non-complying as they were developed under prior standards. The sites can operate and change provided this non-compliance is not further contravened per Section 1.4.B. Effectively this would mean that these new standards would only apply to new parts of the building or new/expanded parking areas. Existing parking areas can continue to be used and altered.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
67	Wei Guo	Great Gulf Group of Companies on behalf of Scottish Heather Development Inc., Shayma Dick Holdings Inc., Kendalwood Land Developments Inc., Brampton G&A Holdings Inc.	Friday, November 8, 2024	Great Gulf has received draft plan approval for: 21T-06024B, 21T-06026B, 21T-19022B, 21T-04008B and associated five (5) Implementing Zoning Bylaws 344-2013, 216-2020, 149-2021, 150-2021, and 173-2021 with site specific provisions. Great Gulf has designed and built many houses to meet the site specific provisions and other existing zoning provisions. Great Gulf has a total of more than 1,000 units that are zoned but not sold, registered, or built. The zoning provisions for all zoned lots should remain unchanged to maintain certainty. We support the transition provisions (Section 1.7.B) proposed in the new Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw. However, if the transition provisions lapse after three years per the proposed Sections 1.7.C.1.a. and 1.7.C.1.b, all house models will need to be redesigned to meet the new provisions, creating uncertainty from both functional and aesthetic perspectives. Redesigning all house models is also costly and will negatively impact housing affordability. Therefore, we propose to delete Section 1.7.C.	It is preferred that the new zoning by-law incorporate an expiry on transition, so that the City can eventually move on to administering the new zoning by-law. Administering both will come with increased administrative costs over a period of time. Eventually the City would like to see new standards implemented. We have largely carried forward exception zones which are available for review in the third draft and we would be pleased to discuss further if there are specific concerns about the impact of the new zoning by-law on these developments.
68				The City's existing Zoning Bylaw 270-2004 does not have a maximum lot coverage requirement for the freehold units in Designated Greenfield Areas. Regarding the landscaped open space coverage, the existing Bylaw 270-2004 requires that "the entire yard areas shall be landscaped open space other than a driveway, an encroachment, or an accessory building permitted by this by-law". We recognize the need to require a maximum lot coverage for R1M (Residential First Density – Mature Neighbourhood). However, it is unnecessary for compact development in Designated Greenfield Areas. The existing provisions in Bylaw 270-2004 are appropriate as they stand. Introducing a maximum lot coverage and a minimum landscaped open space coverage would require additional calculations for each lot, which would be time-consuming, unnecessary and would generate additional costs. The additional costs will also negatively impact housing affordability. Therefore, we propose to delete the "Front Yard Landscaped Open Space (min %)" and "Lot Coverage (max. %)" for R1, R1A and R2 zones (Table 4.1.8)	In consideration of comments the min lot coverage requirements were removed from the third draft; the City would like to maintain soft landscaped open space standards.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
69	Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd., on behalf of Loblaws	Thursday, November 14, 2024	<p>Loblaws is the leaseholder of a number of properties throughout Brampton, including the following (referred to as the “Loblaw lands”):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70 Clementine Drive ((leaseholder); • 35 Worthington Avenue (leaseholder); • 60 Quarry Edge Drive (leaseholder); • 345 Main Street N (leaseholder); • 8990 Chinguacousy Road (leaseholder); • 9920 Airport Road (leaseholder); • 700 Balmoral Drive (leaseholder); and • 295 Queen Street E (leaseholder). <p>In general, we are concerned that a number of the new zoning standards will create instances of legal non-compliance. Loblaw understands the need to apply updated performance standards to respond to the City’s long-term objectives as it relates to creating complete and healthy communities, including appropriate development standards. However, we are concerned that the Draft Zoning By-law will create instances of legal non-compliance that could hinder the long-term operation and viability of these lands, including in the case where Loblaw may elect to explore opportunities for infill and expansion opportunities to existing uses.</p> <p>We understand that the first draft of the Zoning By-law withheld site specific zoning provisions. It is our client’s expectation that site specific provisions will be maintained in the new Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the creation of legal noncompliance as a result of new and updated performance standards. We feel this impact is well-balanced by the provisions of 1.4.B and the approach of retaining the majority of site-specific zoning. There is a need to update the City’s standards to implement the new Official Plan and Urban Design Guidelines.</p>
70				<p>We seek clarification regarding the implications of the Planning Act definition of “Area of Employment”, and Provincial Planning Statement (“PPS”) policies that came into effect on October 20, 2024, including the implementation of the PPS (Section 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Policy 6.1.6. “Planning authorities shall keep their zoning and development permit by-laws up-to-date with their official plans and the Provincial Planning Statement by establishing permitted uses, minimum densities, heights and other development standards to accommodate growth and development.” o Policy 6.1.7. “Where a planning authority must decide on a planning matter before their official plan has been updated to be consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, or before other applicable planning instruments have been updated accordingly, it must still make a decision that is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement.” 	<p>The City is reviewing PPS implementation in the Official Plan and this may, in the future, result in further zoning changes. The approach in the Third Draft ZBL is to retain existing permissions. The GE and PE zones will likely represent the "Employment Zones" moving forward and have been revised in Draft 3 to remove any conflicting sensitive and commercial uses.</p>
71				<p>In our submission, in order to avoid rendering existing conforming developments as non-conforming under the new By-law, it would be appropriate to add a “Vacuum” clause to the Draft By-law, where notwithstanding any other provisions of the new By-law, any lot and the location thereon of any building or structure, existing on the effective date of the new By-law, would be deemed to comply and would be permitted by the new By-law. In addition, it would be appropriate to provide an allowance for additions and alterations to legally existing buildings without rendering the existing development as non-conforming as a result of the addition or alteration. Section 1.4.B of the Draft ZBL does allow for lots, buildings, structures, and other features that do not comply to the zoning by-law to be altered or enlarged, but requires compliance “with all applicable requirements of this By-law and does not cause further contravention of any requirement herein”. Given the departure from the in effect zoning, we suggest the City review further for implications of legal non-compliance;</p>	<p>We are not supportive of the proposed clause, as this would likely enable long-term permission of uses that do not conform to the Official Plan, and would also legalize conditions that the City would like to see evolve over time. Section 1.4.B has been revised slightly to create more flexibility to existing conditions. Additionally, most site-specific zones are retained and the zoning by-law allows for transition of applications in process, creating a balanced solution.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
72				<p>Section 2.3N (formerly 2.3E) provides zoning standards for Drive Throughs including provisions for minimum number of stacking spaces and regulating the location of the stacking lane, whereas the current Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not generally regulate these matters. The Loblaw lands at 70 Clementine Drive are developed with uses that include multiple drive-throughs, and we are concerned that the configuration of the existing established site will be rendered legal non-conforming. We therefore suggest that transitional provisions be included for the existing number of stacking spaces and locations of existing drive-through and stacking spaces where they may be located within a front or exterior side yard</p>	<p>We would prefer to incorporate updated standards to support the City's planning objectives, and acknowledge that some sites may be legal non-complying as they were developed under prior standards. The sites can operate and change provided this non-compliance is not further contravened per Section 1.4.B. If further discussion is warranted, please provide clarity about how the existing use will be impacted by the new standards and further consideration can be made to tweak the requirements.</p>
73				<p>Section 2.3.K (formerly 2.3.O) provides zoning standards for seasonal garden centres, whereas the existing Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not provide similar provisions for this type of use. Several of the Loblaw lands are developed with grocery stores that accommodate a seasonal garden centre for approximately 90 days, annually. We have concerns that the new zoning standards would create non-compliance for the longstanding seasonal garden centre, including by restricting the location of the garden centre, and that the garden centre not occupy more than 10% of required parking. We have concern with the introduction of new zoning requirements that will conflict with the current and longstanding operation of these lands</p>	<p>We would prefer to incorporate updated standards to support the City's planning objectives, and acknowledge that some sites may be legal non-complying as they were developed under prior standards. The sites can operate and change provided this non-compliance is not further contravened per Section 1.4.B. If further discussion is warranted, please provide clarity about how the existing use will be impacted by the new standards and further consideration can be made to tweak the requirements.</p>
74				<p>The bicycle parking requirements of Section 3.6 include a minimum long-term bicycle parking requirement for retail, personal service shop, or restaurant uses (among several other uses) at a rate of 1 per 300 sq.m gross floor area (for PRA 1), and short term bicycle parking at a rate of 1 per 300 sq.m of gross floor area. We seek clarification as to whether these rates are based on any specific technical background study / analysis, in particular as there is no current minimum requirement in Zoning By-law 270-2004, as amended by By-law 259-2020, and the appropriateness of long-term bicycle parking for certain uses, including the end-of-trip facilities</p>	<p>The bicycle parking framework builds on previous work the City has completed (the City administers bicycle parking currently in certain zones, but not everywhere). The rates are informed by best practice, and supports the new Official Plan. Updates to bicycle parking have been proposed in Draft 3.</p>
75				<p>Section 3.6.D of the Draft ZBL provides provisions for "End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities for Non-Residential Uses", including that Bicycle Facilities would be required for non-residential uses that are required to provide more than 5 long-term bicycle parking spaces (which for retail uses is a retail use that is 1,500 sq.m GFA for greater based on the identified rates). The definition of a Bicycle Facility is as follows: "shall mean a dedicated area where showers, clothing lockers and private change rooms are provided for cyclists." We seek clarification as to the appropriateness of a requirement for potentially multiple areas dedicated to providing showers, clothing lockers, and change rooms for retail uses</p>	<p>The requirements for shower/change facilities has been removed from the third draft ZBL.</p>
76				<p>Section 5.2.D.1 (formerly 5.2.B.1) provides direction for waste storage enclosures in Commercial Zones, including that waste storage be enclosed and not to be in a front or exterior side yard, and shall be located at least 15m from any lot line abutting a residential, institutional, or open spaces use. Similar provisions do not currently exist in Zoning By-law 270-2004, and we are concerned that existing sites may be rendered legal non-conforming given the existing development pattern. We suggest that Section 5.2.D.2 be modified to expand the circumstances to which this section not apply, including for buildings that exist as of the date of the passing of the by-law</p>	<p>We would prefer to incorporate updated standards to support the City's planning objectives, and acknowledge that some sites may be legal non-complying as they were developed under prior standards. The sites can operate and change provided this non-compliance is not further contravened per Section 1.4.B. If further discussion is warranted, please provide clarity about how the existing use will be impacted by the new standards and further consideration can be made to tweak the requirements.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
77				<p>Section 5.1.D proposes a provision to require a max building height of 11m and 3 storeys in the HC and GC zones, whereas the existing C2 zone is subject to a maximum building height of 6 storeys, and the C3 zone is not subject to a maximum building height. We suggest that the City consider an alternative and greater maximum height, as we are concerned that the proposed provision has the effect of reducing the scale of development on lands zoned Mixed Use, from current zoning permissions</p>	<p>This is noted. Upon further review and to maintain existing permissions, the C2 zone and C3 zones have now been translated into the GC zone, which allows retail. Where there are no site specific zoning requirements identifying height in an exception zone, the by-law now identifies a max height of 6 storeys per Schedule B on any lands previously zoned C2 to maintain these permissions. We acknowledge the C3 does not have an existing maximum building height. In the interest of supporting the Official Plan, the GC zone is subject to a 3 storey max building height. Any greater building heights on lands previously zoned C3 would also be subject to any exception zones. In the future, a rezoning to a mixed-use zone is encouraged to provide for taller buildings, as the mixed use zones are more comprehensive.</p>
78				<p>Section 5.1.E proposes a provision to require a minimum Landscape Open Space of 20% in the HC and GC zones, whereas the current C2 and C3 zone applicable to the Loblaw lands requires a minimum landscape open space area of 8%, potentially rendering sites as legal non-conforming. This section further proposes a provision to require Landscape Strips in various locations, and specifies their required width, whereas the current C2 and C3 zones applicable to the Loblaw lands do not regulate landscape strips. We suggest a transition clause be added such that existing developed sites will not be subject to the more than doubled landscaped open space requirement</p>	<p>As above, the City's requirements have changed to support the Official Plan and Urban Design Guidelines. We have reduced the min landscaped open space to 15%. If there are specific concerns with a property and ability to achieve the updated standards, we would be pleased to review further with you.</p>
79				<p>The Highway Commercial (HC) Zone is proposed to be applicable to the Loblaw lands which are currently zoned C3 with site-specific regulations by Zoning By-law 270-2004, as amended. These sites are all occupied by supermarket (grocery store) uses, as well as a range of other commercial and retail uses. We note that all of the properties proposed to be zoned HC are designated Mixed Use by the Brampton Plan ("OP"). Loblaw has substantial concern that the proposed HC zone is a significant departure from existing zoning and built form, and raises concern that the following uses (among others) are not proposed to be permitted in the HC Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Commercial recreation o Financial Service o Health or fitness centre o Office o Outdoor Market o Personal service shop (including laundromat and dry cleaning and laundry distribution station) o Pet day care o Retail o Veterinary Clinic <p>We seek clarification that site specific provisions for the Loblaw lands will be carried through, including use permissions where applicable. We also seek clarity regarding the intended function of the HC zone, and the uses intended to be permitted, which as noted are a substantial departure from existing permissions on certain Loblaw lands. We suggest that staff consider expanding the range of uses that are permitted in the HC zone.</p>	<p>Upon further review, we have updated the zone concordance in Draft 3, meaning that any existing sites zoned C3 are now zoned GC so that retail permissions and other uses are not lost. Combined with this, the site specific zones have largely been carried forward. The HC zone is now based only on the existing HC zones and provides a highly automobile-oriented function while the GC zone allows a broader range of uses.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
80				<p>Comments Specific to the Mixed Use High Rise (MH) Zone: Section 6.1.C provides both a minimum and maximum Front Yard Setback regulation which we suggest is overly restrictive, particularly to existing and interim development. o The existing development at 295 Queen Street East does not meet this requirement, on account of the generally large setbacks from property lines. Given that these are existing conditions, we seek clarification on how these provisions will be implemented, particularly for minor additions or renovations to these existing developments. For example, for a minor infill or expansion project which does not comprehensively redevelop the lands, would this trigger compliance issues with this new front yard setback requirement?</p>	<p>We note that this site is currently located in a PMTSA. Per the new Official Plan, these lands are intended to be rezoned to facilitate more urban, denser and mixed use development. Any existing buildings and structures would be subject to the provisions of Section 1.4.B with respect to expansion or alteration. Whether an application is required or not would depend on what is being proposed and we can discuss this further. It is agreed that the new MH zoning is very different from the current zoning given the policy direction, and many of the existing conditions will now be legal non-complying. A further contravention of a legal non-complying situation would require an application such as a minor variance.</p>
81				<p>Section 6.1.D provides minimum and maximum Height and Density regulations, with a minimum height requirement of 11 metres (or 3 storeys) for the MH zone, and a minimum 40.5 metres (13 storeys) for the MH zone within a PMTSA. As well, minimum Density requirements 2.5 are provided for the MH zone. In line with our above comment, we have concerns that the existing development at 295 Queen Street East does not currently meet the criteria, which would presumably lead to a legal non-complying status.</p>	<p>As above, it is noted that some existing development will not meet the new standards and will be subject to Section 1.4.B. The City would like to see new development/infill meet the new zone requirements and if this cannot be achieved, an application should be sought for review against the applicable policies and urban design guidelines. We note that Section 1.7 offers transition on any existing applications before the by-law comes into effect.</p>
82				<p>Section 6.2.E provides that for Mixed-Use Zones, surface parking shall only be permitted in the rear yard. The lands at 295 Queen Street East would not comply with this provision, having existing surface parking lots in the front and/or side yards. Again, in line with the above comments, we are concerned that this provision would limit development of the site, particularly for minor infill or expansion projects, which do not yet contemplate the comprehensive redevelopment which these policies are intended to apply to.</p>	<p>As above, it is noted that some existing development will not meet the new standards and will be subject to Section 1.4.B. The City would like to see new development/infill meet the new zone requirements and if this cannot be achieved, an application should be sought for review against the applicable policies and urban design guidelines. We note that Section 1.7 offers transition on any existing applications before the by-law comes into effect.</p>
83	Sandra Patano	Weston Consulting on behalf of PMB HOLDING Ltd. (10810 Coleraine Drive, Brampton)	Thursday, November 7, 2024	<p>The subject property was previously subject to a Zoning By-law Amendment (“ZBA”) application (City File: OZS-2021-0051), which was approved by City Council and deemed to have come into effect on April 17, 2024. Site-specific Zoning By-law 61-2024 rezones the subject property from Residential Rural Estate Two (RE2) to Industrial Four – Sections 3770 (M4-3770) permitting industrial and non-industrial uses on the subject property and applying certain site-specific provisions. The owners will be commencing the Site Plan Approval (“SPA”) application process in the near future. Given that site-specific Zoning By-law 61-2024 was approved and came into full force and effect prior to the enactment of the new CZBL, we respectfully request that the existing site-specific permissions for the subject property be carried forward into the CZBL in accordance with By-law 61-2024, which zones the subject property Industrial Four – Sections 3770 (M4-3770).</p>	<p>We have carried forward the provisions of Special Section 3770 in Draft 3.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
84	Mauro Peverini	Solmar (Hampton & Bristol Lands)	Thursday, November 7, 2024	<p>Thank you for meeting with me yesterday to discuss the draft transition provision for the City's new Comprehensive Zoning By-law (CZBL). As a follow-up to the meeting, by way of this email I am formally requesting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - notice of any public hearings, information meetings, etc., respecting the CZBLR, and any consideration by the City of the disposition of site-specific By-laws 192-2022 & 54-2024 for the Hampton and Bristol lands. My contact information is provided in the signature below. - notice of any public hearings, information meetings, etc., respecting future City Zoning Amendment initiatives related to the City's MTSAs, particularly the Kennedy & Downtown MTSAs, and the Development Permit Area in Downtown Brampton. - that when available the CZBLR team provide any information on how it intends to incorporate the site-specific By-laws into the City's new CZBL, prior to any report being brought forward for Council's consideration, to afford me the opportunity to review the City's approach to manage these site-specific By-laws and if necessary, meet with staff and prepare any correspondence to staff and/or Council. 	This is noted. Regarding By-law 192-2022, The new Zoning By-law does not apply to the DPS lands.
85				As discussed at our meeting, and in my email of October 29th below, the Bristol & Hampton site-specific By-laws were recently approved by Council and are the result of comprehensive development applications reviewed through the City's application review process at considerable time, effort, and cost. Therefore, both site-specific By-laws must be maintained and included as exceptions in the City's new CZBL	We confirm that by-law 54-2024 has been carried forward into the new zoning by-law via retention of exceptions 3780, 3781, 3782. By-law 192-2022 is located outside of the new Zoning By-law and not subject to it. The new Zoning By-law excludes lands in the Downtown Brampton Major Transit Station Area and the Main Street North DPS Area.
86				<p>Transition Policy - the concern is that both projects contain multiple buildings. The Hampton project consists of 4 residential buildings and an office building. As you can appreciate, it can take more than 3-years to pull a building permit(s) for an "approved application" of this scale. So, for example, if the By-laws are not maintained as exceptions, and Hampton submits the Site Plan application for the 4th building or the office building one day after the 3-year transition policy for the "approved application" expires, the final phase(s) of the project would be subject to a new set of zoning standards, different from those applied to the initial phase(s). Consequently, a Zoning Amendment or variance application may be required that would open a future phase(s) of the project to a potential appeal(s), delay, and costs or alternatively to a redesign to meet the new zoning standards again at considerable time, cost, and delay. The CZBLR team must recognize that for all large multi-phase "approved application" projects in the City, not just Hampton and Bristol, full approvals and building permits may not be achieved within 3-years, and to subject the final phase of a comprehensively designed project to a new set of zoning standards and potentially make subsequent phases subject to a potential appeal or redesign is not appropriate. Therefore, the as-of-right and in-effect zoning must be maintained on each property to avoid this situation.</p>	This is noted. The City is unable to maintain the transition period indefinitely, as it will result in significant administration costs, and it is desirable to eventually move forward on the new standards in support of the Official Plan. Other municipal by-laws typically include a 3 to 5 year transition timeframe. If the new standards are not achievable when the transition period lapses, an application may be sought to vary or amend the standards that are not achievable.
87	Mark Condello	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. ('GSAI') on behalf of 10307 Clarkway Developments Limited (c/o Fieldgate) (10307 Clarkway Drive, Brampton)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	10307 Clarkway Developments Limited (c/o Fieldgate) has received recent approvals for a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment; By-law 157-2024, to facilitate a comprehensive residential development that will implement the Block 47-1/Block 47-2 community, as approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. recommend that these provisions be adequately addressed in the new Zoning By-law.	We confirm the exception zones introduced through the referenced by-law have been carried forward.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
88	Mark Condello	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. ('GSAI'), on behalf of 10365 Gore Developments Limited (10365 The Gore Road, Brampton)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	10365 Gore Developments Limited (c/o Fieldgate) has received recent approvals for a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment; By-law 5-2024, to facilitate a comprehensive residential development that will implement the Block 47-1/Block 47-2 community, as approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. recommend that these provisions be adequately addressed in the new Zoning By-law.	We confirm the exception zones introduced through the referenced by-law have been carried forward.
89	Mark Condello	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. ('GSAI'), on behalf of Cedar Developments (Clarkway) Inc. (10308 Clarkway Drive, Brampton)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	Cedar Developments (Clarkway) Inc. has received recent approvals for a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment; By-law 218-2013, to facilitate a comprehensive residential development that will implement the Block 47-1/Block 47-2 community, as approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. recommend that these provisions be adequately addressed in the new Zoning By-law.	We confirm the exception zones introduced through the referenced by-law have been carried forward.
90	Jason Lodder	N/A	Friday, October 18, 2024	<p>Jason Lodder identified a "missing middle" issue, where the current housing stock is predominantly low-rise, while new developments tend to be tall (over 100m). He emphasized the need to shift away from 1-3 storey buildings to meet density requirements, noting that tall buildings often face community opposition and can negatively impact surrounding areas.</p> <p>He proposed focusing on "C4 Mid-Rise" buildings (5-12 storeys) throughout the city, including infill and greenfield sites. Drawing comparisons to European cities like Paris, he highlighted how they achieve high density without many tall structures, maintaining livability and sunlight access. Mid-rise buildings are less taxing on infrastructure and can enhance property tax revenues. He suggested that the city should expedite approvals for these projects to address housing needs more effectively.</p> <p>Key Points: Promote sensitive intensification. Provide appropriate height/massing transitions.</p>	Through Secondary Planning level exercises, the City sets out the planned development typologies, and there are many areas of the City where mid rise is being planned. The role of the new Zoning By-law is to create the zones that will set standards for various development proposals in these areas and support implementing the Secondary Plans. It is an objective of the new By-law to support creation of missing middle housing including new Mid Rise focused zones and allowing for a broader range of development typologies in the low rise residential zones. Additionally, the new Zoning By-law introduces a fourplex residential zone on certain corridors (R1A), in accordance with the Official Plan.
91	Mark Condello	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. ('GSAI'), planning consultants for Emerald Castle Developments Inc. (c/o Cachet Homes) (The Gore Road, City Block 47-2, Brampton)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	Gore Creek Estates Inc has received recent approvals for a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment; By-law 6-2024, to facilitate a comprehensive residential development that will implement the Block 47-1/Block 47-2 community, as approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. recommend that these provisions be adequately addressed in the new Zoning By-law.	We confirm the exception zones introduced through the referenced by-law have been carried forward.
92	Mark Condello	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. ('GSAI') are the planning consultants for Golden Gate Castlemore Plaza Limited (4538 Castlemore Road, Brampton)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	Golden Gate Castlemore Plaza Limited has received recent approvals for a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment; By-law 149-2024, to facilitate a comprehensive residential development that will implement the Block 47-1/Block 47-2 community, as approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. recommend that these provisions be adequately addressed in the new Zoning By-law.	We confirm the exception zone introduced through the referenced by-law will be carried forward. We note that there was a numbering issue with the existing exception zone (i.e., it appears as 3679 in the city's zoning map but should be 3769 as per the by-law text). In the tracking sheet it is indicated by exception 3679 so corrections may be required prior to Council adoption but the exception will be maintained.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
93	Mark Condello	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. ('GSAI'), planning consultants for Gore Creek Estate Inc. (10263 The Gore Road, Brampton)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	Gore Creek Estates Inc has received recent approvals for a site-specific Zoning By-law Amendment; By-law -P1-2024, to facilitate a comprehensive residential development that will implement the Block 47-1/Block 47-2 community, as approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal. Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. recommend that these provisions be adequately addressed in the new Zoning By-law.	We confirm the exception zones introduced through the referenced by-law have been carried forward.
94	Janet K	N/A [REDACTED]	Sunday, November 10, 2024	I reside at [REDACTED]. It is in the Greenbelt, and according to MPAC and Brampton taxes it is currently zoned as Residential. Prior to 2004 it was Rural-residential. The mapping for proposed zoning shows the property as Agricultural. Will our municipal taxes finally be taxed at an agricultural rate? There has long been a disconnect between the City's zoning, MPAC and municipal taxes. An Agricultural zone tax rate would be appropriate in the Greenbelt since these residents are excluded from plans for water and sewer service, and hence there will be no building of secondary units on these spacious lots (some with ample well water). I look forward to hearing your response at the open house Oct 15	WSP defers to MPAC and City of Brampton Finance Staff with respect to the tax assessment of individual properties.
95	Lino Malito	Orlando Corporation	Wednesday, October 23, 2024	Section 2.13.3 - rooftop mechanical equipment Define "enclosed." Does this mean fully enclosed with a roof or screened from all	We made proposed updates to remove this statement.
96				Section 3.4.1, Table 35.1 "Required parking for industrial uses is excessive, far exceeding what is typically required by warehouse or manufacturing operations. Parking and EV ready requirements are excessive and disproportionate to the number of employees which often occupy these buildings. The number of EV charges required should be determined by the tenant or occupant of the building. Consideration should be given to reducing this requirement. A minimum of four chargers can be provided with the provision of conduit for future chargers to meet the 10% requirement, if needed by the user. "	We have made some tweaks to the standards but welcome further input or specific examples of parking needs. With respect to EV parking, the City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.
97				Section 7.1.D, Table 7.1.4, Maximum height for PE Maximum height restrictions on industrial buildings limits the flexibility to respond to market demand, considering market trends for warehouse and manufacturing facilities exceed this requirement. The existing Zoning By-law does not contain a provision for maximum height for industrial buildings (M4 zoning), and we note there are no height limitations proposed for GE – General Employment Zones. Consideration should be given to removing the maximum height provision from the proposed by-law. What is the intent of the maximum height provision for PE zones? Furthermore, the By-law should be explicit in exempting roof top mechanical equipment in the calculation of the maximum height of a building. Industrial buildings are often constructed on spec without consideration of the tenant's roof-top mechanical needs.	Height requirements in the employment zones have been reviewed and updated for more flexibility in draft 3.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
98				<p>Section 7.2 B.1b</p> <p>Our ability to provide two rows of front yard parking along the entire street frontage is critical to the function of warehouse and manufacturing operations.</p> <p>This requirement would limit our ability to meet the excessive parking requirements for industrial buildings. Visitor and employee parking would have to be relocating to the rear of the building, conflicting with loading activity and creating safety concerns.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to removing this requirement and having the parking layout reviewed through the Site Plan Review Process. Front yard parking can be mitigated by providing screening from street view with landscape planting.</p>	<p>The City would like to support location of buildings near the street and provision of landscaping, directing parking to the side and rear. Revisions in draft 3 are proposed to create more flexibility and we have reduced the min parking requirement. We also note that 1.4.B applies to existing buildings and parking areas to give flexibility around future alterations or changes.</p>
99				<p>Section 7.2.F.7 Landscape planting should be a permitted as an acceptable method of screening and can be reviewed the Site Plan Review Process.</p> <p>Or conversely, refine the definition of outdoor storage to exclude trailer parking in rear and side yards, when associated with on-site warehouse uses.</p>	<p>We agree with accepting vegetation as an acceptable screening method and have revised.</p>
100	Bob Lehman	N/A	Thursday, October 31, 2024	<p>I am so pleased to see the City is using the overlay zoning technique (badge). I introduced that to Canada in the late 1970's in the Regina zoning by-law and then in Ontario in the London zoning by-law around 1980. It is also used in Toronto, Midland, Newmarket, Oakville and Guelph to a much more limited degree. One way we used it as well was to create mixed use zones by applying two use zones to a single property.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
101	Robert S			<p>Section 1.2. Where can I find schedule A? The mapper still shows draft 1 (6 October)</p>	<p>Schedule A is the main zone map, available on the City's website for review in draft: https://brampton.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/media/index.html?appid=9ba95f1aa59b4dc19cb2e73685bddf23</p>
102				<p>Section 1.8 / Table 1.3.1 understand additional categories for types such as skyscrapers and estate residential (for areas that lack municipal water/sewer), but this seems to add far too many zoning categories for Low Rise typology. Do we really need R1, R1A, R1M, R2A, R2B, in addition to R3L?</p>	<p>We note there has been a large reduction over the existing range of residential categories. There is a need to retain these zone categories, as there are areas of the City where the Official Plan or the applicable Secondary Plan has limited permissions and the zoning must correspond to the permissions of the policies. For example, there are areas that are planned exclusively for townhouse and similar density levels, which requires the application of restrictive zones. The third draft Zoning By-law introduces a new very flexible R zone which may be applied in new greenfield areas provided the policies are flexible in allowing a wide range of typologies.</p>
103				<p>Section 1.8 / Table 1.3.2 Draft 1 of the mapping shows Corridor commercial (accessed 6 October) please clarify if this is going to be added to the CZB document or if the mapping will be renamed</p>	<p>The third draft does not have a Corridor Commercial zone any longer; the General Commercial Zones and Highway Commercial Zones replaced them.</p>
104				<p>Section 1.9.B 5 & 6 Do you mean overlay instead of "overly"?</p>	<p>Yes - corrected.</p>
105				<p>Section 2.2.A.6 e Should Alectra be mentioned by name here given that it is the successor organization to Brampton Hydro?</p>	<p>Some corrections were made to refer to hydro companies more generally.</p>
106				<p>Section 2.3.G.2 Does this mean that for a stand alone gas bar, that the building de facto needs to be located between the road and the gas pumps?</p>	<p>That is correct.</p>
107				<p>Section 2.3.1, Table 2.3.2 A minimum lot area requirement of 8,000 meters in residential areas is outrageously large this, is larger than the lots of a majority of Catholic churches in Brampton, and is larger than the area of most Protestant houses of worship.</p>	<p>These are the existing standards and specific review has not been undertaken. The comment is noted for further updates/evaluation. Generally, in the future, it is intended that Places of Worship will be located in Mixed Use and Institutional zones. The framework of allowing places of worship in all residential zones was carried forward from the current zoning by-law.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
108				Table 3.1.1 n PRA2, the rules give 4.5 parking spaces for a triplex and 4 for a fourplex, consider making triplex require 1 space per unit in PRA2. In PRA3, a triplex requires 6 parking spaces and a fourplex requires 5 spaces, consider having Triplexes use the same parking formula as fourplexes Restaurant parking for PRA2/PRA3 may be onerous for quick service restaurants, where people generally get food to go. Consider requiring a 15 minute parking space for things like Door Dash for	We agree with the reductions as noted; requiring 6 spaces for a triplex in totality is excessive as a min standard although it is similar to other municipalities.
109				Table 3.5.1 2 bike parking spaces per classroom seems low	This has been reviewed and is similar to other municipalities.
110				Parking Area 2 should be vastly expanded, including but not limited to along Chinguacousy from Steeles to Sandalwood and Steeles from Chinguacousy to Finch, McLaughlin from Steeles to Wanless, Kennedy from Steeles to Heart Lake Terminal (at Sandalwood) The same applies to Dixie, Bramalea, and Torbram from south city limits to Countryside. These are all based on them having very good transit service today, not in the future, today.	This is noted. The basis for PRA2 are the various Major Transit Station Areas and Mixed Use areas which will have transit access. As such, the delineation of the PRAs is in line with planned land uses and growth structure per the Official Plan, so it will support the Official Plan's vision. Over time, the City may choose to update the standards in PRA2 or other PRAs as the urban form evolves. The new framework in the Zoning By-law is an improved framework for the City to update its parking rates over time in light of different mobility contexts across the City.
111				The way 2.2.7.4 is worded, it does not seem like mature neighbourhood overlay should be a zone in its own right which precludes multiplexes. Indeed, I see no zone which actually reflects the intentions of Low-Rise Plus in the OP, R1A is too short and R3L precludes multiplexes. Consider consolidating R1A, R2, and R2A into a multiplexes zoning which permits both multiplexes and townhouses.	The R1A zone is designed to implement Brampton Plan's policies along the corridors/boulevards, which allows for up to fourplex dwellings (Section 3.3.1.14 of Brampton Plan). The ML zone would help support the Low-Rise Plus policies. Further, the zoning by-law allows height to be established separately on Schedule "B" which would override the maximum height in the zone. As such, in the future, low rise plus could be implemented through height schedule changes and without updating the zones.
112	Sandra K Patano	Weston Consulting on behalf of 2182036 Ontario Inc. (4523 & 0 Queen Street East)	Tuesday, November 5, 2024	<p>The City of Brampton is working on the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law (CZBL) to implement the Brampton Official Plan. The second draft proposes zoning the subject property as Mixed-Use Office (MO-H(25)-D(5)), allowing a maximum height of 25 storeys and various commercial uses, but excluding gas stations, drive-throughs, and take-out restaurants. This contrasts with the current zoning, which permits these uses.</p> <p>Transition provisions in the draft CZBL recognize existing building permits and planning applications submitted before its adoption. These provisions will lapse three years after the new CZBL is adopted for approved applications and five years for complete applications. The active Site Plan Approval (SPA) application for the property is expected to transition under these provisions.</p> <p>Weston Consulting requests that the existing site-specific permissions from By-law 195-2017 and Minor Variance A-2022-0322 be retained in the new CZBL to protect the progress made in development approvals. Ongoing monitoring of the CZBL review process is planned, and notifications about future drafts and related decisions are requested.</p>	<p>We agree with retaining the exception as it is recently approved. The effect of the minor variance is to apply similar standards to the adjacent A zoned site, and as such we have expanded the exception zone to cover that site. Minor variances will not be carried forward into the new zoning by-law directly but would be subject to Transition only. Please advise if there are further concerns and consideration can be made to integrating specific statements regarding the approved minor variance into the exception zone.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
113	Jennifer Maestre	Fotenn Planning + Design on behalf of 2832948 Ontario Inc. (10590 Highway 50, Brampton)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>The property at 10590 Highway 50 is zoned agricultural, despite being designated as an “Employment Area” in the Region of Peel Official Plan and “Industrial” in the City of Brampton Official Plan. The owners plan to redevelop the site for office and warehouse uses, including a truck repair facility and outside storage.</p> <p>Previous applications indicated that development was premature until certain appeals were resolved, but recent engagement with the City has led to plans for a Zoning By-law Amendment application. The new CZBL draft incorrectly maintains the agricultural zoning, conflicting with the Official Plan designations. The owners request that the City rezone the property to an Employment zone to align with the Official Plan policies.</p>	<p>The agricultural zoning in Draft 2 was simply the existing zoning for the property. Lands outside of PMTSAs are not being pre-zoned for specific uses through the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review as this is out of scope. A rezoning process is required to implement the applicable policies and address applicable policies. In consideration of the comment we have updated the zone to Future Development, but an application for Zoning By-law Amendment is the recommended mechanism to consider an Employment Zone.</p>
114	Jennifer Maestre	Fotenn Planning + Design on behalf of Airport / Highway 7 Storage GP Corporation (5 Nevets Road)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>Request that staff include “Self-storage Facility” as a permitted use in the CZBL for the Subject Property, which would either incorporate the site-specific performance standards pursuant to which our client’s building was constructed, or provides broader “legalizing” language recognizing that performance standards applicable at the time of the building permit remain the only standards applicable; or</p> <p>A site-specific ‘Prestige Employment Zone’ be created permitting “a “Self-storage Facility” on the Subject Property that also recognizes the previously approved site specific performance standards.</p>	<p>The exception zone applicable to the property (1569) is carried forward in conjunction with the PE zone. The PE zone replaces the prior base M4 zone. The new zoning by-law defines and permits self storage facilities in the PE zone. However, the exception zone 1569 does not explicitly permit self storage. In line with the previous approvals and recognizing the new terminology in the zoning by-law, we have added permission for Self Storage Facility from the PE zone as a change to exception 1569 to maintain the permission. With respect to the minor variance, the intent is not to carry them forward and for the City to apply its new performance standards. If there are specific provisions that need to be integrated into the exception zone please provide a specific request. In reviewing the letter we noted various differences between the current zoning and the new zoning. While there may be some differences, the City would prefer to begin to implement updated performance standards so we would appreciate a specific rationale regarding the desired standards. Otherwise, previously approved minor variances would be subject to transition provisions in Section 1.7.</p>
115	Rachelle Laroque	Biglieri Group on behalf of Ambria Church Limited (120, 122, 126 & 128 church Stret East and 43, 49 McCaul Street)	Monday, November 4, 2024	<p>The zoning, as drafted, appears to include a fragmented approach on the subject site and block. The block has been split into three zones: Residential First Density – Mature Neighbourhood (R1M), Residential Third density – Mid Rise (R3M) and Residential Third Density – High Rise (R3H). To allow for a cohesive development of this block of land owned by our Client and the lands to the east, we would request that the number of zones proposed be reduced from the proposed zones, to Residential Third Density – High Rise (R3H), along Church Street, and Residential Third Density – Mid Rise (R3M) along the northern edge of the subject site to provide a transition to the low-density residences on the north side of McCaul Street. This will be consistent with our request for changes in the draft MTSA polices.</p>	<p>The proposed zone categories have been introduced to implement the three (3) Neighbourhood designations (Low-Rise Residential, High-Rise Residential, Mid-Rise Residential) of the MTSA, as per Brampton Plan. Changes to the proposed zone categories will only be considered if changes to the designations are proposed via the City’s MTSA process.</p>
116	Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto	Tuesday, October 1, 2024	<p>Lot and Setback Standards: Existing church buildings that were legally constructed will be grandfathered, meaning new requirements will only apply if the Archdiocese decides to rebuild or add to the structure.</p> <p>Definition of Place of Worship: The current definition includes various faith-based activities and accessory uses. The proposed revision adds that these activities should not be for commercial gain, which may be redundant since religious organizations are typically not-for-profit. This addition could create enforcement challenges, and it is suggested that this phrase be removed.</p>	<p>Yes - any expansions/alterations would be subject to Section 1.4.B of the new by-law if the building no longer meets the requirements of the new zoning by-law. The City would prefer to retain the language of the definition to help differentiate a place of worship from a commercial use. This has not created an enforcement concern we are aware of, but open to more context about the interpretation concern.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
117				<p>Parking Standards: A new parking standard for places of worship is proposed, shifting from a seat-based calculation to one based on total floor area. The new requirement ranges from 7.5 to 10 spaces per 100 square meters, significantly reducing the parking needed compared to the previous standard of 20 spaces per 100 square meters. Calculations for specific churches indicate that the new standards would require fewer spaces than currently available, and confirmation of these calculations is</p>	That is correct; the new standards are floor-based which will be easier and more reliable to calculate. Generally there has been acceptance of an approach to reduce parking rates across the City as other transportation modes become more viable.
118	Jacob Lapointe	Weston Consulting on behalf of Bovaird Commercial Centre Ltd. (Bovaird Drive W and Creditview Road, Brampton)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>They submitted a Site Plan Approval (SPA-2023-0007) application for retail, service commercial, and office uses, which was deemed complete on March 6, 2023, with conditional support from City Staff on April 30, 2024. All site plan comments have been addressed, and approval is expected soon.</p> <p>The property is currently zoned C3 – 3525, allowing mixed-use development. Variances for the proposed development were approved by the Committee of Adjustment on December 19, 2023. However, the second draft of the new comprehensive zoning by-law proposes to rezone the property to “MM-H(12)-D(3)” (Mixed-Use Mid-Rise), which raises concerns about new zoning conformity issues not addressed in the previous approvals.</p> <p>Weston Consulting requests that the site-specific zoning provisions from the OMB decision and the approved variances be included in the next draft of the by-law. They also seek assurance that the new by-law will not hinder future occupants from obtaining occupancy permits. A prompt response to these comments is requested.</p>	<p>The site-specific zone 3525 will be carried forward into draft 3 for the subject lands as it generally meets the policies of the new Official Plan for these lands. We have updated the base zone from GC to MM, as it better corresponds to the exception zone which allows for a mix of uses while the GC zone was strictly a commercial base zone. The site plan application and minor variances would also be subject to the transition provisions of Section 1.7. If there are aspects of the minor variance that should be incorporated into the exception, we would request a detailed rationale as to which standards need to be incorporated.</p>
119	Oz Kemal	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), planning consultant for Bovaird West Holdings Inc. (northeast corner of Bovaird Drive West and Creditview Road,	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>Holding Provisions: The proposed holding provisions for properties within Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) are deemed unnecessary for the subject lands, as developments already require Site Plan Approval, which assesses infrastructure capacity.</p>	This is noted and the 3rd draft does not include holding provisions on the subject lands. Holding provisions have been proposed in the PMTSAs primarily to support creation of parks and community hubs.
120				<p>POPS Definition: The definition of Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) should be expanded to include urban parks as a viable option for providing green space within MTSAs.</p>	Noted. The 3rd draft has replaced POPS with the term 'urban park' to be more inclusive of types/tenure.
121				<p>Angular Planes: The City’s decision to move away from angular planes is supported, but it should align with MTSA studies aimed at reducing building heights near GO stations, particularly for corner sites and low-rise neighborhoods.</p>	This is noted. The heights in the MTSAs were driven by the City's separate design study and are proposed to be implemented in the zoning by-law. If there are specific comments about the proposed heights this should be directed to the MTSA team.
123	Bruce McCall-Richmond	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. on behalf of Crestpoint Real Estate Investments Ltd. (2 & 4 Hanover Road, Brampton)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>This letter provides comments on the new Queen Street Transit Corridor Secondary Plan and the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review.</p> <p>The subject property, approximately 3.8 hectares in size, currently has two residential buildings (18 and 22 storeys). GSAI has facilitated planning applications to rezone the property for infill redevelopment, including two new residential towers, and is finalizing a Site Plan Approval application.</p> <p>As the City updates Secondary Plan Area 36, GSAI requests that the existing site-specific zoning regulations be incorporated into the new plan and zoning by-law. They emphasize the need for adequate time to review any future amendments and reserve the right to provide further comments as the plans evolve.</p>	<p>The existing site specific exception to facilitate two residential buildings of 18 and 22 storeys generally align with the Official Plan and was a recent approval. We will carry forward existing site specific exception 253 in draft 3.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
124	David A McKay	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) , planning consultant for Crystal Homes (Wildflowers) Corporation (1626, 1646 & 1654 Queen Street W, Brampton)	Wednesday, October 30, 2024	<p>Draft does not incorporate the site-specific By-law 186-2023, which was approved on November 1, 2023. This by-law rezoned the properties from Residential Hamlet One to various residential categories and includes provisions for Open Space and Floodplain.</p> <p>The corporation requests that the City staff ensure the draft Zoning By-law accurately reflects By-law 186-2023 and its provisions. They acknowledge that the draft process is still early and are providing preliminary comments for the City's consideration. They express their intention to monitor the draft Zoning By-law policies and look forward to collaborating with City staff and stakeholders throughout the process.</p>	We are recommending that the Special Sections be carried forward given that they were recently approved in 2023. Prior to council adoption we will remove the Holding symbol if it has been removed through another process, but the timing of completion of Draft 3 of the by-law may not have captured a recent update. We note that there appears to be some inaccuracies with the way these exceptions and base zones have been mapped due to timing of the application and zoning data updates, and this will be corrected prior to council adoption. The exceptions will be maintained and correctly mapped.
125	Elizabeth Gillin	The Daniels Corporation (Block 1, 2 & 3, Plan 43M-2153 and Block 1 Plan 43M-2153)	Friday, November 1, 2024	Table 6.1.2 - The current R4A-3662 zoning has no minimum lot areas, widths, depths, front yard depths, interior side yard depths, exterior side yard depths, lot coverage or maximum FSI (Section 3662.2(4)). The Draft ZBL Table 6.1.2 requires a minimum lot area of 3,000 square metres. We would like to retain the current zone allowance of no minimum lot area carried forward in the zoning for this site.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
126				Table 6.1.3 - Front Yard: Minimum of 3m and maximum of 7.5m is proposed. While the current R4A-3662 zone has no minimum front yard depths, it is acknowledged that the Draft ZBL does not provide a front yard setback. The current R4A-3662 zone requires a minimum building setback to a lot line abutting Bovaird Drive west of 4.5m, except allows a total length of 90m to be setback a minimum of 3.0m. The proposed minimum 3.0m, and maximum 7.5m front yard is acceptable.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
127				Table 6.1.3 - Rear Yard: Minimum of 7.5m and no maximum is proposed. The current R4A-3662 zone has no minimum rear yard depths.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
128				Table 6.1.3 - Exterior Side Yard: Minimum of 3.0m. While the current R4A-3662 zone has no minimum side yard depths, it is acknowledged that the R4A-3662 zone requires a 3.0m setback to a public street (Section 3662.2(6)). The proposed Draft ZBL provision is acceptable.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
129				Table 6.1.3 Rear Lot Line and Interior Side Lot Line Setback: minimum setback of 10m from the 5th to 12th storeys, and minimum setback of 12.5m above the 12th storey. The current R4A-3662 zone has a minimum building setback to the abutting zone R4A-3661 (to the north), a public or private street of 3.0m (Section 3662.2(6)). We would like to retain the current zone allowance as it relates to setbacks to the lot line to the north	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
130				Table 6.1.3 Minimum Horizontal Separation of Buildings on the same lot (1st to 4th storeys = 15m; 5th to 12th storeys = 20m; and above 12th storey = 25m): The current R4A-3662 zone has a minimum building separation of 15 metres, regardless of height. We would like to retain the current zoning allowance as it relates to minimum building separation.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
131				Table 6.1.4 – Maximum Building Height: 20 storeys / 62.5m. The current R4A-3662 zone has a maximum building height of 15 storeys. We welcome the additional height permissions.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
132				Table 6.1.4 Minimum Building Height within a PMTSA: 13 storeys/40.5m. The current R4A-3662 zone has a minimum building height of 6 storeys. We would like clarification on how the minimum building height would be applied. Does this minimum height apply to a podium portion of the building? For example, could a podium be 3 storeys with a tower portion totaling 13 to 20 storeys on top?	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
133				Table 6.1.4 Minimum Ground Floor Height for all uses: 4.5m. The current R4A-3662 zone permits a 3m ground floor height and 4.5m for non-residential uses. In our experience, when there are residential uses at grade, a 4.5m height results in additional unnecessary height within the internal rooms. We would like to retain the current zoning permissions	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards. The min ground floor height supports the direction of the UDGs, which will allow ground floors to evolve into commercial uses over time.
134				Table 6.1.4 Building Step Back for all storeys above the 3rd facing a streetline: 3.0m. The current R4A-3662 zone has no stepback requirements and we would like to retain the current zoning permissions.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
135				Table 6.1.4 Building Step Back for all storeys above the 3rd, rear elevation: 2.5m. The current R4A-3662 zone has no building stepback requirements; however, it does have an angular plane requirement above the 10th storey (Section 3662.2(16)).	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
136				Table 6.1.4 Maximum Floor Plate for all storeys above the 12th, residential: 800 sm. The current R4A-3662 zone has no maximum floor plate size requirements and we would like to retain the current zoning permissions. In our experience in other jurisdictions, floor plate size maximums within zoning are typically 850sm, allowing for flexibility within the floor plate and ultimately the individual suite design.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards.
137				Table 6.1.4 Minimum Landscaped Open Space (%): 25% and excludes driveways and parking areas, etc. The current R4A-3662 zone has no minimum landscape open space requirements and we would like to retain the current zoning permissions. A 25% minimum requirement for open space area is high, particularly for smaller development sites.	We have carried forward the exception zone which takes priority over the draft parent zoning by-law where there are conflicting standards. The LOS requirements have been reduced.
138				Section 6 - Daylight Triangles: There should be consideration for a specific minimum setback or minimum front yard requirement for daylight triangles. Some daylight triangles for corner sites are as large as 15m which can create odd corner conditions if a minimum front yard setback is 3.0m and a maximum is 7.5m, as proposed.	We have clarified these requirements as now contained in Section 3.17.
139				Section 6.2.B Active Use Frontage Requirements: Schedule E – Corridors and Boulevards, as displayed on the interactive mapping tool uses inconsistent language as compared to Section 6.2.B of the Draft ZBL. The Schedule references “Corridors” and “Planned Corridors” as it relates to Bovaird Drive West, abutting the Daniels lands; however, this Section of the by-law references “Primary or Secondary Boulevards”. As a result, we are unable to assess the impacts of sub-sections .1, .2 and .3 on Daniels lands. We are seeking clarification on the classification of Bovaird Drive West in order to assess the impacts	The active frontage requirements in Section 7 (mixed use zones) now refer to Schedule E which indicates these areas specifically.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
140				<p>Section 6.2.C Amenity Area Requirements: We have reviewed Section 4.2.C which requires the below minimum amenity area requirements. The minimum amenity area requirements are extremely onerous and will negatively impact the viability of developments by removing crucial sellable/ leasable GFA. In particular, for buildings that fall within the 21–200-unit category. The total areas required are significantly more than what is required in other municipalities. Where specific requirements are not provided by the municipality, these are much higher than the industry benchmark amenity areas. These benchmark amenity areas are generally 2 sm/unit interior and 2 sm/ unit exterior amenity space; however, depending on the type of amenities provided and overall scale or unit mix within the buildings, these total areas may be adjusted. The requirements for additional amenity space not only impacts the up front capital cost to create, but it also impacts the long term costs to maintain, replace and renovate those areas. In a condominium, the maintenance, replacement and repair is a cost directly passed on to the purchaser in the long term through their monthly maintenance fees. In a rental building, these are long term operational costs, which would have an impact on the monthly rents being charged to tenants. Furthermore, there are no exceptions noted in the Draft ZBL for affordable housing projects. Lastly, requiring this same amount of amenity space for grade related townhouses (back to back townhouses and stacked townhouses, for example) should be reviewed further as that will be difficult to implement and is much more than what would be typically provided for a grade-related product</p>	<p>We have updated the common amenity area requirements to include a simpler 5 sqm per dwelling unit requirement along with updated locational requirements.</p>
141				<p>R3M Zone - Daniels lands on the south side of Lagerfeld Drive, east and west of All Nations Drive and west of Eamont Street are proposed to be zoned R3M “Residential 3rd Density – Mid Rise Zone” which permits apartment dwellings up to 12 storeys and a minimum building height of 4 storeys. This site is currently zoned R4A 3661 which permits a broad range of townhouse typologies, as well as apartments up to 6 storeys in height. We note that the proposed R3M zone does not permit any townhouse typologies, other than those located on the ground floor of apartment buildings. We would like to request a meeting with the City to review the existing zone provisions and the proposed R3M zone in relation to this site to determine how best to carry forward the existing zoning permissions, while also allowing the opportunity for increased density as envisioned by the City.</p>	<p>We recommend carrying forward the existing site specific exception 3661 because it generally aligns with the Low Rise Residential designation and was recently approved to facilitate the proposed development of the lands.</p>
142				<p>Section 3.5: Bicycle requirements We support provision of alternative and more sustainable modes of transportation. Within the PRA1 zone, the zoning requires 0.7 spaces/unit for long term bike parking and 0.1 spaces/unit for short term bike parking, totaling 0.8 spaces/unit, plus any non-residential bike parking requirements. We have the following comments relating to the bike parking rates: ☐ Consideration should be given for sharing of any short-term residential bike parking with non residential bike parking. Those uses may have different ‘peak’ times and should be shared to ensure that a large surplus of bike parking is not provided. ☐ The requirement that short-term bicycle parking be accessible by to a public street may be challenging in some condominium and rental high rise sites. Consideration should be given to ensuring that there is clear and direct access to the bike parking but that may not be directly from a public street (may be through an internal private driveway or private road, for example). ☐ A total provision of 0.8 bike parking spaces / unit is high for some parts of the City where actual cycle rates and bike ownership may be lower. Was data relating to number of cyclists reviewed when establishing this rate? Was the current and future provision of cycling lanes and infrastructure throughout the City reviewed when establishing this rate?</p>	<p>We appreciate the input and ideas and the bicycle parking section has been updated/revised considerably in light of a wide range of comments.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
143	Bill Tam	KLM Planning on behalf of DG Group	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>SECTION 1.7: Transition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3-Year Window : The transition policy allows a 3-year period to use former by-law provisions for buildings on draft plans approved before the New By-law. However, this period is deemed insufficient due to various uncontrollable factors affecting development timelines. - Request for Perpetuity : There is a request to allow previous by-laws to be used indefinitely for lands previously zoned for urban development, suggesting the deletion of Section 1.7.C.1.b. - Planning Applications : Similar to the above, any planning applications deemed complete before the New By-law should also be allowed to use previous by-laws indefinitely. 	It is preferable that the City establish a timing for expiry of transition so that the City can move on administratively from managing the old zoning by-law. For improved flexibility, we have also proposed a new provision allowing variances to be sought under the old zoning for any site plans or plans of subdivision which are transitioned.
144				<p>SECTION 2.11: Permitted Yard Encroachments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Porch Stairs : Clarification is sought on whether stairs associated with porches can encroach into required yards, similar to provisions for decks. - Porch Depth and Eaves : There is a concern that the maximum porch encroachment of 1.8m may include eaves/overhangs, potentially limiting porch depth. A request is made to specify that eaves can encroach an additional 0.6m. - Box-Out Windows : The term "Windows bay" lacks definition; a request is made to include "box-out windows" in the encroachment provisions. 	We have made various revisions and explicitly address the access stairs.
145				<p>SECTION 2.17: Sight Triangles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setback Requirements : There is no clear minimum setback requirement for lot lines forming sight triangles at corner lots. A request is made to clarify that no minimum setback applies to these areas when incorporated into public right-of-way. 	We have made revisions to Section 3.17 which should resolve the concern.
146				<p>SECTION 3.2.B: Minimum Parking Aisle and Driveway Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tandem Parking : The provision states that parking spaces must have unobstructed access, but it waives this for specifically permitted tandem parking. A request is made for explicit permission for tandem parking in cases where only single-car garages are provided. 	The general parking section has been updated to explicitly indicate permission for tandem parking.
147				<p>SECTION 4.1.B: Lot Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lot Area Reductions : Requests are made to reduce minimum lot areas for various dwelling types across different zones (R1, R2E, R2, R2A) to better align with typical lot sizes. - Minimum Lot Width : The term "development" is not defined, leading to confusion about the application of the minimum lot width requirement of 24m, especially concerning back-to-back dwellings. 	We have made various modifications to the zones in consideration of a wide range of comments.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
148				<p>SECTION 4.1.C: Building Location - Requested Changes</p> <p>R1 Zone Adjustments :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum Front Yard : 3m (consistent with R2 street townhouses). - Minimum Rear Yard : 7m (reduced to 6m when adjacent to parks/schools). - Minimum Exterior Side Yard : 3m (consistent with R2 street townhouses). <p>Lane-Based Dwellings :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum Rear Yard : 0.5m for attached garages (9m only for detached). - Minimum Exterior Side Yard : 3m. <p>R2A Zone for Back-to-Back Dwellings :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum Front Yard : 3m (excessive 6m requirement should be reduced). - Minimum Exterior Side Yard : 3m. <p>Interior Side Yard Regulations :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request to clarify that a 0.6m interior side yard applies when the minimum interior lot width is less than 12.5m. - Corner lots should be allowed a minimum 0.6m interior side yard without needing to meet the total side yard requirement of 1.8m. 	<p>We have made various revisions to the zones. Generally the City prefers a 4.5 m front yard setback for any grade-related dwelling units, to provide for front yard greenspace.</p>
149				<p>SECTION 4.1.E: Site and Landscaping :</p> <p>Front Yard Landscaping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request for Removal : The requirement for front yard landscaping is requested to be removed. The definition of landscaping excludes driveways and solidly covered areas, which complicates compliance, especially on tapered lots where the front yard is smaller. - Interpretation Conflict : The November 2023 draft suggests that driveways may supersede landscaping percentages, leading to potential conflicts in interpretation. <p>Maximum Lot Coverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed Increases : - R1 Zone : Increase maximum lot coverage to 55% . - R2 Zone : Increase to 60% . - R2A Zone : Increase to 80% for back-to-back dwellings, reflecting their compact nature. <p>Amenity Area Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification Needed : There is uncertainty about whether the common amenity area requirement applies to back-to-back townhouses in freehold tenure or only in condominium tenure. Clarity is needed on whether the requirement is based on individual lots or the total number of units. <p>Driveway Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under Review : No comments can be provided at this time as the driveway standards are still being reviewed. <p>Lane-Based Townhouses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request for Exemption : Clarity is sought regarding lane-based townhouses as the Refer to comment letter for comprehensive list of other observations. 	<p>The 3rd draft proposes front yard min landscaping in favour of having any lot coverage requirements, which is responsive to other comments and helps support the City's emphasis on creating greener neighbourhoods and facilitating tree planting. Some revisions to amenity area are proposed in draft 3. The driveway requirements have been incorporated into draft 3, and these are carried over from existing standards; the City will continue to review driveway requirements through other processes and this may lead to a future ZBLA.</p>
150				<p>Lane-Based Townhouses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request for Exemption : Clarity is sought regarding lane-based townhouses as the Refer to comment letter for comprehensive list of other observations. 	<p>Thank you for the detailed comments which have informed a number of refinements to the 3rd draft. It may be best to discuss specific responses given the details provided.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
151	Marshall Smith	KLM Planning on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc. (4320 Queen Street E, Brampton)	Friday, November 1, 2024	Request retaining permissions from the existing site-specific zoning (city file number OZS-2021-0021, exception numbers 3616, 3617, 3618, 3619) framework for their property. This retention is crucial for ensuring continuity and consistency in the review process, especially given the ongoing site plan applications. They request that equivalent permissions be incorporated into the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law to prevent future non-compliance and variances.	We have retained these four exceptions in draft 3, as the exceptions are recent and generally in line with policies. Further corrections to the text and exception references may be needed in the final version.
152	Marshall Smith	KLM Planning on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc.	Friday, November 1, 2024	KLM Planning Partners Inc. is representing Forestside Estates Inc. (8840 The Gore Road, Brampton) in response to the City's Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review. They express gratitude for the opportunity to review the Second Draft and highlight the importance of retaining permissions from the existing site-specific zoning framework, especially as there are pending site plan applications for the property. They request that equivalent permissions be included in the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law to prevent future non-compliance and variances. KLM Planning Partners looks forward to ongoing collaboration with the City and requests to be informed about any public meetings or updates related to the zoning by-law. They are committed to supporting the City's efforts to create a zoning framework that aligns with municipal objectives and the goals of individual properties.	Most of the exceptions are proposed to be retained. We are recommending deletion of exception number 3455, as it appears to be covered by the new base zone and the homes appear to be constructed. We are also recommending deletion of 2873, which permits apartments, in favour of the MM zone, as per the direction from the City's MTSA team to implement the Official Plan. Any site plans in process would be granted transition per Section 1.7 of the new zoning by-law.
153	Oz Kemal	MacNaughton Hermesen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) on behalf of Glenshore Investments (5203 Old Castlemore Road)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	Zone District 1. Zone the Subject Lands as a site-specific Employment Zone rather than as a Commercial Zone to not only provide the approved uses approved for the lands, but to bring the lands into conformity with Peel Region Official Plan and aligned with regional context of City of Vaughan on east side of Highway 50 that are designated and zoned for Employment Area uses; or, 2. Zone the Subject Lands as a site-specific Local Commercial Zone that maintains existing permitted uses.	The 3rd Draft ZBL replaces instances of MBU zoning with LC zoning as the base zone. The 3rd Draft also retains the existing site-specific zoning which we understand to be exception 3558 per by-law 171-2021. However, the comment letter references 3588 and we do not have records of this exception and unsure if this relates to the active file. Please reach out if there are outstanding concerns.
154				Permitted Uses In context of active Site Plan applications for the lands (City File: SPA-2022-0051), it is recommended that the current permitted uses be incorporated into the proposed Draft #2 Zoning By-law through a site-specific zone. The warehouse use that is currently proposed should not become legal non-conforming uses through a zone district conversion of lands. This may impact future building additions and expansions to the warehousing establishments.	As above the exception 3558 is carried forward in the third draft.
155				Provisions As per above recommended amendments, it is recommended that the building heights that were recently approved for the Subject Lands through MBU-5388 be maintained through a site-specific zone. The 20-metre building height adjacent to Regional Road 50 and Castlemore Road provides an appropriate transition from the major goods movement corridor of Regional Road 50 westward to the internal lot area of the Subject lands.	As above the exception 3558 is carried forward in the third draft. If this is intended to reference 3885 please follow up as we understand the applicable exception zone to be 3558 for these lands. Exception 3588 appears to have been tied to by-law 201-2021. There is no exception 5388.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
156	David A McKay	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) , planning consultant for Home Depot of Canada Inc. ("Home Depot")	Friday, October 25, 2024	<p>Specifically addressing concerns for their stores located at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 49 First Gulf Boulevard (Store #7006) 2. 60 Great Lakes Drive (Store #7110) 3. 9515 Mississauga Road (Store #7301) 4. 9105 Airport Road (Store #7239) <p>They note that the second draft of the Zoning By-law removes existing retail warehousing permissions for the first three locations, which could significantly impact their ability to display merchandise and affect operations. In contrast, the Airport Road store retains its retail permissions under the proposed General Commercial zone.</p> <p>Home Depot requests that the City recognize the existing uses of the affected stores as "legal conforming" under the new Zoning By-law. Alternatively, they propose that these locations be zoned as General Commercial, similar to the Airport Road store.</p> <p>The letter emphasizes that these comments are preliminary, given the early stage of the draft Zoning By-law process. Home Depot is committed to monitoring developments and looks forward to collaborating with City staff and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Upon further review, we have updated the zone concordance in Draft 3, meaning that the translation of existing zones to new zones has changed in some instances. We have also carried forward any existing exception zones on these properties (Exceptions 2700, 851, 1465, 3716 appear applicable). These modifications should resolve the concerns.</p>
157	Katherine Rauscher	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) , planning consultant for Industrial 5000 Real Estate Investments Inc.	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>Specifically addressing concerns for the following locations and requesting that the zoning of these four addressed properties be zoned under one cohesive, site-specific zone district.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 255 Chrysler Drive; 2. 9050 Airport Road; 3. 9150 Airport Road; and, 4. 9200-9250 Airport Road <p>We request that each of the four addressed properties be zoned as General Employment (GE) in the proposed new Zoning By-law. The reasons are based on the following key matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each parcel meets the minimum lot frontage and lot area requirements of the proposed GE zone; • Three of the parcels contain buildings that are split zoned. These should be consolidated under one zone to reflect the existing GE uses within these buildings; • The current use of the existing buildings, which are not proposing to be redeveloped in the near term, represent GE zone permitted uses, including the ancillary office, retail and outdoor storage; • The consolidation of the split zoning will facilitate and simplify the zoning context of the Brampton Business Park to create a cohesive industrial park within an Employment Area; • The permitted uses under the Prestige Employment Zone, such as Child Care Centre and Hotel, <p>are not compatible with the existing uses of the Subject Properties nor existing</p>	<p>The request to consolidate zoning for these properties is out of scope of the zoning by-law review. The zones that replace the existing zones are intended to retain existing permissions. M3A is replaced by the GE zone and M1 by PE consistently. We have also carried forward the existing exception zones (503, 366). Please also note that updates have been made to permitted uses in these parent zones as a result of further review, to retain existing permissions, compared with Draft 2. While we appreciate there may be good rationale to consolidate the zoning, this should be addressed through an application and we would be pleased to discuss further. In particular, we are concerned about modifying permitted uses in the employment areas prior to the City undertaking implementation of the new PPS policies for employment areas.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
158	Raj Lamichhane	Weston Consulting on behalf of Kallo Developments (205 & 209 County Court Boulevard and 7685 Hurontario Street in Brampton)	Tuesday, November 5, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Development Needs: As Brampton evolves into a denser, more urbanized city, particularly around transit corridors, it is essential to plan for a growing community and ensure adequate housing is available. 	Noted.
159				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency with Current Plans: The proposed permitted uses for the Mixed-Use Office zone in the CZBL do not align with the residential uses allowed under the current Brampton Official Plan and the Hurontario-Main Secondary Plan Area 55. The Subject Property, located within a Primary Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), is suitable for residential, office, and retail/commercial uses. 	The 3rd draft Zoning By-law has been updated to contemplate residential uses in the new MHO zone which applies to these lands. The MHO zone contains provisions regarding the establishment of non-residential uses to implement the policies of Brampton Plan for lands designated Mixed Use Employment. Note that updates to height/density were made through the City's separate MTSA process, which this zoning by-law will implement. Note that the northerly portion of one of the properties is identified in the I2 zone and subject to exception 2552A, carried forward from the existing zoning - it is unclear if this portion is tied to the lands to the north so we would be pleased to discuss further.
160				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Active Transportation: The proposed development, with increased densities and access to transit, will promote active and multi-modal transportation, especially with the ongoing Hazel McCallion LRT construction, which enhances the area's connectivity. 	Noted.
161				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with Official Plans: The Brampton Official Plan supports residential uses alongside office uses in Mixed-Use Employment areas within the MTSA. The proposed development is seen as consistent with these policies, facilitating appropriate intensification and a mix of uses. 	Noted.
162				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning Request: The submission requests that the Subject Property be rezoned to Hurontario Corridor Mixed-Use One (HMU1) with site-specific provisions, excluding the property at 7685 Hurontario Street, which is not part of the proposed development. 	Noted.
163	Kevin Freeman	Kaneff Group	Friday, November 1, 2024	8525 Mississauga Road - Zoning to be updated per MZO that was issued under O. Reg. 784/21. File: C04W02.006	The MZO is noted. We understand this area has been subject to the Bram West planning study and would like to discuss the application of the MZO in relation to the Bram West process. For now, in draft 3 we have retained the existing zoning including the exception zone. The MZOs will be carried forward into the final zoning by-law as reformatted/applied as exception zones.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
164				8475 & 8501 Mississauga Road - Request to include Office as a permitted use	The site is now zoned LC-938 in Draft 3 which appears to resolve the request, as offices are allowed by the exception zone.
165				1990 Hallstone Road - Request to delete exception zone 2831	The exception zone 2831 has been carried forward in the third draft. If there is a desire to expand uses to the other uses permitted in the GC zone an application should be made. We are concerned about expanding commercial use permissions within the Employment Areas of the city through the ZBLR process; a site-specific rationale would be required.
166				7965 - 7985 Financial Drive - Apply GC Zone which permits the existing drive-through.	This site is subject to the LC zone, which replaces the prior SC zone, as well as exception 2727. We recommend retaining the exception. The use of the GC zone would greatly expand uses and an application is recommended to consider this. However we note that the current site provides for a drive-through which is no longer permitted by LC. As such we have added permission for the drive through explicitly in the exception zone so that there is no loss of the current permission.
167				8215 - 8405 Mississauga Road - Request to delete exception zone 2440	The exception includes a floor area cap of 20,000 sq.m, and the effect of deleting the exception would be to allow commercial uses unrestricted, which may conflict with the intent of the original exception zone. We are open to further discussion for deleting but would require a site-specific rationale as we are unsure of the original intent of the floor area cap.
168				1 Hallstone Road - Carry forward exception zone 1480	We have carried forward exception 1480 in Draft 3.
169				7500, 7510 & 7600 Financial Drive - To apply PE zone as shown on 1st draft of CZBL, OE zone does not permit existing use.	We have updated the zoning in the third draft to apply the new OC zoning, which is equivalent to the existing OC zoning. Additionally we have retained the exception zone.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
170				210 & 220 Steeles Avenue West - site specific zoning approved June 2024, (3783) to be carried forward.	Exception zone 3783 is retained in the 3rd draft zoning by-law.
171				EV Parking – The new CZBL should include transition provisions for electrical vehicle parking requirements. Currently, approximately 3% of all vehicles on the road are electric. While electric vehicle ownership is expected to increase over the next few decades, the new draft CZBL requires that 20% of resident spaces and 10% of visitor spaces be equipped with electrical supply for charging stations. This requirement is not consistent with current market demand for EV parking.	This is noted. The City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.
172				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity Area – The City should apply a fixed minimum amenity ratio and should reduce min amenity requirements within PMTSAs. Per Table 4.2.3, an apartment and townhouse development must provide 1,240.0 m2 of common amenity plus 4.0 m2 per unit over 200 units. The amenity ratio should be applied on a per unit basis. The baseline requirement of 1,240 square metres of amenity for any development with 200 or more units inflates the minimum amenity required on a per unit basis. Our request is that the City remove the minimum common amenity area requirement of 1,240.0 m2 for a development consisting of 200 units or more and require that amenity area be provided at a fixed ratio of 4.0 square metres per unit. 	We have applied a simple requirement of 5.0 per unit in Draft 3.
173				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of Trip Bicycle Facilities – Sec 3.6.D requires that end-of-trip bicycle facilities, including shower facilities, be provided for all non-residential uses that are required to provide longterm bicycle parking spaces. In our opinion, this is challenging for larger-scale nonresidential uses that are owned and managed by a single entity. Commercial plazas and multi-unit employment centres that occupy a larger area typically do not provide such centralized and shared end-of-trip facilities. In most cases, providing such shared facilities would require the landlord to inherit maintenance and liability obligations which could otherwise be avoided. 	We have removed this requirement from Draft 3.
174				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Mixed-Use High Rise (MH) and Residential Third Density – High Rise (R3H) zones restrict tower floorplates to a maximum area of 800 square metres for all floors about the twelfth storey. In our opinion, the zoning by-law should not regulate tower floorplates. There are instances where an 800+ square metres tower floorplate is appropriate for mid-rise and high-rise buildings. This is dependant on several factors including the existing context, tower separation, building location, distribution of massing, building articulation, impact on streetscape, architectural design, etc. For these reasons, the maximum tower floorplate should not be regulated by the zoning by-law. 	To support implementation of the new urban design guidelines, a max tower floorplate is identified. A minor variance could be sought for increases.
175	Martin Quarcoopome	Weston Consulting on behalf of Lixi Group (99 Hereford Street)	Friday, October 25, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current zoning (Office Commercial with Special Exception 2803) allows hotels and conference centers. However, the draft CZBL proposes to rezone the property to Office Employment (OE), which would exclude these uses. - The hotel is deemed appropriate due to its proximity to Pearson Airport, major highways, and existing transit infrastructure, enhancing its viability. - Weston Consulting request that the next draft of the CZBL retains the existing land use permissions under Special Exception 2803, noting that the hotel aligns with the Brampton Official Plan and supports employment generation in the region. 	On further review we have updated any existing instances of OC zoning with an equivalent OC zone in Draft 3. We have also carried forward exception 2803.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
176	Marshall Smith	KLM Planning on behalf of Lyngate Developments Inc. and Yellowpark Property Management Limited (Southwest Corner of Highway 50 and Castlemore Road, Brampton)	Friday, November 1, 2024	The property has pending site plan applications based on an approved site-specific zoning framework. It's crucial to retain existing permissions and development standards to ensure continuity in the review process. KLM requests that equivalent permissions from the current zoning be incorporated into the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law to avoid future non-compliance and variances.	We confirm that exception 1394 is retained.
177	Constance Ratelle	Korsiac Planning on behalf of Mattamy Homes	Friday, November 1, 2024	Residential provisions, table format is difficult to navigate. Should be organized by building type or zone, not by provision.	We will consider further improvements in the final version.
178				Please clarify "proposed zoning" mapping of previously zoned sites.	We request clarity on the comment. The draft zoning is available for viewing on the City's website.
179				Section 1.11.G.2: Disagree, maximum should be measured based on the closest part of the building. (Or a percentage requirement should be applied.)	The by-law no longer utilizes maximum and implements a build-to-zone approach. The text for measuring maximum (which is retained) is updated.
180				2.5.1: Frontage on a Road or Street - Site specific provisions would be required to permit dwellings (lane based) fronting onto park/open space.	Noted. We are unclear on what typology/format is not facilitated and would be pleased to discuss further improvements.
181				Table 2.4.1: Stairs: Propose 0.5 m to property line instead of 0.6 m. Balconies: Incorrect. Should be permitted in front and exterior, instead of interior. In addition, balconies can only project 1.5m, whereas 1.8m for porch. Suggest coordinating them if balcony above porch. Window bays: Revise to a maximum width of 4m instead of 3m and for them to be permitted in interior side yards.	We have updated to 0.5 for the stairs. We have made various other revisions. For window bays, city prefers 3 m and to limit it to 40% of the dwelling width if they are encroaching.
182				2.12.2 Reserve is counted toward yard but does it account for depth, frontage measurement?	Updates proposed for clarity.
183				2.15.1 – Setback from rail line, revise to any habitable building or structure.	Rail setbacks have been updated in consideration of Railway agency comments; they are requesting this applies to all buildings and structures. We have included language that allows uses which require the rail for loading/offloading to be exempted from the setbacks.
184				2.17 – confirm 0 metre setback to a daylight triangle.	We have added this clarification.
185				2.18.1 is too subjective; some municipalities refer to whichever the wider street is. This method can be kept for if the roads are equivalent.	We have added this clarification.
186				Table 3.1.1.8, is live/work parking allowed to be tandem?	No - customer parking should be separate and accessible but resident parking can be tandem. We have updated section 3.2 to clarify when tandem is permitted.
187				3.2.B: a. Revise the minimum number of required parking spaces may be reduced at a rate of 10 spaces rather than 4 for every one dedicated car sharing space.	We have removed this car sharing provision from the by-law in the interest of simplifying.
188				Clarify that 3.2.B.1 is related to parking lots only? Or corner lots? Change to intersection of street lines. Property lines is not correct.	We have updated this provision.
189				Table 3.5.1: "Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Equipped with Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment" - deleted this requirement (and allow it to be market driven) or only applied to street/row townhouses (not stacks, back to backs or cluster towns).	This is noted. The City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.
190				3.5.B.2: Revise to allow bicycles to be stored in a storage locker provided that the minimum bike storage space requirement is provided plus additional space for	The City would prefer not to allow bicycles to be provided in storage lockers and to have dedicated space.
191				3.5.C.1: Eliminate the % requirement of vertical/horizontal bicycle parking spaces.	City prefers to retain this maximum in light of other best practice and in the interest of making bike parking convenient.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
192				Table 4.1.1. Shift commercial uses to R2 instead of R2A. They make more sense in R2 zone for live/works.	We have made some revisions to the tables.
193				4.1.B: Lot Requirements - Table 4.1.2 a. Reduce corner lot width and associated lot area for singles (i.e. 12 m/225m2 for R1). b. Typical Rear Lane Townhouse Dwelling depth is 18m – revise lot area to 100 m2. c. Reduce lot area for lane-based products (singles AND towns) and back-to-backs d. Eliminate minimum width for development of back-to-backs. e. No dwelling width noted for stacked townhouse without garage.	We have made various updates in consideration of the comments as well as other related comments.
194				4.1.C: Building Height and Form – Table 4.1.4 a. Front Yard – revise minimum setback to 2.5m. Should allow for front wall to project closer to street to deemphasize garage. b. Exterior side yard – revise to 2.0 metres. c. Interior Side Yard, Cluster Towns – revise to 1.2 metres. d. Revise lane-based singles and semis to be consistent with lane-based towns, i.e. 0.5m rear setback where garage is attached. e. Why a 7.5m rear yard for back to back stacked product? Just make it the same as front yard. f. 4.1.D: revise height to 14 metres	Some revisions to setbacks have been proposed in consideration of comments. Generally the City would like to retain 4.5 m front yards for landscaped open space in some zones. Heights have been reviewed and slightly updated.
195				Table 4.1.4: a. Notes under 4.1.4 require 2 x 1.2m side yards if the lot is >12.5m, disagree. Interior side yards should be consistent. b. Reduce front yard (from 4.5m to 3m) and rear yard (from 7.5 m to 6m) c. Reduce exterior side yard setback from 4.5m to 3m d. Reduce front yard setback for back to backs from 6m to 3 m	We have updated interior side yard. Generally the City would like to retain 4.5 m front yards for landscaped open space. We have reduced exterior to 3 m.
196				Table 4.1.5. Some municipalities allow 0m front yard for mixed use; suggest 0m for front and 2m for flankage.	These setbacks are aligned with the UDGs which call for public realm to be provided. A small front yard is desirable to facilitate this. The 3rd draft is updated to include a build-to zone approach for some flexibility.
197				Table 4.1.6: a. R2: Revise to 14 m. b. R2A height should be 4 storeys c. R3L: Revise to 4.5 storeys	Heights must be limited to 3 storeys per the OP in neighbourhoods but Schedule B can override this. Some tweaks have been proposed.
198				Table 4.1.7 Suggest min 4.5m ground floor height be for mixed use buildings, not all apartments	City and UDGs prefer 4.5 m min ground floor height for all uses to create flexibility for future non-residential uses to locate in ground floors.
199				4.1.E: Site and Landscaping – Table 4.1.8 – we propose that the minimum landscaped open space % and lot coverage % requirements be reconsidered.	We have removed min lot coverage in favour of retaining the landscaped open space.
200				Table 4.2.3: Minimum Amenity Space Requirements a. Revise requirement for 8 to 200+ units to 4m2 per unit.	We have simplified the amenity area requirements to refer simply to 5 m2 per unit.
201				4.2.D.3: Setback to a garage door - revise to 5.5 m.	City prefers 6.0 m to create a functional space for a vehicle to be parked/loaded.
202				4.2.D.4, 4.2.D.5 Minimum dimensions of any parking space in an attached private garage – revise to 2.9m x 6m.	These standards were implemented by Council via a ZBLA recently and intent is to carry this approach forward.
203				Table 6.1.3. Some municipalities allow 0m front yard for mixed use; suggest 0m for front and 2m for flankage.	These setbacks are aligned with the UDGs which call for public realm to be provided. A small front yard is desirable to facilitate this.
204				Table 6.1.2 Live work requirements in Mixed Use zone too big, interior lot width should be 6m and lot area should be 100 (100?) m2.	We agree and have updated the provisions.
205				6.2.5 Suggest allowing parking in interior side yard in mixed use zones	UDGs and OP direct parking to the rear in these areas.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
206				Street townhouse definition: Revise to “public or private street”	Street townhouses are intended to front onto public streets while cluster townhouses capture private roads. We would be pleased to discuss if there are any gaps but the intent is to cover all scenarios.
207	Jenna Thibault	Weston Consulting on behalf of Mayfield Commercial Centre Ltd (southeast corner of Airport Road and Mayfield Road)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>1. We understand through review of the By-law that exception zones, which are to be included in Section 12, have not yet been completed, and will be provided in a future draft of the By-law. We kindly request confirmation that the site-specific zoning provisions for the larger site that were implemented through sitespecific amending By-law 194-2022 be reflected within Section 12 of the future draft of the By-law.</p> <p>2. We kindly request confirmation that the new By-law once enacted will not prevent future owners and occupants of the development on the subject lands from being able to obtain occupancy permits for their units.</p> <p>3. The previously mentioned Zoning By-law Amendment application (OZS-2024-0026) for the smaller site is currently scheduled to be considered by the City of Brampton Planning and Development Committee on November 4. The proposed site-specific zoning for the smaller site is intended to allow for the smaller site to be developed as a fully-integrated expansion of the development on the larger site, and therefore fulfilling the intent for this property as outlined within the approved Tertiary plan. On the basis the application is approved, we ask that Section 12 capture the site-specific zoning provisions.</p>	We confirm we have carried forward exception 3656 into Draft 3. With respect to occupancy permits, the new zoning by-law should not introduce constraints as certain planning/building applications are granted transition under Section 1.7. We confirm that the final zoning by-law will incorporate any recent approved zoning amendments up until the council adoption date if they have not already been incorporated into draft 3.
208	Oz Kemal	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), planning consultant for McVean Plaza Inc. (9995 McVean Drive, Brampton)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	<p>Current and Proposed Zoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands are currently zoned as Commercial One (C1-2302), allowing a range of commercial uses, including retail stores and a private school tutoring center. A Minor Variance application is pending to add a Day Nursery as an additional permitted use. - The Draft #2 Zoning By-law proposes to rezone the property to Local Commercial (LC), which includes similar commercial uses but excludes the private school tutoring center. - The proposed LC zone generally aligns with current uses, except for the omission of the private school tutoring center. The inclusion of a Child Care Centre is supported, as it aligns with the ongoing Minor Variance application. - The submission requests that the City consider site-specific provisions to recognize canopy encroachments and the existing private school tutoring center. 	We confirm we have carried forward exception 2302 for these lands which will recognize the canopy and the private school tutoring centre.
209	Gerry Tchisler	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), planning consultant for Morguard Corporation (410 @ Steeles Business and Retail Centre)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>1. Electric Vehicle (EV) Parking Provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Morguard expresses concerns about the requirement for EV parking, which currently applies only to new gross floor area. Given that the shopping center is nearly fully built out, the original plans did not account for EV parking. - While Morguard supports the introduction of EV parking, they argue that it should not be implemented on an ad-hoc basis for partially built-out sites. Instead, a cohesive approach should be taken for the entire site. - They request that the new zoning provisions include an exemption for the Subject Lands from EV parking requirements. 	This is noted. The City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
210				<p>2.Existing Site-Specific Zoning / Permitted Uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Subject Lands are currently governed by several site-specific zoning provisions that have guided their development. It is crucial that these provisions are carried forward into the new by-law, with necessary modifications to ensure all existing uses remain permitted. 	We confirm that we have carried forward exceptions 3158, 2073, and 3456 in Draft 3.
211	Keith MacKinnon	KLM Planning on behalf of Neamsby Investments Inc. C/O The Remington Group (Block 266 on registered plan 43M-2103, and Block 426 on Plan of Subdivision 21T-11005B)	Friday, November 1, 2024	The submission requests that the site specific exception within Approved By-law Number 61-2014, passed on March 26, 2014, into the upcoming 3rd Draft of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law. The owners seek to ensure that their existing permissions are maintained in the new by-law.	We confirm that we have carried forward exception zones passed via by-law 61-2014 into draft 3. Additionally, ongoing plans of subdivision and other application types are subject to the transition provisions of section 1.7.
212	Katherine Rauscher	MacNaughton Hermesen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC), planning consultant for Pagecorp-Peel Properties Inc., Pagecorp-Peel II Inc., Traconair Holdings Inc., and Traconair II Inc., represented by Oxford Properties (75, 85, and 95 Charolais Blvd, and 430 and 440 McMurchy Avenue, Brampton)	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>Comments on Residential Third Density High-Rise (R3H) zone:</p> <p>The Subject Lands are located southeast of the Charolais Boulevard and McMurchy Avenue intersection, adjacent to the Uptown Urban Centre and the HLRT-22 Gateway Terminal Major Transit Station Area (MTSA).</p> <p>The site consists of five parcels, four of which contain residential apartment buildings (Brampton Towers) ranging from 20 to 21 storeys, with parking provided on-site. They are currently zoned as Residential Apartment B with site-specific exemptions (R4B-3148).</p> <p>The Draft #2 Zoning By-law proposes to rezone the Subject Lands to Residential Third Density – High Rise (R3H). However, specific provisions and exception zones have not yet been released.</p> <p>These proposed R3H uses generally align with the current R4B-3148 permitted uses of the Subject Lands, with the exception of recreational facilities (health/fitness centre). This is not of concern, as the new R3H zone does permit similar commercial uses under the R4B-3148 zone. The concern may be regarding section 4.2.F Commercial Uses in the Residential Zones, where commercial uses may only comprise a maximum of 200 m2 in gross floor area (GFA) per lot, whereas the current R4B-3148 permits a maximum 290 m2 area for commercial use. Similarly, s.4.2.F.3 limits medical office/clinics to one practitioner and a maximum of 2 treatment rooms/areas. This may exclude practitioners who share medical practices in context of a limitation to the number of practitioners who may locate within one office</p>	To maintain existing permission for commercial, Draft 3 carries forward exception zone 3148 for the subject lands.
213				Increase GFA for Commercial Uses: Allow a higher GFA for commercial uses in the R3H zone.	The retention of exception 3148 should address the concern.
214				Remove Practitioner Limitations: Eliminate restrictions on the number of medical practitioners allowed in a medical office/clinic.	We agree with removal of the number of medical practitioners for commercial uses in residential zones, since the scale of the use is regulated by the GFA limit.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
215				Amend EV Parking Requirements: Change the requirement for electric vehicle parking from "shall be provided" to "may be provided".	This is noted. The City would prefer to advance its strategy to improve EV parking options across a wide range of land uses. The third draft proposes revisions to the definitions to not require Level 2 charging and provide for future installation.
216	Debra Walker	MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) , on behalf of Patel Land and Developments Limited (8383 Mississauga Road, Brampton)	Friday, October 25, 2024	Based on our review of the second draft of the Draft Brampton Zoning By-law, we are concerned that our original comments have not been addressed. As such, we attach our original commenting letter to this letter to reiterate our comments and would request that they be addressed as part of the next version of this Zoning By-law. We note that the Permitted Yard Encroachments section has been revised from Section 2.4.D in the first draft to Section 2.11 in the second draft. Therefore, our comments related to the Parkade Ventilation – Permission for Encroachment now relate to this Section and Table 2.4.1: Permitted Yard Encroachments. We also note that the Minimum Landscaped Open Space in the Prestige Employment Zone has been increased from 20% to 25%. This is the opposite of our request, and it appears that our comments have not been considered.	The comments are noted. We have updated yard encroachments and LOS requirements in consideration of the comments in Draft 3.
217				The purpose of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law is to implement the Region of Peel and City of Brampton Official Plans. Where there is an existing non-conformity to the Official Plans, zoning review provides the appropriate opportunity to amend the zoning of lands to a zone that appropriately implements the Official Plans, regardless of an active application. Therefore, any proposed zoning within the Employment designation should implement the permitted employment uses of the Official Plans. It is our opinion, that the proposed transition provisions in the second draft of the Draft City of Brampton Zoning By-law do not adequately address the concern of conformity to the Region of Peel Official Plan and the City of Brampton Official Plan, regarding permitted uses in an employment designation. We recommend that the proposed transition	This is noted. Pre-zoning for development is largely out of scope of the new ZBL as there are policies that would have to be satisfied, which may require studies or an application. Further the City is reviewing its employment area policies in light of the new PPS. The transition provisions have no relationship to pre-zoning; they relate to building permits and planning applications which are currently in process.
218				Repeat comment on Draft 1, not addressed: the Subject Lands be zoned Prestige Employment	Site specific zone changes creating significant new permission outside the PMTSAs is out of scope of the zoning by-law review and should be submitted as an application. The FD zone has been applied in place of the A zoning for the property. We would be open to applying either A or FD but do not support rezoning to PE through this CZBLR process.
219				Repeat comment on Draft 1, not addressed: a site specific exception be added to recognize the existing permitted Supportive Housing Type 1 and 2 as a permitted use on the Subject Lands	These uses are now permitted in the A and FD zones, in keeping with the current permissions in the A zone.
220				Repeat comment on Draft 1, not addressed: Section 2.4.D (Permitted Yard Encroachments) and specifically, Section 2.4.D.1 - Table 2.4.1 (Permitted Yard Encroachments in All Zones) be revised to permit “parkade ventilations” within any yard to a maximum encroachment of 0.6 m from any property line	We agree and have made the change.
221				Repeat comment on Draft 1, not addressed: Section 7.1.E (Site and Landscaping) – Table 7.1.5 be revised to require a Minimum Landscaped Open Space of 10% in a Prestige Employment Zone.	Min landscaped open space has been reviewed and updated.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
222	Kelly Graham	SvN Architects + Planners on behalf of RioCan Management Inc. and 1388688 Ontario Ltd (499 Main Street South)	Friday, November 1, 2024	Height and Density Increase: The owners seek to increase height and density permissions, particularly for blocks adjacent to the transit terminal, similar to other nearby areas with unlimited density.	In accordance with the City's separate PMTSA master planning work, the subject lands have been pre-zoned to implement the new concept plan and the exceptions were deleted.
223				The permitted uses proposed in the draft by-law are more limited than the existing permissions in the site-specific by-law, and we would like to request that the list remain as broad as possible, acknowledging that the master plan is going to be built out over several decades.	The permitted uses are in accordance with the new zones which have been updated. We would be pleased to discuss any omissions but the intent of the permitted uses is to conform to the permitted uses in Brampton Plan for the Protected Major Transit Station Areas.
224				Transition Regulations: There is uncertainty regarding how transition regulations will apply to properties with recent site-specific approvals.	We would be pleased to discuss further.
225				It is our position that the built form standards in Site-Specific Zoning By-law 228-2020 should generally be maintained through a site-specific exception in the new Comprehensive Zoning By law. We are happy to work with staff on the details of what this exception would contain.	As above, the exceptions have been deleted in order to pre-zone the lands per the City's master planning work for the PMTSAs.
226	David Matthews	Matthews Planning and Management Inc on behalf of Sheridan Capital Management Corporation (0, 10635, 10647, 10797 The Gore Road)	Thursday, October 31, 2024	1.7C Lapse of Transition Provisions - is an overly restrictive provision especially when considering the current timelines associated with development. A three year transitional period especially within the context of larger landowner groups and stormwater management and servicing makes these timelines restrictive if waiting for adjacent landowners to develop their lands. We propose that the three year minimum at the very least be increased to 5 years. Alternatively staff should consider a rewording of this section to simply specify a date before which you will be grandfathered indefinitely.	The City would prefer to continue with the transition provisions as indicated, in order to eventually move away from administering the current zoning by-law and focus on the new zoning by-law. This is balanced with the continuation of existing exception zones.
227				Table 2.4.1 Structure: Balconies and decks, including any associated access stairs. We ask that staff consider encroachments over and above 3.5m	The table is updated to refer to access stairs more explicitly. We feel a 3.5 m encroachment into the rear yard is appropriate as there should be some distance between the balcony and the rear lot lines.
228				Section 3.4 Remove requirement for 20% of the total resident parking spaces or 1.0 whichever is greater. Does equipment mean physical chargers? This language is not clear. Only rough-in should be required.	Some revisions to the standards and definitions; intent is not to require Level 2 charging station to be installed, but require the electrical infrastructure necessary for future Level 2 charging.
229				"Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment" Please clarify whether this definition only means the rough-in of the infrastructure, rather than providing the charging equipment.	Some revisions are proposed in the third draft.
230				Section 4.1B - Lot Requirements R2A Zones should have a lot area per dwelling unit as low as 80sq.m R2A Zones Should have lot width at a minimum 12m"	We have updated the standards in consideration of various comments.
231				Section 4.1.C, Table 4.1.4 R1 Front Yard minimum reduced to 3.0m	The City prefers 4.5 m in the front yard in R1 to support vegetation planting.
232				Section 4.1.C, Table 4.1.4 R1 A Front Yard minimum reduced to 3.0m	The City prefers 4.5 m in the front yard in R1 to support vegetation planting.
233				Section 4.1.C, Table 4.1.4 R1 Rear Yard minimum reduced to 6.0m	We have reduced the rear yard slightly to 7m and 6 m in cases where the rear yard abuts open space.
234				Section 4.1.C, Table 4.1.4 R1 A Rear Yard minimum reduced to 6.0m	We have reduced the rear yard slightly to 7m and 6 m in cases where the rear yard abuts open space.
235				Section 4.1.C, Table 4.1.4 R2 A Rear Yard minimum reduced to 6.0m	We have reduced the rear yard slightly to 7m and 6 m in cases where the rear yard abuts open space.
236				Section 4.1.C, Table 4.1.4 R1 Exterior Side Yard minimum reduced to 3.0m. This is realistic for existing and future lot fabric.	We agree with 3 m ESY.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
237				Section 4.1.C, Table 4.1.4 R1 A Exterior Side Yard minimum reduced to 3.0m. This is realistic for existing and future lot fabric.	We agree with 3 m ESY.
238				Regulations to Table 4.1.4 Please amend this section to read like the current By-law for interior lots and corner lots which reference the Zoning Symbol on the Schedule/map. Example R1F-x	Tweaks have been made. The lot widths are now shown on Schedule D to the by-law. The by-law text makes reference to this.
239				Section 4.1.D R1, R1A R2 and R2A Building height maximum should be raised to 13m, 3 storeys. This will coincide with increased ceiling heights which are becoming common.	We have incorporated some revisions to height in consideration of various requests.
240				Section 4.1.2 Front Yard Landscaped Open Space Minimum percentage is difficult to implement and should be removed. Please revert to current requirement in in-force by-law.	The City prefers to implement min LOS, and we have deleted lot coverage requirements.
241				Section 4.1.2 Lot Coverage max percentage. Request that coverage provisions are removed.	We have removed lot coverage from most zones.
242				Section 4.2.C Please clarify indoor vs outdoor amenity area requirement for a B2B TH. How will this section in the By-law deal with freehold units. How will the amenity area be shared? We suggest that B2B TH units are removed from this requirement.	We find that back to back townhouses would benefit from amenity space since they have limited on-site opportunities aside from balcony or a rooftop patio.
243				Section 4.2.D reduce 6.0m to a 5.7m setback for all cases. Why would a single parking space require 6.0m as opposed to 5.7m	This has been updated to consistently require 6.0 m. City's preference is for 6 m normally to create a useable space for the rear door/trunk to be opened.
244				Section 4.2.D Revise private garage dimensions to 2.9 by 6.0	The garage dimensions were endorsed by Council through a prior amendment and the intent is to retain this approach.
245				Section 4.2.D Revise private garage dimensions to 3.1 by 6.0	The garage dimensions were endorsed by Council through a prior amendment and the intent is to retain this approach.
246				Section 4.2.I Please release the driveway standards as soon as they're updated, not when the third draft is released.	Driveway standards have been updated in the 3rd draft, mainly incorporating existing requirements. The City would prefer to review these standards and conduct a separate consultation process.
247				Section 4.2. NProviding rear yard access limits lot sizes. removal of this provision will allow for smaller lot sizes. Alternatively id provision is kept, remove 2-step grade requirement.	We agree with removing the two step grade requirement but the City prefers to maintain a direct pedestrian access to a rear yard.
248				Chapter 11 -Definitions - Include covered porch as part of listed excluded items.	We have removed lot coverage standards from the ZBL so the exclusion should no longer be a concern.
249	Mauro Peverini	Solmar (includes Bristol Place Corp. and United Holdings Inc.)	Tuesday, October 29, 2024	The Bristol and Hampton lands are subject to Council approved and in-effect site-specific Zoning By-laws 192-2022 & 54-2024 respectively (copies attached). Both Zoning amendment applications were subject to considerable review by the City and commenting agencies and supported by comprehensive reports, studies, and plans. Accordingly, both By-laws must be maintained as site-specific exceptions through the City's ZBL process. Bristol has submitted a Development Permit System application (City File No. DPS 2022-0004) and Hampton is expected to file a Site Plan application for Phase 1 of the project in Q4/2024. The in-effect site-specific By-law approvals and the work undertaken to-date has guided the development plans for each site. Bristol has submitted a Building permit for Tower 1 of the development. During the presentation it was noted that all Exceptions approved since 2020 will be retained thereby preserving the Bristol and Hampton Zoning approvals. Please confirm this is the case. If the Bristol and Hampton site-specific By-laws are not proposed to be maintained, I would like to arrange a meeting with staff to discuss this matter.	We confirm that the exception zones from 54-2024 are carried forward into the third draft zoning by-law. 192-2022 is in the DPS Area which is not subject to the new by-law.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
250				I reviewed the Zoning Maps for both properties on the City's project website. For Hampton (241 Queen Street E) the lands are proposed to be zoned into 3 categories (h)MH Mixed Use High Rise, (h)MH-D(6) and (h)MM, subject to the General Provisions. As noted above, By-law 54-2024 must be retained on the lands. Zoning By-law 54-2024 provides one zone category (DC1) over the entirety of the property with three exceptions (3780, 3781 and 3782) applying to portions of the site the boundaries of which are aligned with the anticipated development phasing. The new online ZBL map illustrates three (3) Zone categories and 2 the site-specific exception boundaries do not align with the zone or exception boundaries in By-law 54- 2024. It is imperative that the new ZBL reflect the current and consistent zone and exceptions boundaries for the property. Please review the proposed zoning for the Hampton lands and advise of the City's disposition of this matter.	As above the existing exceptions have been carried forward and we have updated the extent of the mapping which should align with the by-law.
251	Sandra K Patano	Weston Consulting on behalf of Sunfiled Investments (172 Church Street East, Brampton)	Tuesday, November 5, 2024	Based on our review, we understand that the active SPA application for the Subject Property will be transitioned under Section 1.7.B of the CZBL given that the application was deemed complete before the passing of the new by-law and complies with site-specific zoning by-law 116-2022, and that the applicable transition provision shall lapse 5 years after the date of passing of the CZBL. Notwithstanding the above transition provisions, it is acknowledged that site-specific zoning by-law 116-2022 was passed and came into full force and effect prior to the adoption of the new CZBL. As such, we request that the existing site-specific permissions for the Subject Property be carried forward into the CZBL in accordance with by-law 116-2022.	Through the separate MTSA work, the City has requested that the zoning be updated in favour of pre-zoning for midrise residential uses, in accordance with the new MTSA plan. As such exception 3626 is proposed for deletion in Draft 3. The existing Site Plan application would be subject to transition per section 1.7.
252	Kelly Graham	SvN Architects + Planners on behalf of RioCan Management Inc. and 1388688 Ontario Ltd (499 Main Street South)	Friday, December 6, 2024	<p>Follow up submission to two previous submissions dated (September 20th and November 1st 2024). The November 1st submission included a revised Master Plan Concept reflecting a density uplift of approximately 30% beyond the version that was the basis of the rezoning approval in 2020 (By-law no. 228-2020). Our team has subsequently completed a review of the latest architectural plans for Phase 1A of the Shoppers World Brampton redevelopment against the applicable regulations of draft two of the CZBL. Minor variance application (City file no. A-2024-0321) was recently granted for the Phase 1A development, and as a consequence the currently plans are deemed to fully comply with the in-force zoning. However, our review has determined that there are a number of new and/or modified standards in the draft CZBL that the proposal would not comply with. In other words, if the draft CZBL were in force on the site before a site plan had been submitted, the proposal would not comply. Zoning by-law 228-2020 was developed based on the submitted architectural concept for the Master Plan, and has subsequently guided any modifications to the Master Plan. As a result, we can extrapolate that there will likely be a number of zoning compliance issues, if the draft CZBL were to come into force and be applied against subsequent site plan applications for different phases of the Shoppers World Brampton redevelopment.</p> <p>The Phase 1A site is currently zoned as HMU1(H)-3008 in By-law 228-2020, and is proposed to be rezoned to Mixed-Use High Rise (MH) in the second draft of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Our review of the applicable standards has identified potential zoning compliance issues related to minimum yards, building height, setbacks and step backs, ground floor uses, and amenity area requirements. In general, the draft MH zoning standards are more restrictive than the in-force zoning. The draft zoning also does not recognize site-specific provisions that were negotiated through the rezoning approval process, such as the requirement for commercial uses at grade for lands fronting Steeles Avenue W.</p> <p>While the CZBL regulations are still in draft and subject to change, we would like to request that the Shoppers World Brampton site be added to Chapter 12: Exception</p>	In Draft 3, exception 3008 has been proposed for deletion in favour of the new draft zones and heights/densities established by the MTSA planning team. We understand there are discussions ongoing with the City's MTSA team so further refinement to this approach and discussion may be required prior to Council adoption. We note that Section 1.7 would apply to grant transition to any applications in process which meet the criteria.

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
253	Tim Cane	SGL on behalf of 2706287 Ontario Inc. (8888 The Gore Road)	Monday, December 30, 2024	<p>The Subject Site is within The Gore Road Primary Major Transit Station Area (MTSA). The Brampton Plan designates the Subject Site as “Mixed-Use (Mid-Rise Mixed-Use)” with a “Height Transition Area” overlay. We support the proposed “Mixed Use Mid Rise” zoning for the Subject Site, which conforms to the Brampton Plan land use designation. However, we object to the proposed height limit of 8-storeys. In reviewing the Draft Zoning there does not seem to be any justification for the proposed height of 8-storeys (Policy 2.2.2, refer to Figure 2). The proposed 8-storeys limit appears to be arbitrarily applying a maximum height to transition from the station to the adjacent properties to the north, which is not the intent of the Height Transition Area policies, which references “appropriate transition measures” to be determined on site-specific basis through the planning application process. Sites with larger frontages and lot areas with sufficient space to accommodate appropriate separation or transition in design should accommodate greater heights as per the Brampton Plan. The Subject Site has a frontage of 45.77 metres (150 ft) along The Gore Road and an area of 0.35 hectares (0.88 acres). As such, the Subject Site can accommodate tower separation distances between a mid-rise building and the adjacent properties while providing sufficient space to minimize adverse impacts related to shadow, privacy and overlook. As such, we recommend that a height of 12-storey be permitted on the Subject Site within the proposed Zoning By-law. This permitted height would also be reflective and consistent with the proposed Floor Space Index of 3.0 and a lot area that can accommodate a mid-rise up to 12-storeys.</p>	<p>To implement the direction of the City's PMTSA planning team, we have recommended deleting exception 2873 which applies to these lands, in favour of the recommended rezoning for MM with 8 storeys per the City's concept plan. Any applications in process such as a site plan would be subject to the transition provisions of Section 1.7.</p>
254	Sumeet Ahluwalia	The Daniels Corporation (Part of Block 168, Plan 43M- 1854, designated as Part 10 on Reference Plan 43R-40778, being all of P.I.N. 14087- 1689(LT))	Friday, November 1, 2024	<p>Daniels undertook a Site Plan Approval process that was completed in 2023 for the construction of a mixed-use residential development. Construction has not yet commenced. The current OC-2030 zone permits a multiple residential dwelling in addition to a wide range of non-residential uses. The OC-2030 zone has no maximum height restriction. Parking rates for this site are 1.08 residential/visitor and 1.0 per commercial premise where there is both residential and commercial. The draft Comprehensive By-law proposes that this site be zoned “Office Employment” (OE). Under the proposed OE designation, the development of this site becomes extremely challenged. The OE zone does not permit residential uses and has a building height restriction of 11m. This proposed category provides significantly different development standards to those that are in place today. OE also severely limits the extent of permitted non-residential uses to only financial services and office. As OMG3 is effectively a continuation of the previous two phases located directly to the south and as such a residential zone makes the most sense. As a parental zoning category, Office Employment does not fit the context of the surrounding built environment and should be adjusted to fall under, for example, the Residential or Mixed-Use (MM) category to ensure optimal flexibility while focusing on a primarily residential use. This site falls within Parking Regulation Area 2 (PRA2) which applies a rate of 0.9 residential/visitor combined plus a non-residential rate of 2.25 spaces per 100m2 of GFA under use 16 of the proposed by-law. Under the proposed rates our development does not meet the standard. Although the PRA2 minimum rate for apartment dwelling is the lowest of the three parking regulation areas, consideration should be made to lower the residential rate to below 0.75 spaces per unit and adjust the ratio applied for non-residential uses.</p>	<p>We confirm that exception zone 2030 has been carried forward in Draft 3 which would retain existing remissions. The site plan would also be subject to transition under Section 1.7.</p> <p>As above the exception has been carried forward to retain the approved spaces.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
				<p>A critical item that appears to be missing from the parking standards is a reduction for Affordable Housing. Use 12 in table 3.1.1 considers Supportive Housing (1/2) but does not allow flexibility for other forms of housing along the affordability spectrum. Other municipalities have recognized that in most cases, vehicular use among affordable housing residents is lower, and provide exemptions to parking standards. Brampton should be considering opening the reduced parking rate beyond the Supportive Housing Residence type and review a secondary Apartment Dwelling rate under the affordability lens. The rate should be based on dwelling unit and not bedroom type.</p>	<p>The exception has been carried forward which retains existing standards for parking.</p>
				<p>Table 4.2.2 in the proposed CZBL outlines the minimum common amenity area requirements based on number of dwellings. These standards are extremely onerous and negatively impact the viability of developments by removing crucial sellable/leasable GFA that is needed for projects to 'pencil out', especially those that fall within the 21-200-unit category and even more so the projects that are seeking to be affordable. Below is an example of what is routinely seen as a standard for amenity rates (Toronto Example):</p> <p>Amenity Space for an Apartment Building In the RA zone an apartment building with 20 or more dwelling units must provide amenity space at a minimum rate of 4.0 sm for each dwelling unit, of which: A) at least 2 sm for each dwelling unit is indoor amenity space located at or above established grade B) at least 40 sm is outdoor amenity space in a location adjoining or directly accessible to the indoor amenity space; and, C) no more than 25% of the outdoor component may be a green roof.</p>	<p>This is noted and the common amenity requirements in Draft 3 are updated to more simply require 5 sqm per dwelling unit.</p>
				<p>The OMG3 site meets the relevant criteria to ensure the land use permissions in the current zoning exception are retained given its recent approval and construction status, along with significant differences in development standards with the proposed zoning. Daniels is submitting this letter to outline the key concerns with the CZBL as it relates to our site and general review of relevant sections of the proposed by-law. Along with this letter we would like to request a meeting with staff to discuss the impacts the proposed zoning has on our site and work collaboratively to ensure that housing can continue to be built while municipal policies are being updated.</p>	<p>This is noted.</p>

ID#	Name	Group/ Organization	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment (see Note 1 at end of table)	City/WSP Response (April 2025)
255	Kamal Paudel		Wednesday, November 20, 2024	<p>As a property taxpayer in the City of Brampton, I would like to bring it to your attention regarding the proposed changes to R1M zoning in the City. This comprehensive zoning reform was a big necessity, but one of your proposed zoning updates, R1M, limits the 'by default' option to potentially increase housing density in the critical parts of the City.</p> <p>In the proposed zoning by-law, R1M zoning is found around major intersections such as Mavis and Steeles, Queen and Main, Hurontario and Steeles, etc. As you may be aware, those are the areas that already have a higher density of people, and have bigger lots to support fourplexes, hence the pilot project for second unit registration started. With R1M zoning in those locations, and if it is limited to a maximum of 3 units, the neighbours are likely going to see other houses in the City with 4 units and start building a 4th unit (illegally). These are also the areas where there is a known high density of population. It is better to give all of those neighbourhoods an option to build 4 units legally, or fourplexes so that the enforcement becomes easier for the City and simple for the residents to understand and follow rules.</p> <p>There are other incentives to take action for the homeowners:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If four units are allowed in those areas, there is an economic incentive for homeowners to do it all at once (economy of scale vs 3 units). 2. If higher numbers of units are available for rental, the rental price won't increase as rapidly or might stabilize. 3. These are areas with high public transit accessibility, therefore, more people want to live here and walk to bus stops. 4. The current few examples of R1A zoning (that allows fourplexes) are very limiting (a few lots here and there, that's it!) and probably won't make any difference in the overall density we need in the City. The City might end up reviewing it again in a year to fix the problem that should not have existed to begin with. 5. If you want to be bold, be like Vancouver or even the City of Toronto or Mississauga. BC has six units allowed in some areas. 6. The changes in zoning for commercial zones are great steps, but those take a very 	<p>The R1M zone is designed to implement the Mature Neighbourhood policies of Brampton Plan and has been implemented on properties that are subject to these policies per Schedule 12 of Brampton Plan. The R1A zone similarly is directed by Brampton Plan and allows for up to four units. Through further Secondary Plan updates, the City may identify other suitable locations where multiple dwelling development is appropriate. As such the new zoning by-law takes significant steps forward to create housing flexibility, but further updates can occur.</p>

Note 1:

The comment / summary of comment column provides a pasted version of the original comment, or a summary of the comment written by the WSP/City team. This column is provided for convenience only and the original comment should be viewed for accuracy. In some cases the comment is lengthy and is cut off in this table.