

Brampton



City of Brampton Official Plan Review

Discussion Paper Workshops Summary Report

September 2005



City of Brampton
Planning, Design and Development Department

This workshop summary was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura is providing third-party facilitation services as part of the City of Brampton's Official Plan Review. This summary captures the key discussion points from the five discussion paper workshops held on June 29, July 6 and August 10, 2005. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript and is subject to review by workshop participants. If you have any questions or comments regarding the summary, please contact either:

Christina Lo, MCIP, RPP
Policy Planner (Official Plan Review)
Planning, Design & Development
City of Brampton
Tel: 905-874-2124
E-mail: ourfuture@brampton.ca

OR

Jean-Louis Gaudet
Consultant
Lura Consulting
Tel: 416-410-3888
E-mail: jgaudet@lura.ca



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	i
1. Introduction	1
1.1 City of Brampton's Official Plan Review	1
1.2 The Focus Area Discussion Papers	1
1.3 Discussion Paper Public Consultation Process.....	3
2. Cultural Heritage Workshop Summary	5
2.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks	5
2.2 Overview Presentation	5
2.3 Roundtable Feedback	7
2.4 Individual Comments and Written Submissions	11
3. Environment and Open Space Workshop Summary	14
3.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks	14
3.2 Overview Presentation	14
3.3 Roundtable Feedback	16
3.4 Individual Comments and Written Submissions	25
4. Urban Form/Development Design Workshop Summary	31
4.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks	31
4.2 Overview Presentation	31
4.3 Roundtable Feedback	32
4.4 Individual Comments and Written Submissions	38
5. Retail Workshop Summary.....	43
5.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks	43
5.2 Overview Presentation	43
5.3 Roundtable Feedback	44
5.4 Individual Comments and Written Submissions	50
6. Office Workshop Summary	52
6.1 Welcome and Opening Remarks	52
6.2 Overview Presentation	52
6.3 Roundtable Feedback	53
6.4 Individual Comments and Written Submissions	59
Appendix A: Cultural Heritage Participant List, Submissions and Workshop Materials	
Appendix B: Environment and Open Space Participant List, Submissions and Workshop Materials	
Appendix C: Urban Form/Development Design Participant List, Submissions and Workshop Materials	
Appendix D: Retail Participant List, Submissions and Workshop Materials	
Appendix E: Office Participant List, Submissions and Workshop Materials	

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CITY OF BRAMPTON'S OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW

The City of Brampton's Official Plan (OP) is a document that establishes goals, objectives and policies to guide the City's land-use decisions for the next 20 to 30 years. The City's current OP was approved by Council in June 1993 and adopted by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in March 1997.

The *Ontario Planning Act* requires that municipal councils hold a special meeting every five years to determine if there is a need to revise the OP. Such a meeting was held in Brampton on June 3, 2002, where it was determined that the City should carry out a strategic Official Plan Review (OPR) to address a number of focus areas. These focus areas include:

- New Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts;
- Economic Development, in particular Office and Retail;
- Environment/Open Space;
- Cultural Heritage;
- Urban Design;
- Housekeeping; and
- The NW Brampton Urban Boundary Review.

Brampton's OPR process began in July 2002. As a part of this process, a series of discussion papers addressing specific focus areas were prepared for use in consulting with stakeholders and the public. The discussion papers and other documents prepared for the OPR are found on the City's website at http://www.city.brampton.on.ca/official_plan/home.tml.

1.2 THE FOCUS AREA DISCUSSION PAPERS

Six discussion papers were prepared as a part of the City's OPR. They include:

- Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts
- Cultural Heritage;
- Environment and Open Space;
- Urban Form/Development Design;
- Office Strategy; and
- Retail Policy Review Study.

All the focus area studies and associated discussion papers were prepared by City staff except for the retail policy review study, which was undertaken by Malone Given Parsons Ltd and commissioned by the City.

The general format of the discussion papers included a number of components in their reviews, including:

- Relevant Provincial, regional and municipal policies (e.g.; Planning Act; Provincial Policy Statement, Greenbelt Plan, Peel Regional OP, Brampton's existing "Six Pillars" strategic plan, etc);
- Recent and potential policy initiatives and programs (e.g., development design guidelines, block planning, Flower City strategy, Gateway Beautification Program, etc.);
- Other Official Plans within the Greater Toronto Area; and
- Proposed policy changes and directions.

An exception to this was the Retail discussion paper, for which the executive summary of the Retail Policy Review Study prepared by Malone Given Parsons was used.

The discussion papers are described briefly below.

Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts

The Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts Discussion Paper outlines a range of population, housing and employment forecasts developed with the assistance of Hemson Consulting Limited and discusses the planning context from which these forecasts were derived. The paper also highlights a number of strategic issues and presents plausible options for dealing with the City's unprecedented growth levels.

Cultural Heritage

The Cultural Heritage Discussion Paper reviews existing cultural heritage policies in Brampton's OP and in recent programs/initiatives. It also reviewed major enabling legislation and policies, including the recently amended Ontario Heritage Act. The paper recommends new and updated policy options for preserving the City's cultural heritage resources.

Environment and Open Space

The purpose of the Environment and Open Space Discussion Paper is to review the environmental and open space sections and schedules of the City's OP. The discussion paper provides a summary of the background, policy context and proposed revisions to the environment and open space policies and schedules. The review examines the policy framework of the OP in the context of ensuring consistency with objectives surrounding the protection and enhancement of the City's environment and open space system. The discussion paper also presents proposed updates to Schedule "D" (Environmental Features) and Schedule "E" (Recreational Open Space) of the OP.

The Discussion Paper and the schedules were prepared in consultation with the Region of Peel and local conservation agencies, including the Credit Valley Conservation Authority and the Toronto Region Conservation Authority.

Urban Form/Development Design

The Urban Form/Development Design Discussion Paper examines the City's existing OP urban form policies in the context of relevant Provincial, regional and municipal policies and initiatives and other municipal official plans. The paper proposes revisions and updates to the urban form policies, including implementation of the Council-

approved City-wide Development Design Guidelines and improvement on how the City promotes high quality civic and development design.

Office Space Strategy

The Office Space Strategy Discussion Paper addresses existing office space policies, related land use designations and Schedule "A" (General Land Use Designations) of Brampton's OP. It also proposes policy directions for accommodating office development potential within Brampton. The review considers historic and current trends in the office space market in the Greater Toronto Area, including the latest forecasts prepared by Hemson Consulting Limited for the City's Growth Management Program.

Retail

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. was selected by the City to carry out the Retail Policy Review Study. The Study was carried out in two phases. Phase 1 provides a review of the existing planning, commercial and market context and forecasts retail/commercial space needs in Brampton up to 2031. Phase 2 assesses directions of growth and makes recommendations on modifications to the existing retail policies and hierarchy of designations within the City's Official Plan to help ensure effective responses to current and emerging commercial trends and projected future growth.

1.3 DISCUSSION PAPER PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

The discussion papers represent a central feature of Brampton's OPR's public consultation process. To facilitate discussion and feedback on the papers, the City hosted a series of public stakeholder workshops between late June and mid August 2005. The workshops were held on the following dates:

- Cultural Heritage – June 29, 2005
- Environment and Open Space – June 29, 2005
- Urban Form/Development Design – July 6, 2005
- Office Strategy – August 10, 2005
- Retail Policy Review Study – August 10, 2005

Because the Population, Housing and Employment Discussion Paper is interrelated to the City's Strategic Response to Growth, it has been presented as part of the package of documents. Input on the Discussion Paper has been obtained as part of the consultation process of the strategy as well as through circulation. No workshop was organised for the Discussion Paper.

All workshops were held at the Brampton Holiday Inn (30 Peel Centre Drive, Brampton).

To publicize the workshops, the City extended invitations to stakeholder organizations with an interest or mandate relating to each topic area. Notices were sent to people who attended the Official Plan Review and Growth Management Program Public Information Meeting held on April 18, 2005, and to those who requested to be notified of future OPR events. Advertisements were also placed in the Brampton Guardian and notices placed

on the City's website to encourage individual Brampton residents to participate in the sessions.

The workshops were facilitated by David Dilks of Lura Consulting. The session format included a presentation on the discussion paper topic, a question and answer period, and interactive roundtable discussions. The roundtable discussions were used to obtain feedback on the key issues addressed in the discussion papers and on the proposed policy recommendations and Official Plan revisions. Small table discussions were led by City staff using a workshop workbook containing several focus questions on the discussion topic. The final plenary of each session included a report from each table on the highlights of their discussions.

A summary of the participant feedback from each workshop is presented in Sections 2 through 6. Appendices A to E contain participant lists for each workshop, written submissions, a copy of the session workbooks, and the summary presentations.

2. CULTURAL HERITAGE WORKSHOP SUMMARY

June 29, 2005, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Caledon East Room, Holiday Inn
30 Peel Centre Drive
Brampton, Ontario**

2.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Councillor John Hutton introduced the workshop and thanked the participants for coming. He noted that this is the first of a number of workshops. Councillor Hutton then introduced David Dilks as the facilitator.

Mr. Dilks welcomed the participants to the workshop and said the purpose of the workshop was twofold. The first was to get in-person feedback from participants about proposed changes to the Official Plan. The second purpose was to provide participants with the opportunity to ask questions or obtain clarification about the discussion paper contents. Mr. Dilks then guided the participants through the workbook.

After asking participants to introduce themselves, Mr. Dilks introduced Christina Lo to provide a presentation on the Cultural Heritage Discussion Paper.

2.2 OVERVIEW PRESENTATION

Ms. Lo delivered a presentation on Brampton's Official Plan process and on the Cultural Heritage discussion paper. A copy of the presentation is found in Appendix A.

A question and answer session followed the presentation and is documented below.

Q: Clarify what is meant by Cultural Heritage.

A: *The definition of Cultural Heritage is not far different from the current definition of Heritage. The current practice focuses on built heritage, but the new definition provides a broader sense of what heritage is. It relates to the impacts of people on the landscape and the local area. It includes vistas, architecture, sites, cemeteries, historical trees, etc. It includes any place where humans may have had an impact and where someone might value it. The new definition goes beyond buildings.*

Comment: Councillor Hutton commented that Churchville is a heritage village, not because of its buildings but because of all that is there, such as the river, how it was used, and the people. There will be a cost-sharing approach where all owners in a block plan will pay towards the heritage property, and not just the property owner. For example, all of the developers will share in the cost of maintaining a heritage property if there is one on their block.

Q: How is Cultural Heritage currently designated? A building is easier to designate.

A: *Most of the identified properties are buildings. The Heritage Act allows the City to expand the definition to include contextual elements, such as the grounds and other aspects of the property. This expanded definition includes architecture, trees, ruins, remnants (e.g., fences) on properties. The new definition can broaden what staff look at. Staff want to describe the assets correctly so that they can be designated. It adds the other elements to built heritage.*

Comment: Cultural Heritage includes the people who lived there.

Response: People or populations cannot be designated as Cultural Heritage, but you can include them in the overall heritage aspect.

Q: What is the cut-off date for defining Cultural Heritage? The 50s? The 60s?

A: *It could be as recent as the 70s, but nothing from that era has been defined as Cultural Heritage yet. There is nothing that excludes modern buildings from the definition; it just needs cultural values.*

Q: How would the amendment affect existing buildings or heritage sites? This is long overdue, but how will currently undesignated sites be protected in the transition period? There is concern over protecting Brampton West.

A: *City staff have currently identified areas in the west end that are still relatively intact because little development has taken place there. These will be made heritage properties if they have not already been designated so. The City can use the Heritage designation now to make sure that the heritage properties are protected and integrated properly.*

Q: Heritage districts should be established. It needs to be recognized that some areas or districts are unique and different.

A: *City staff are working towards that. The goal is to not have monolithic areas.*

Q: What about the dilution factor? How do you prevent a situation where everything is designated Cultural Heritage? How do you make sure that the Cultural Heritage designation does not get out of hand and everything gets protected?

A: *An integrated approach will be used. Heritage resources will be identified so that they can receive protection. This will help to ensure compatibility.*

The inventory will not just be what to preserve, but will also document what is of interest. Not all of the Cultural Heritage properties will be of equal weight, and some will be documented for posterity.

2.3 ROUNDTABLE FEEDBACK

This section summarizes the table discussion highlights. Detailed participant feedback is included in Section 2.4.

Key Issues to Be Addressed

1. From your perspective, what are the top 3 or 4 issues relating to Cultural Heritage that the Official Plan Review must address?

A summary of the participant's priority issues are listed in the table below. One issue raised by two of the three groups was **incentives**. One group felt that the OPR should include more incentives, such as public recognition, cost sharing or grants. Another group questioned the feasibility of development charge (DC) credits.

Public education was another common priority issue. One table felt that the myths and misconceptions surrounding heritage should be addressed and the public benefits of heritage should be stressed. Another group felt that there should be public education on the implementation of heritage districts.

PRIORITY ISSUES

The priority issues raised included:

- **Public education** – The misconceptions and myths surrounding heritage properties (for example, that changes cannot be made to the properties) should be addressed. It should be stressed that heritage is in the public interest and that it has benefits. There should also be public education on the implementation of Heritage Districts. It was felt that there is resistance to heritage districts due to public misconceptions.
- **Incentives** – There should be more incentives, such as public and civic recognition, some sort of cost sharing, grants, and other mechanisms. The feasibility of DC credits was questioned.
- **Continuity** – The OP should acknowledge Council's support of and resolve towards heritage. It should describe the tools and resources (new and current) that are available to promote cultural heritage.
- **Proactive approach** – The OP should formalize and describe the mechanisms for protecting cultural heritage, such as the block plan, financial strategies, early engagement of stakeholders, etc. The OP should also highlight recent achievements in this area.
- **Municipal leadership** – The City needs to be a leader and show initiative and consistency.
- **Barn preservation** – It was asked if restoring barns is feasible and if they could be moved or otherwise preserved.
- **Cost Sharing Agreements to include heritage features** – The cost-sharing pay structure for the protection of cultural heritage must be considered. It is supported by public sector but not by private sector developers. Small properties that are not part of a Block Plan should not pay towards heritage conservation.
- **Reference to Provincial Policy Statement** – It is important to refer to the Provincial Policy Statement in the Cultural Heritage policies in the OP.

- **Definition of Cultural Landscapes** – The OP should include a clear definition of what cultural heritage is. The City should develop a cultural heritage inventory, similar to what was done in Mississauga.

2. Does the Cultural Heritage discussion paper effectively identify these key issues?

The participants generally felt that the issues of **public education** and **incentives** should be more thoroughly addressed. A summary of the issues requiring more detail are presented in the table below.

ISSUES OR CONCERNS
Issues said to require more attention included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public education – Misconceptions and popular myths about heritage should be addressed, such as alterations, paint colours, modernizing the homes, and property values.• Incentives – Include topics such as compensation, more civic recognition, other incentives; use incentives in preference of regulation.• Adaptive re-use of heritage properties – Increase focus.

3. What Cultural Heritage issues are missing in the discussion paper, if any?

The most common issue said to be missing from the discussion paper was **public education**. Other missing or under-represented issues are listed in the table below.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES
Missing or under-represented issues identified included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public education – Myths need to be debunked. There should be advertising and public awareness of heritage issues, such as in newspapers, or using signs and banners. A contest could include taking a picture of a different house and asking people to guess where it is. A twice-yearly Heritage Board newsletter would be good.• Flower City – The “Flower City” should be stressed more.• Public works is not devaluing heritage but is widening it – This is mentioned in discussion paper but is worth more emphasis.• Definition of Heritage – The definition should be clearer.• Cultural heritage landscapes (Mississauga discussion paper and inventory) - The landscapes are not necessarily to be preserved, but they are to be recognized

There was a general comment that the expanded heritage resources inventory should include numbers and other specifics.

Proposed Policy Recommendations and Official Plan Revisions

1. Which of the following proposed recommendations/revisions would you change or add, if anything? Why?

No major significant changes to the discussion paper's proposed policy updates were recommended. Most of the suggestions focused on clarification of the proposed updates. The suggested changes are listed in the tables below.

DIRECTION 1: IMPROVEMENT OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE POLICIES	
Proposed Revision	Comments from Meeting Participants
Rename Policy to "Cultural Heritage" to reflect the broadened scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs definition, is murky
Reinforce the important role of cultural heritage preservation in the City's land use planning process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewording of the goals and objectives statements and other relevant sections of the cultural heritage policies to include a declaration of the City's commitment to heritage conservation; citing intent and objectives, Provincial policies, City initiatives, <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to include the "why", such as distinctiveness, individuality, civic pride
Use more decisive and declarative terms in the policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use more direct and simple to understand terms
New sections for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural heritage landscapes, and Heritage Cemeteries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification of landscapes
Consolidated (as existing) or separate implementation policies for each cultural heritage resource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate policies
DIRECTION 2: UPDATING OF THE POLICIES TO REFLECT THE LATEST PROVINCIAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEGISLATIONS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN RESPECT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE	
Proposed Revision	Comments from Meeting Participants
<u>Provincial Policy Statement</u> To reflect and incorporate the new PPS policies including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new policy on adjacent development; The latest definitions on cultural heritage and related terms; and The new implementation standard of "consistent with" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make sure PPS is balanced with Official Plan

DIRECTION 3: UPDATING OF THE POLICIES TO REFLECT EXISTING, PLANNED AND POTENTIAL POLICY INITIATIVES, PROGRAMS, AND IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS	
Proposed Revision	Comments from Meeting Participants
Heritage Inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress how important this is • Early identification is key
Heritage Program projects and studies including Heritage Property Tax Reduction Program Heritage Conservation District Study Education/public awareness programs Archaeological Master Plan Signage Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress myths issues and why public awareness is so important
Flower City Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect heritage gardens and landscape – more tangible elements (indigenous species)

2. Are you generally comfortable with the proposals?

The participants were generally comfortable with the proposals. One table commented that the proposals were good, but the implementation strategies are what is important: “the devil will be in the details”.

3. Are there any proposals that you believe will face implementation challenges? If so, how can these challenges be overcome?

The most common challenge identified was the **heritage cost sharing**. Other implementation challenges identified are listed below.

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost sharing of heritage properties - Some will likely oppose the implementation of heritage cost sharing because they are not used to it yet; it is a new concept. • Development Charge credits - Is it realistic for all property owners? • Cultural heritage landscapes. • Designating large areas might be difficult. • Vandalism and security – There is no enforcement. The Heritage Board has some enforcement, however the residents or property cleaners are held responsible for the property. • Keeping items within proper legal jurisdictions. • Architectural master plan process protection of sites. • Areas of high architectural potential.

2.4 INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Two individual workbook submissions were received following the workshop. The workbook comments are summarized in the tables below.

Worksheet 1: Key Issues to be Addressed

1. From your perspective, what are the top 3 or 4 issues relating to Cultural Heritage that the Official Plan Review must address?

PRIORITY ISSUES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flower city strategy- more flowers, more roses. Flower displays i.e. flowerbeds with designs such as towers and tiered flowers would be nice.• Financial incentives would be a good way to get developers to participate the heritage conservation program/effort- grants given to those who plant.• Prevent demolition of heritage structure, not landscape.• Make derelict heritage buildings useful again; convert them.• Financial incentives.• Effective documentation of heritage resources.• Dealing with vacant/derelict properties.• Consider cultural landscapes in more detail, implementation criteria.

2. Does the Cultural Heritage discussion paper effectively identify these key issues?

ISSUES OR CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes, it identifies many key issues-dealing with the key issues may be difficult. The city needs man power to initiate/carry out program, in order to be effective.• The amended Ontario Heritage Act makes numerous references to a "register." It should be more clear if this is the same or not with the city's heritage documentary.

3. What Cultural Heritage issues are missing in the discussion paper, if any?

ADDITIONAL ISSUES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How to get residents of the city of Brampton involved in heritage conservation. People in Brampton need to know the importance of heritage and how to maintain what the city already has.• Dealing with landscapes and vacant properties.

Worksheet 2: Proposed Policy Recommendations and Official Plan Revisions

DIRECTION 1: IMPROVEMENT OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE POLICIES		
	Proposed Revision	Proposed Change or Addition
2	<p>Reinforce the important role of cultural heritage preservation in the City's land use planning process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewording of the goals and objectives statements and other relevant sections of the cultural heritage policies to include a declaration of the City's commitment to heritage conservation; citing intent and objectives, Provincial policies, City initiatives, <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> etc. 	Clarify where necessary with definitions, e.g. cultural landscape, heritage attributes, etc.
3	Use more decisive and declarative terms in the policies	It should be clear that there is a commitment towards conservation
5	<p>New sections for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural heritage landscapes, and Heritage Cemeteries 	Ensure these are well integrated into the policy and not separate.
7	Schedule(s) to show designated and significant heritage resources	Make sure that policies are not exclusive of yet unknown or identified heritage resources.
DIRECTION 2: UPDATING OF THE POLICIES TO REFLECT THE LATEST PROVINCIAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEGISLATIONS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN RESPECT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE		
	Proposed Revision	Proposed Change or Addition
	<p><u>Ontario Heritage Act</u></p> <p>To reflect the approved 2002 Amendments</p>	Define terms in a glossary that are consistent with the act.
3	<p>Part IV Heritage Designation (Individual Properties)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change of basic designation criteria from "historic or architectural value or interest" to "cultural heritage value or interest" Requirement for specifying heritage attributes in the "reason for designation" to ensure their protection and preservation Strengthening demolition control over designated properties by the requirement of permit for new construction prior to demolition, increasing maximum fines for illegal demolition, setting time limit for completing the replacement building etc. 	Is this necessary if council only allows demolition under specific circumstances (e.g. structural failure)? Will Heritage impact statements be required?

DIRECTION 3: UPDATING OF THE POLICIES TO REFLECT EXISTING, PLANNED AND POTENTIAL POLICY INITIATIVES, PROGRAMS, AND IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS		
	Proposed Revision	Proposed Change or Addition
3	Heritage Inventory	Will this be done with the owner's consent? Is council's consent necessary?
6	Demolition Permit Application Policy	Heritage impact statements may be required.
DIRECTION 4: SPECIAL POLICIES BASED ON STAFF'S REVIEW OF OTHER MUNICIPALITIES' OFFICIAL PLANS		
	Proposed Revision	Proposed Change or Addition
2	City-owned heritage resources	Should be subject to review and policies.

2. Are you generally comfortable with the proposals?

Some proposals like heritage landscapes might be a little too stringent or hard too define.

3. Are there any proposals that you believe will face implementation challenges? If so, how can these challenges be overcome?

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

See above. Building new heritage developments may be costly and unattractive to developers, building new communities.

3. ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN SPACE WORKSHOP SUMMARY

June 29, 2005, 2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Caledon East Room, Holiday Inn
30 Peel Centre Drive
Brampton, Ontario**

3.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Adrian Smith, Manager of Growth Management and Special Policy with the City of Brampton Planning Department, welcomed the participants to the workshop. He noted that the purpose of the afternoon's session was to discuss the proposed direction for Brampton with respect to environmental and open space issues. He thanked the participants for coming to offer their feedback. Mr. Smith then introduced Mr. David Dilks as the workshop's facilitator.

Mr. Dilks welcomed the participants to the workshop and said the purpose of the workshop was twofold. The first was to get in-person feedback from participants about proposed changes to the Official Plan. The second purpose was to provide participants with the opportunity to ask questions or obtain clarification about the discussion paper contents. Mr. Dilks then guided the participants through the workbook.

After getting the participants to introduce themselves, Mr. Dilks then introduced Ms. Tara Buonpensiero to provide a presentation on the Environment and Open Space discussion paper.

3.2 OVERVIEW PRESENTATION

Ms. Tara Buonpensiero delivered a presentation on Brampton's Official Plan process and on the Environment and Open Space discussion paper. A copy of the presentation is found in Appendix B.

A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Q: There is an emphasis on the natural environment but not much on things like coordination between environmental concerns, road management and infrastructure. There is an emphasis on the obvious, such as landscape. But a more important issue is planning the impact of development, especially on agriculture. Is there a link between the environment and growth management?

A: *Issues such as growth management and traffic are fundamental to environmental protection issues. The challenge is that this part of the Official Plan focuses on environmental and open space features of the City. The City has a growth management*

program that looks at growth and block areas. It also has a traffic master plan that handles traffic. All of this will be fundamental to the environment.

Follow-up comment: Those concerns should be brought into the process.

Comment: Health was not mentioned. There are environmental issues that relate to transportation and health, and these are linked to how people live day-to-day. Mixed-use development can help. The discussion paper focuses on narrow boundaries. There needs to be linkages to people and health. Social aspects of land use should be included. For example, the focus should not be just on watersheds but on farmland too.

Q: Are there supposed to be comments on agriculture in this discussion paper or is it covered in another area?

A: *Agriculture is covered in the discussion paper where it interfaces with the environment.*

Comment: Air is included in the definition of environment, but otherwise it was not mentioned in the presentation.

Comment: In slide 2 of the presentation, perhaps the term “blueprint” should be changed to “greenprint”.

Q: What is meant by the terms “secondary plan”, “block plan” and “draft plan”?

A: *A secondary plan is a smaller, more detailed plan than the OP. There are 49 secondary plans in total in Brampton. A block plan breaks down secondary plans even further. There are a number of block plans in a secondary plan. The draft plan breaks down the block plans. Each type of plan refines the process at each step.*

Q: Can we comment beyond 20 to 30 years? Where does it end? There cannot be perpetual growth. How can the public feed growth messages back up the chain to the federal and provincial governments? How does the public control how much it wants to grow?

A: *Brampton is part of a larger system and has to fit into a larger set of plans, such as provincial plans for growth. Brampton has been identified by the Province as being a growth centre.*

Follow-up question: Yes, but because we are not an island, we need to feed information back up the chain. How can the City of Brampton impact a population the size of Canada's?

Comment: This is a comment about the procedure. The group of stakeholders here at this meeting are slanted in one direction. There needs to be other stakeholders involved in this consultation process.

Comment: The open space section covers connections for trails. What about environmental spaces that provide connections for animals and trees? They are needed in the East/West direction. This doesn't appear in the discussion paper.

3.3 ROUNDTABLE FEEDBACK

This section summarizes the table discussion highlights.

Key Issues to be Addressed

1. From your perspective, what are the top 3 or 4 issues relating to Environment and Open Space that the Official Plan Review must address?

The participants presented a wide range of priority issues. The most common priority issues were **policy integration** and **natural corridors and interconnectivity**. **Municipal leadership** and **health** were also seen to be key issues. Other identified issues are listed in the table below.

PRIORITY ISSUES
<p>Priority issues raised and comments received included:</p> <p><i>Policy Integration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of policies (Social/Economic/Natural). • Be selective when incorporating provincial policy, not verbatim (is a jurisdictional issue). • Reflect new policy initiatives from province. • Need to improve policies for the integration of watershed plans/subwatershed plans and land use planning. Be clear. • Clarity in the policies, regulations and guidelines; provide a clear policy that allows consistent application for similar circumstances. • Policy should recognize Brampton's urban setting. Need to balance planning for natural heritage system planning with other community planning objectives so that environmental objectives for restoration do not compromise other important planning objectives for the community (jobs/housing balance). <p><i>Natural Corridors and Interconnectivity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connectivity and linkages between natural areas to allow the movement of wildlife. • Emphasize interconnectivity between natural features. • Need large ecological corridor planning – need to emphasize this more, especially for large mammals. This connects to a further need to address the new PPS emphasis on natural heritage systems planning at all scales (may be inappropriate for some areas, (e.g. Claireville and not throughout Brampton.). <p><i>Municipal Leadership</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need emphasis on municipal leadership in environmental protection. • Policy on environmental leadership should be clear and strongly worded.

Health

- Add emphasis on human health (along with social policies, it affects quality of life).
- Missing themes: human health, air quality.
- Cumulative impacts of growth upon the environment and the health of Brampton's residents.

Other Issues

- Rehabilitation and enhancement of Natural Heritage Features, including the use of best management practices (BMP).
- Commitment to Environmental Improvements (BMP), such as environmental design policies (energy conservation).
- Brownfields and contaminated sites.
- Education/Outreach.
- Stormwater management in industrial areas must be permitted, such as quality ponds and on-site controls for efficiency/compact form.
- Allow flexibility to accommodate efficient development, i.e. stream realignment – acknowledge the distinction between industrial/residential developments.
- Accuracy of mapping that is not restrictive – mapping has a relationship to policy. Crest of slope is interpretive and is defined in the field.
- Combined parks and schools (a jurisdictional issue).
- Standardize conservation setback.
- Address financial implementation of preservation initiatives.
- Stormwater management facilities should, in addition to their primary function, serve as recreational amenities.
- Address the financial implementation of preservation initiatives.
- Setback standards should not be provided in the OP, rather such info should be addressed in detailed documents.
- Should have policy on transportation and air quality. Comprehensive pedestrian/bicycle scale planning need policies.
- Community garden policies and urban agriculture needed.
- More compact, intensified development – incentives for Brownfield development and disincentives for greenfield.

2. Does the Environment/Open Space discussion paper effectively identify these key issues?

Participants identified a wide range of issues that they felt the discussion paper should deal with in more detail. The most common one was **human health**, which was mentioned by two of the groups. One group commented that many issues have been identified but need to be explored further. These issues are described in the table below.

ISSUES OR CONCERNS

Policy Issues

- Conservation Authority policy process – No input from stakeholders with impacts on private property rights. Is there science behind it?
- Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) - Environment is only one consideration under PPS. There are other issues to consider, such as economics, compact and efficient development.
- Implementation of provincial policy – should be selective, not verbatim.

Other Issues

- Human health.
- Land use distinction for stormwater facilities – Industrial and residential
- Jurisdictional issues – Conservation Authority commenting; the authority of the City to grant approvals and take leadership.
- Technical committee representation.
- Stormwater management ponds – Should be recategorized as recreational amenities.
- Balancing preservation of natural features – Key features such as pathways are being provided as part of development. Hence, it is important to have agreement on how much of the natural feature is to be preserved.
- Cost sharing – Cost sharing issues should be addressed in Secondary Plan or Block Plans.
- Municipal leadership - The objective of the City to be an environmental leader is not consistent with the economic, financial, social and other responsibilities of the City.
- Mixed-use.
- Defensible plan.
- Strong, annotated definitions.
- Mixed-aged communities.
- Environmental linkages.
- Ecosystem Planning - Define Ecosystem Planning and describe how these OP sections relate to this planning approach.

3. What Environment/Open Space issues are missing in the discussion paper, if any?

The participants presented a number of different issues that they felt were missing from the EOS discussion paper. The most common ones identified were **health and air quality, energy conservation, sustainable alternatives, mapping and monitoring and data collection**. One group commented that they felt that there needs to be a balance between urban policies and natural system policies. A summary of the issues felt to be missing are presented below.

MISSING ISSUES

Health

- Air quality and public health. Air quality issues are not improving. There are more smog days. More studies/research needed showing how air quality affects health.

Energy Conservation

- Energy conservation best management practices.
- Energy conservation and emerging technologies (i.e. biodiesel, wind, etc).

Sustainable Alternatives

- Promote bike trails for commuter use in addition to recreation trails (transportation alternatives).
- Missing policy emphasis on emerging sustainable policies – air quality, urban design (linkage to the quality of the natural environment in urban areas), urban landscaping, water conservation, alternative energy sources.

Monitoring and Data Collection, Mapping

- Monitoring programs.
- Monitoring program/inventory.
- Quality of data sets that go into creating our maps.
- Open space limits.
- Natural areas survey.
- Consistency of mapping tools in Official Plan, secondary plans, watershed plans.
- Missing special policy areas, in particular hazard mapping in some parts of the city.

Other Issues

- Funding - for environmental improvements, and the linkages between policing and funding.
- Cumulative impacts.
- Renaturalization, or environmental design.
- Jurisdictional issues – the Conservation Authority policy is setting the agenda and there is no public or stakeholder opportunity to participate.
- Education awareness program on environment (all aspects) issues and implications.
- Integration of environmental issues with other key issues in the OPR.
- Consistent setback guidelines.
- Regional protection of wetlands.
- Preservation of agricultural land.
- Sprawl prevention.
- Ecosystem planning – need a definition of what this is how this discussion paper/section achieves this approach to planning.
- Inventory of divergence that becomes an Annual Report to Council.
- An extensive annotated glossary.
- Environmental sensitive land preservation.
- Diversity of housing options for groups such as the young and elderly.

Proposed Policy Recommendations and Official Plan Revisions

One of the groups provided some general comments about the changes proposed in the discussion paper. The comments included:

- Most of the recommended policy changes are housekeeping amendments.
- The group needs to see specific policy changes to provide more detailed comments.
- Add sections for transportation alternatives, health and health promotion, and for education and awareness.

1. Which of the following proposed recommendations/revisions would you change or add, if anything? Why?

A number of comments were provided for individual suggested policy revisions. The comments are presented in the tables below.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (SECTION 4.4)		
Sections	Proposed Revision	Proposed Changes or Additions
4.4	<u>Environmental Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the policies in Section 4.4 specific to Environmental Management and relocate policies related to recreational open space to the Open Space Section (Section 4.5). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include BMP (energy conservation), monitoring and inventory programs, and cumulative effects. • Include the linkages between health, land use, transportation, etc. Interrelated issues can't be isolated.
4.4	<u>Introduction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to focus on ecosystem approach and expand on interconnectedness of environmental features. • Consider placing more emphasis on the City being a leader in environmental responsibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify what principles will be removed. This is significant. • The jurisdiction needs approval authority. There has to be balanced decision making, as there are other considerations than just environment. • Use stronger wording - the City should demonstrate leadership.
4.4.1 – 4.4.4	<u>Storm Water Management; Water Supply and Conservation; Groundwater Recharge/Discharge; Soils Conservation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include these sections under the heading Watershed and Subwatershed • Add a new section titled Subwatershed Study to discuss requirements, contents etc. • Reflect Storm Water Management Guidelines and Development Design Guidelines. • Refer to PPS Section 2.2 regarding water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include policies that address planning requirements for sand lenses.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (SECTION 4.4)		
Sections	Proposed Revision	Proposed Changes or Additions
4.4.5 – 4.4.9	<p><u>Valleylands, Watercourses and Natural Hazards; Sensitive Areas; Forestry, Trees and Planting; Wetlands; Habitat: Fisheries and Wildlife</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include these sections under the heading of Natural Features and Functions and discuss the features included in Schedule D. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Features identified or refined through additional review.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rename the valleyland category to valleyland/watercourse to accommodate important headwater tributaries that do not have defined valley corridors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use caution in renaming the valleyland category to valleyland/watercourse. Study is required.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider implementing guidelines for determining the limits of development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify what is meant by “Consider implementing guidelines for determining the limits of development”.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to new PPS Section 2.1 Natural Heritage and 3.1 Natural Hazards. • Include policies to implement the Greenbelt Plan as appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not refer to the policy verbatim. Be careful and selective.
New	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a new section titled Environmental Impact Studies to discuss purpose, requirements and contents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include environmental design. • Include outreach/education. • What is the relationship to the EIR process? • Add or expand air quality policies. • Add a section to deal with energy conservation and emerging technologies.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (SECTION 4.4)		
Sections	Proposed Revision	Proposed Changes or Additions
4.4.11	<p><u>Noise and Vibration Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change reference in policies from Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) to ORDC railway. • Change terminology as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ 'noise level' to 'sound level' ◦ 'N.E.F.' to 'N.E.F./N.E.P.' • Include other uses that generate noise and vibration such as some industrial and commercial uses. • Need to define unacceptable noise levels. • Update to reference the Toronto Pearson International Airport Operating Area and Composite Noise Contour map. • The Land Use Policy Near Airports document is no longer in publication and has been replaced with the Provincial Policy Statement. • Contact CN railway to determine if they have specific policies to be included in the OP. • Remove reference to specific documents that will be out dated and rely on the policy that states "all current guidelines and policies." • Appendix I is also out of date, as it referenced documents no longer in publication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to address conflict situations where policies promote intensification but other policies restrict residential development in industrial areas (i.e. Queen St. Central Area, also flood plain issues. • Contact ORDC about policies to be included in OP.

OPEN SPACE (SECTION 4.5)		
Sections	Proposed Revision	Proposed Changes or Additions
4.5	<u>Introduction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise designations on Schedule E as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Wide Parks Community Parks Conservation Areas Cemeteries Greenbelt Boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to differentiate categories to clearly separate natural heritage system from the City's other recreational and open space parks classifications.
4.5.1	<u>Recreational Open Space</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate policies currently included in Section 4.5.5 The Parks System to this section. Revise to indicate that utility easements or rights of way will not be credited towards parkland dedication. Remove policy that the City may purchase lands released by the school boards because in new development areas the schools are often located adjacent or within close to parks. Reorganize to discuss recreational open space hierarchy (currently Section 4.5.6) in this section. Include policies to implement the Greenbelt Plan as appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a combined parks/school objective.
4.5.2	<u>Conservation Areas</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a new policy to state that the City will work with the Conservation Authorities to maximize public access of conservation lands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not necessarily appropriate in industrial areas, okay in residential.
4.5.4	<u>Secondary Plan Considerations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the need for a pedestrian/cyclist circulation system analysis at the secondary plan level, as this will be addressed during the block planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. Keep planning for pedestrian/cyclist circulation system at a larger citywide master plan and secondary plan scale – but implement through the Block Plan process.
New	Add a new section titled Block Planning Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a legislated process under TPA, no basis – not appealable.
4.5.6	<u>The Parks Hierarchy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the policies related to Parkettes, Neighbourhood Parks, Community Parks and City Wide Parks should be made more general and refer to the Culture Leisure and Recreation Master Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify.

OPEN SPACE (SECTION 4.5)		
Sections	Proposed Revision	Proposed Changes or Additions
4.5.7	<u>Open Spaces Linkages</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider placing more emphasis on the connectivity aspect of open space linkages and the potential benefit from an ecosystem connection perspective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify and define compensation /acquisition of linkages across development lands. No to hedgerows.

SCHEDULE D: ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES

- The relationship to policy must be flexible. No UPAs.
- Clarification of what changes were made and why they are needed. Explain the link between policies and features.
- How was the significant sensitive area designation at Heart Lake significantly reduced?

2. Are you generally comfortable with the proposals?

The participants were generally comfortable with the proposals, but many said that it would depend on the details of the policies. Suggestions and comments included:

- Add new notions, such as environmental design, human health linkages, and energy consumption.
- Provide additional clarity.
- The policies need to be flexible.
- Further work needs to be completed.

3. Are there any proposals that you believe will face implementation challenges? If so, how can these challenges be overcome?

Participants identified a few challenges to implementing the revised policies. Two groups noted that there would be **financial** challenges to implementing the revisions, such as the financial implications of preservation. Other challenges included:

- The potential for conflict between policies, for example policies surrounding hazard areas versus intensification.
- Reaching a balance between the urban and natural areas for the greatest public benefit.
- Being proactive.
- Undertaking the necessary studies at each stage of the development approval process and submitting them in a timely manner to facilitate a streamlined review process.

One group commented that they would need to see the new policies for the OPA in order to comment on the proposed changes.

3.4 INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Two individual workbook submissions were received following the workshop. The workbook comments are summarized in the tables below. Additionally, two letter submissions were received. Their comments are summarized following the tables below. Copies of the written submissions are included in Appendix B.

Participant Workbook Summaries

Worksheet 1: Key Issues to be Addressed

- 1. From your perspective, what are the top 3 or 4 issues relating to Environment/Open Space that the Official Plan Review must address?**

PRIORITY ISSUES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regard for environmental focus beyond purely environmental sections – the discussion paper is focussing on the “what” not the “how”.• Singular focussed land uses are a problem.• Universality of set backs (development limits) “Natural Areas Survey”.• Linkages – good – but financial implications.• “inventory of natural areas” (lacking qualitative assessment) – pursue only those that are strategically beneficial.• Tree by-law? Protection of “cultural heritage”.• Woodlands/Parkland dilemma – the challenge of not being able to “acquire” everything we’d like to.• Establish clear parameters for road construction.• Clarify how the Block plan process heightens the regard for the environment.

- 2. Does the Environment/Open Space discussion paper effectively identify these key issues?**

ISSUES OR CONCERNS
How to acquire major open space when city will not pay? Environmental design standards.

- 3. What Environment/Open Space issues are missing in the discussion paper, if any?**

ADDITIONAL ISSUES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Air quality.• Energy conservation – and related emerging trends supporting “sustainable development”.

General Comments:

- Need for standardized conservation setbacks from environmental features - “criteria” for the determination of suitable areas.
- Other key issues:
 - Health- air quality. Population vs. planning, efficiency vs. transition.
 - Criteria for setbacks- setbacks need to be designed relative to the feature from which that setback occurs.
 - “Emphasize a connected system of open spaces” vs. assembly of larger patches of habitat which is more important than connectivity.
 - How to deal with changes in requirements when study is underway.
 - “Ensure base mapping is consistent throughout related schedules” and accurate and deferrable.”
 - “Utilize the best data available...” but recognize that there is a confidence interval- should be decided based on a field inventory at the finest scale.
 - Don't put trails in every corridor if the goal is environmental function.

Worksheet 2: Proposed Policy Recommendations and Official Plan Revisions

General Comments:

From Table 2:

- How to manage conflict?
- Provide direction but flexibility to achieve net gain.
- Large patch sign with minimal edge, no trails, more important.
- Restrictions on cats that ravage neo-tropical immigrants.
- Squirrel-proof feeders.

From Table 4:

- Design guidelines for setbacks.

From Table 5:

- Schedule E, the valleylands are not well defined!

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (SECTION 4.4)		
Sections	Proposed Revision	Proposed Changes or Additions
4.4.5 – 4.4.9	<p><u>Valleylands, Watercourses and Natural Hazards; Sensitive Areas; Forestry, Trees and Planting; Wetlands; Habitat; Fisheries and Wildlife</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include these sections under the heading of Natural Features and Functions and discuss the features included in Schedule D. • Rename the valleyland category to valleyland/watercourse to accommodate important headwater tributaries that do not have defined valley corridors. • Consider placing more emphasis on the City being a leader in environmental responsibility. • Consider implementing guidelines for determining the limits of development. • Consider emphasizing the importance of connectivity between environmental features and the importance of all natural features to the overall environmental system. • Refer to new PPS Section 2.1 Natural Heritage and 3.1 Natural Hazards. • Include policies to implement the Greenbelt Plan as appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need clear definition • Need flexibility to resolve conflicts in field between mapping and more detailed field investigations and surveys.

OPEN SPACE (SECTION 4.5)		
Sections	Proposed Revision	Proposed Changes or Additions
4.5.1	<p><u>Recreational Open Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocate policies currently included in Section 4.5.5 The Parks System to this section. • Revise to indicate that utility easements or rights of way will not be credited towards parkland dedication. • Remove policy that the City may purchase lands released by the school boards because in new development areas the schools are often located adjacent or within close to parks. • Reorganize to discuss recreational open space hierarchy (currently Section 4.5.6) in this section. • Include policies to implement the Greenbelt Plan as appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove policy that the City may purchase lands released by the school boards because in new development areas the schools are often located adjacent or within close to parks. – “I’d”

Summary of Written Comments

Key points raised in the written submissions include the following:

Preserving Agricultural Land

- Agricultural land is an environmentally important and sensitive land for many reasons and must be preserved. These are areas of inherent beauty and are unpaved. All areas that are still natural earth, and not paved by roads, homes, industry, or mining need to be preserved.
- Most of northwest Brampton is rated as grade two farmland and should be preserved, as this land could have impacts on food resources domestically and internationally over the next 50 to 100 years.
- The cultural heritage and beauty of farmlands - and their very old barns that remain erect or in ruins (some close to 200 years old) - must be recognized.

Preventing Urban Sprawl

- Care must be taken to develop in a way that prevents sprawl or is not too spread out.
- Sprawl has many negative environmental impacts, including impacts on human health (such as respiratory diseases and psychological impacts), air quality, and the destruction of green earth.

Protecting Human Health

- The impact on human health from urban sprawl often goes unrecognized, as people are accustomed to such conditions.
- The health effects of urban sprawl are much more profound for certain segments of the population, such as children and the elderly. Health impacts include respiratory diseases (worst in children and the elderly), psychosocial impacts (isolation, long commute times, loss of community, stress, the impact on those that are not exposed to significant greenspace), social isolation, decreased fitness levels and consequent cardiovascular diseases.

Air Quality

- The increase in the number of vehicles on the road had led to a dramatic and visible decrease in air quality in Brampton in recent years.

Population Increase

- Brampton is designated by the government of Ontario as a place to increase its population. Is Brampton growing in a healthy manner, and what is an appropriate rate of growth?
- Municipalities must provide strong feedback to the higher levels of government regarding provincial and federal policies and their impacts.
- The City of Brampton (and other municipalities) should lobby higher levels of government with regard to their population policies and encourage them to attain a healthy policy of sustainable growth levels instead of rampant growth.

Transportation

- Public transportation is a vital to a sustainable community. It must be timely, affordable, and help to reduce the number of cars on the road.
- Public transit needs adequate funding.
- Urban design is the biggest factor in efficient public transportation. Buses in low-density suburban areas (i.e. sprawled communities) are not close enough to users and do not travel frequently enough.
- New developments should be of an appropriate density and design so that public transportation is a time-efficient and easy alternative to using a car.

- Bicycle paths and lanes should be as consistent as possible and the same standards should be used in all Brampton block plans.

Urban Design

- New developments should follow the methodology of “new urbanism”.

Large Homes

- An incentive/disincentive structure should be developed to discourage the practice of building large homes and to encourage developers and homebuilders to construct smaller homes.

Other General Comments

- Promote municipal cooperation to address urban and development challenges related to protecting human health and the environment.
- Address concerns of the aged in new developments and work toward developing elderly-friendly communities.
- Emphasize energy efficient communities in anticipation of the rising scarcity of fossil fuels.
- Use superlative leadership to address the needs of those that do not voice their concerns.

One contributor clarified concerns raised by his working group during the discussion paper workshop. These concerns are presented below:

Setbacks

- Setbacks from significant environmental features should have predetermined guidelines that are applied equally to all developers.
- The guidelines should be firm and logical as to when variations may occur. They should be followed equally for all developers without exception.
- The setbacks should be generous, protecting as much land as possible, because it is more difficult to increase setback guidelines once developers are informed, rather than to scale them to be shorter if the occasional exception is to be made.

Data Regarding Environmentally Sensitive Areas

- Data regarding sensitive areas has typically been done remotely. There are lapses in the data sets, and environmentally sensitive areas are missed by the data collection process.
- These areas need to be inspected/identified locally using an appropriate process, and the new data be amended to include areas that were missed.

Regional Wetland Protection

- The Province of Ontario has identified wetlands in Brampton that are to be protected. However, their knowledge of the region is limited and there are some wetlands that they did not identify which are still of importance. Such areas should be identified and added to the list of areas to be protected.

Consistent Maps

- There are differing maps as to what areas are available for development etc. These should all be consistent for the sakes of developers and other parties.

Another contributor provided comments on specific proposed policy changes. The comments are summarized below:

- **Storm Ponds – Section 4.4.1:** It is appropriate to credit landowners for Parkland dedication when storm ponds are outfitted with benches, vista areas, trail and large setbacks that go beyond normal functional engineering requirements.
- **Forestry Trees and Planting – Section 4.4.7.2:** Remove reference to “hedgerows” from this section and the entire Official Plan.
- **Forestry Trees and Planting – Section 4.4.7.3:** Wording is too specific and does not reflect typical woodlot management processes in Brampton. Revise the policy framework to allow flexibility when management or safety concerns are raised.
- **Wetlands Section - 4.4.8.4:** If buffers are used for recreational purposes, then Parkland credits should be triggered.
- **Buffers, setbacks and linkages – 4.4.10.5:** Any wording towards the development of natural or man-made linkages should be removed from the document unless satisfactory compensation for the landowner is included in this clause. Mention of hedgerows should be removed.
- **Buffers, setbacks and linkages – 4.4.10.6:** Parkland dedication or satisfactory compensation should be provided to property owners for trail areas.
- **Buffers, setbacks and linkages – 4.4.10.7:** The City of Brampton is served by two Conservation Authorities with different buffer requirements. The process works well, and so a blanket policy is not required. Should one be put in place, the policy would need flexibility as all valley lands, watercourses and wetlands range in significance and setback requirements.
- **Open Space - 4.5.1.7:** Parkland dedication or satisfactory compensation should be provided to property owners for trail areas.
- **Financial Implications:** Further information should be provided to discuss the financial implications of the policies inherent with the discussion paper together with a funding mechanism for uncommon land requirements.

4. URBAN FORM/DEVELOPMENT DESIGN WORKSHOP SUMMARY

July 6, 2005, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Caledon East Room, Holiday Inn
30 Peel Centre Drive
Brampton, Ontario**

4.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

The session introduction welcome was provided by Mr. David Waters, Manager of Land Use Policy. He noted that this was the third of a series of workshops and that two more were planned for August 10 and that everyone here is welcome to come. Mr. Waters then introduced David Dilks.

Mr. Dilks welcomed the participants to the workshop and said the purpose of the workshop was twofold. The first was to get in-person feedback from participants about proposed changes to the Official Plan. The second purpose was to provide participants with the opportunity to ask questions or obtain clarification about the discussion paper contents. Mr. Dilks then guided the participants through the workbook.

Mr. Dilks then introduced Christina Lo to provide a presentation on the Urban Form discussion paper.

4.2 OVERVIEW PRESENTATION

Ms. Lo delivered a presentation on Brampton's Official Plan process and on the Urban Form discussion paper. A question and answer session followed the presentation.

Q: Are the 6 pillars of Brampton's strategic plan included in the discussion paper?

A: *They are mentioned in the discussion paper. The discussion paper makes reference to the strategic plan and reference to urban design.*

Q: One of the goals listed in the discussion paper is that Brampton wants to be a world leader in urban design. Why then was the list of reviewed cities just from the GTA? Why not review cities in the rest of Canada or in other parts of the world?

A: *Staff looked at Toronto, which is a worldly city. Looking at other cities may not have as much relevance to Brampton. For example, Miami's issues may not be very relevant to Brampton. Staff looked at relevant municipalities nearby because they would face similar issues, such as the how to address new provincial policies and acts. A staff*

member also noted that the planning department is comprised of a multi-national staff, so they are aware of planning activities in other parts of the world. Looking at other cities is a good point. Staff will do an Internet scan to see what other cities have done with respect to sustainability issues, etc.

4.3 ROUNDTABLE FEEDBACK

This section includes the roundtable discussion highlights.

Key Issues to be Addressed

1. From your perspective, what are the top 3 or 4 issues relating to Cultural Heritage that the Official Plan Review must address?

One of the most common issues raised by the workshop participants concerned **how policies and guidelines affect developers and industry**. There was a desire for clear, consistent and flexible guidelines and policies. It was felt that too many policies or too many layers of policies create unnecessary complications and increases the amount of time required to secure approvals.

Another common issue raised concerned **how development and operational costs are addressed**. One table commented that financial issues need to be considered in citywide design guidelines and that the on going operational and maintenance costs need to be addressed when considering implementation. Another group commented that materials called for in the design guidelines need to be cost effective, as they can affect lease rates and the value of property.

A summary of the comments is presented in the table below.

PRIORITY ISSUES AND GENERAL COMMENTS
<p>Priority issues raised and comments received included:</p> <p><i>Policies and Guidelines</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Abundance of policies - Too many policies (and layers of policies) create unnecessary complications without adding value. It also, most importantly, adds to the time required to secure approvals. This is a concern for development industry.• Consistency of requirements among different departments - Support of all departments is needed. Engineering standards need to be co-ordinated at the initial development stage (e.g. laneways, R.O.H. widths, etc.).• Design Guidelines:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Process needs to be clear.▪ Neighbourhoods – scale of application of guidelines needs to be considered.• Citywide design guidelines – what will its role be in growth management (considerations: timetable, financial issues, quality of life, equity and social drivers).• Flexibility - Guidelines are just that and are not mandatory.

Costs

- Implementation and operational costs – ongoing operation and maintenance issues; who pays for parkland vs. urban design elements.
- Unrealistic standards – Aspiring to highest or high standards are not realistic. The interpretation of design is a very subjective matter. You must be careful with confining policies, as flexibility is a must for industrial buildings. Operational function dictates form. Design has to be consistent with market demand, cost, function, and creativity.
- Cost effectiveness of required building materials - Materials must be cost effective. Lease rates rise when more expensive materials are used. The authority for architecture controls is limited under TPA.
- Maintaining property values - City needs to maintain the value of private/public property.

Other Issues

- Incentives - Lack of incentives for creative design.
- Public acceptance – education and outreach is needed (e.g. the perception versus reality of safety issues).
- Downtown and central area.
- Sustainability.
- High quality urban design – particularly in the Public Realm.
- Commitment to innovative urban design – other than typical urban sprawl.
- Balance - Balance with other planning realities.

2. Does the Urban Form/Development Design discussion paper effectively identify these key issues?

One group felt that the discussion paper **covered the issue of leadership well**. Another group felt that the discussion paper **did not adequately cover issues concerning the subjective nature of design standards, how the guidelines would be applied, and financial issues**. Comments provided by the groups are presented below.

ISSUES OR CONCERNS

- Leadership – It does deal well emphasising leadership, covering specific design elements.
- No – as set out in our responses in #1 under issues.
- Brook McIlkoy in BWSP – not in Secondary policy to extend proposed, not appropriate because the report is not realistic.
- Implementation – format and content of policies.

3. What Urban Form/Development Design issues are missing in the discussion paper, if any?

The most common issues said to be missing from the discussion paper included **sustainability**, **seniors**, and the **special and unique character of Brampton**. These and other additional issues identified are presented in the table below.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Special character of Brampton – Special character areas need to be more detailed and include good design and variety; Special character areas will make Brampton unique in GTA.• Review of other jurisdictions - Look at future development and best practices in other areas.• Sustainability – How does energy, public transportation, climate change, density issues affect design?• Integration - Connectivity of residential and commercial; denser, integrated community.• Market demand - If market demands it, then the developers will build it.• Protection of heritage.• Clear implementation of policies – design over engineering standards.• Seniors - More focusing options for boomers, etc; where they are.• Sustainable alternatives - more vision and imagination; how to deal with end of cheap oil, e.g. require less transportation, transit supportive, no ability to walk to destination.• Youth - Needs of children and youth, e.g. ability to walk to schools.• Implementation issues.• Who pays - Community benefit at expense of private landowners; how is it achieved, who pays for it, and what does it cost.

Proposed Policy Recommendations and Official Plan Revisions

1. Do you have any general comments about the proposals? Are you generally comfortable with them?

The meeting participants were generally comfortable with the proposed revisions but felt that they should go farther to address some of the issues highlighted in the previous sections. The groups' summary comments are presented in the table below.

GENERAL COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• May want to go further (as below).• There are limitations.• Set our goals from low density to medium density housing.• Generally comfortable with the heritage component.• Add children and youth.• Ok with proposal for policies but need to go further to address the issues we identified.• The process needs to be coordinated within the city. There has to be a coordinated city position on topics.• Design guidelines should be led by the communities.• Include why urban design issues are important, for example, sustainability, transportation,

financial issues, mixed uses, and social issues.

- Address implementation issues and how to move policies forward.

2. Are there any proposals that you believe will face implementation challenges? If so, how can these challenges be overcome?

The most common challenges identified by the workshop groups involved **ensuring design standards and guidelines remain clear and consistent across city departments**. Other potential challenges and comments are listed in the table below.

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

Challenges identified included:

- Co-ordinating zoning by-laws with design guidelines.
- Creating certainty in design review process.
- Executive housing designations may not be all in most suitable locations (e.g. Credit Valley versus Castlemore).
- Engineering standards need to be addressed and included in the process.
- Council has to set priorities, such as engineering versus design standards. Priorities need to be integrated (for example, higher maintenance costs vs. engineering standards).
- Official Plan can't just be changed through just the City Council and the planning department – all of the departments need to be included.
- Becoming a leader means addressing costs and operational issues.
- A challenge related to the development industry is the realities of the market.
- Public perception and reaction can be a challenge, e.g. NIMBY, with respect to infill and intensification.
- Identify and articulate what will make Brampton unique in GTA and attractive.
- Coordination of the internal city position (e.g. the City's position on turning circles).
- City commitment to some for financial/funding.
- Must see policies clarified to give definitive comments.

3. Do you have any specific changes to the proposed recommendations/revisions? Is there anything you would change or add? Why?

There was a range of general comments received about the proposed OP recommendations. These are listed below.

SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSALS

- Goals and objectives – are very subjective.
- City concept – place making.
- Views and vistas concept needs to be fleshed out more.
- Infill/intensification – projects are difficult politically and publicly.
- Heritage elements- not mentioned as a design opportunity.
- Implementation – process streamlining, design comments need to be better coordinated.

- Outdoor – oriented communities.
- Active (versus passive) parks.
- Stronger policies, for example prohibitions for window roads.
- Consider flexible zoning downtown areas – development permits?
- Take planning committee to some innovative sights to see what has been done and what could be done.
- Consider UBC – Larry Frank – Modelling software of what the city could look like.

A number of comments were received about specific proposed policy changes. These comments are provided in the table below.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SPECIFIC POLICIES		
Existing Policy	Proposed Revision	Suggested Change or Addition
Policy Goals and Objectives	A separate section to provide more detailed policy goals and objectives including a declaration of the City's commitment to take a leadership role in promoting high quality urban design, the contemporary vision for civic design including emphasis on social responsibilities, and the role of urban design as an essential city building ingredient.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjective nature necessitates flexibility.
Urban Physical Form and the City Concept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reflect any changes in the city structure that may arise from this and other relevant policy reviews and, • To expand the urban form hierarchy to include "gateways", "communities", "neighbourhoods" and "special character areas" etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts, focal points, centres. • Job of 'place-making'.
General Urban Form Principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence • Diversity • Open space • Preservation • Scale • Enhancement • Circulation • Safety • Human services • Ecological environment • Sustainability • Land use compatibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add a new policy on "Sense of Identity and Place". • To reflect relevant recent Provincial, regional and City policies and initiatives and best practices identified from benchmarking exercise to strengthen existing policies (Section 6.8 of Discussion Paper). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines only. • Flexibility necessary.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SPECIFIC POLICIES		
Existing Policy	Proposed Revision	Suggested Change or Addition
<p>Element Specific Design Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of Special Identity • Gateways • Landmarks • Open space and natural features • Views and Vistas • Public Art 	<p>To be re-titled to "Community/Site Specific Design Principles" and to structure policies around the following structural elements to better align with the block plan and DDG (Section 6.9 of Discussion Paper):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space system, • Landscaping, • Street Network, • Streetscapes, • Edges and Gateways, • Views and Vistas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term "views" needs to be flushed out. • Term "vistas" is subjective. A very difficult issue in broad sense i.e. large scope - Credit River Valley /Churchville.
<p>Other Design Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage • Parking • Roofscapes • Utilities • Buffers • Energy Conservation • Residential Streetscapes 	<p>To be re-titled to "Element Specific Design Principles", and to strengthen existing policies to address additional general built form and design issues (Section 6.10 of Discussion Paper) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Realm • Institutional development • Infill and Intensification • Mixed-use development • Transit-oriented development • Tall buildings • Multiple-residential development • Policy for Special Areas • Car-oriented development • Engineering structures and elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infill and Intensification – always an issue most difficult to process – City commitment. • Heritage elements are a design opportunity.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SPECIFIC POLICIES		
Existing Policy	Proposed Revision	Suggested Change or Addition
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To incorporate the DDG and block planning process and requirements. • To update the relevant terminologies including replacing “design studies” and “Urban Form Management Strategy” with “block plans”, and “Development Design Guidelines” as appropriate. • To establish new policies including potential implementation tools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Compliance with existing and design guidelines to be prepared including Gas Stations, Downtown Urban Design Guidelines, Commercial and Business Corridors etc. ◦ Fostering public and stakeholder participation in the urban design process ◦ Encouraging closer private and public sector collaboration ◦ Encouraging senior levels of government and public utilities to have regard for design objectives ◦ Periodic reviews and studies for aesthetic improvement of existing areas ◦ Review the existing Zoning Bylaw to ensure compatibility with the Official Plan Urban Design policies ◦ The need for public funding commitment ◦ The use of design competitions and urban design awards to promote excellence in and public appreciation for urban design ◦ Recognition to the need of using qualified professionals in the design and construction process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation - given objectives need to address how we will be a leader. Means increased costs, increased operational complexity. • Processing – Streamline. Coordinated position – City a Design. • Objectives need to be more descriptive in terms of what is expected through block planning process. • Agrees with the need for public funding commitment – it must be ongoing, not at private expense.

4.4 INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Two letter submissions were received by City planning staff, one each from the Sustainable Urban Development Association and from Mr. Al Cormier. Key points raised in the written submissions are presented below. The written submissions are presented in full in Appendix C.

Key points raised in the written submissions include the following:

General Comments

- The city is hesitant about substantive changes. The quote on page 9 of the discussion document that “More emphasis should **perhaps** be given to compact development form...” contrasts with the Urban Design Vision Statement that Brampton will have a “cohesive and compact urban form”.
- There seems to be an excessive emphasis on visual appearances, rather than on substantive changes that would aid Brampton residents and workers meet their day-to-day needs.
- Priority should be placed on addressing a number of critical emerging issues that will have a major impact on Brampton residents within and beyond the time horizon of the official plan.
- The world is facing a “peak oil” situation that will bring about a decline of automobile travel. This needs to be included in the planning activities.
- Brampton has a large multi-cultural base that could provide urban designs based on cultural backgrounds.
- Use scenario planning to describe planning options and costs.

Priority Issues

- The growing energy crisis in energy markets and its potential impact on the Brampton's economy and the lifestyle of its residents is a critical emerging issue.
- Transportation alternatives (i.e. transit) must be made available as many residents in the future will not be able to afford the increasing cost of owning and operating an automobile.
- The burning of fossil fuels is a contributor to rapid climate change.
- There is a need to preserve as much of the Greater Golden Horseshoe's agricultural lands as possible, as in the future a greater portion of the community's food will need to be produced regionally.
- Public leadership through policies that adequately reduce future hardships is needed. Emphasis in the discussion paper on visual aspects of the built form should be superseded by policies to improve economic and environmental sustainability.

Population Density

- Brampton's planned overall population density of about 2,700 residents per square kilometre is a level that has been declared unsustainable and has generated actions by the Ontario government to preserve rural lands by requiring higher densities in the region.
- The overall gross population density of Brampton should be significantly increased and supported with a superior public transit system.
- To be in line with provincial policies, Brampton's official plan should emphasize that all development on greenfield lands, and all redevelopment along major roads, be compact and at high density.
- All arterial intersections and other existing or potential transit route intersections should be strictly zoned for high density

Transportation

- Transportation is biased toward the personal automobile. The dispersion of trip origins and destinations and the existing type of street patterns make it difficult for public transit to be effective.
- Car-oriented development should be de-emphasized and not given priority.

- The OP should include provisions for the creation of efficient, shared public parking facilities that can replace mandated private parking requirements and the setbacks and floor space limitations that accompany them.
- The built form of the City should become more transit-friendly.
- It is important that land use planning ensures that all new development is within 200 meters from a transit stop with a shelter. All plans for road infrastructure should contain provisions for transit-only and HOV lanes, and infrastructure that integrate travel by bicycle into the road network as a basic mode of transportation.
- When evaluating the affordability of expanding transit services, both public and private costs must be part of the equation.

Wording

- Replace the somewhat grandiose wording in the Urban Design Vision Statement related to sustainability and meeting the daily needs of Brampton's citizens. The specific reference to "including distinctive executive enclaves" seems out of place. Replace that phrase with housing choices "that use land and resources efficiently and attractively". Also, the vision statement that the city structure will comprise an economically strong, attractive and vibrant downtown and central area should be revised to include neighbourhoods and centres across the city.
- The terms 'sustainability' and smart growth' are absent from the document.

Other General Suggestions

- No new business parks should be created. Business growth should be integrated into the community. However, uses that involve excessive noise, noxious emissions or significant truck movements should continue to be separated from residential areas.
- Secondary planning and block planning may hinder the development of urban corridors (mainstreets). Planning for opposite sides of arterial borders should be complementary and cohesive.

One submitter provided comments on specific policy changes. His comments on specific objectives are listed below.

Section 2.1 – Objective 3 - ...minimal or no appeals from the OMB

- The submitter is not supportive of this objective and says that it is commonly known that the OMB has been overly developer friendly and that its mandate is in urgent need of review. He suggests holding back on design and planning innovations just in case the OMB might strike them down and instead joining the battle for OMB reforms, which will result in respect for local OP and other plans.

Section 3.1.2 – Provincial Policy Statement

- The submitter felt that this was an encouraging statement that was inspired by a variety of issues including examples from other jurisdictions. The submitter suggests that Brampton should find out which cities influenced this statement and to emulate these cities practices to ensure consistency with the statement.

Section 3.2.1 – Region of Peel Official Plan

- The submitter feels that because this plan is nearly 10 years old, it therefore does not properly reflect recent provincial initiatives and should therefore be challenged

where necessary in order to give precedence to the PPS and Places to Grow principles.

Section 3.4 – Issues to be addressed in Urban Form Policy Amendment

- The submitter feels that the statement that 'existing OP urban form policies are considered still largely relevant both in structure and content' is surprising given the flow of new information from the Province and the general issues discussed in Part A above.

Section 4.2 – Block planning

- The submitter notes that the 3rd bullet refers to 'road connectivity' and not to transportation connectivity, giving the impression that road access is the only way in and out of 'blocks' in this context. The submitter feels this should include transit, walking, etc.

Section 4.6.1 – Brampton Central Area Plan Review

- The submitter agrees with welcoming high-rise and mixed development, he says that it has to ensure that current attributes are not done away with. This refers to the multiplicity of shops, restaurants, housing choices, transportation access, narrow streets, alleyways, low speed traffic etc.
- The submitter suggests considering detouring the Queen and Main Street traffic around parallel roadways so that little through traffic has to enter the 'true downtown' area, which could be reserved for higher order transit, pedestrian facilities.

Section 4.8 – Environics Survey

- The submitter finds the fact that less than 30% of those surveyed viewed Brampton as clean and attractive as an alarm bell and a motivator to strive for better aesthetics in design.

Section 5 – Review of Other Official Plans

- The submitter was dismayed that the review was limited to cities in the GTA. He noted that all of the plans reviewed did not reflect recent provincial initiatives discussed above. He suggests that Brampton needs to look beyond the GTA in its efforts to be among 'world class cities'.

Section 6.2 – Urban Design Vision Statement

- The submitter suggests replacing the term 'balanced transportation' with 'transportation systems that support sustainability goals'.
- The submitter suggests that the City structure should include residential districts with some shopping available within walking distance, such as small corner stores and plazas. He says that having to drive to shop is not smart planning.

Page 47 – Transit Oriented Developments

- The submitter suggests that transit oriented development is by nature also pedestrian friendly. Brampton should take a lead among cities and also support 'children and youth friendly' developments. See <http://www.cstctd.org/english/completed.htm> for Children and Youth Friendly Transportation and Planning Guidelines.

- The submitter was dismayed by the limited number of streets considered as candidates for transit nodes and transit friendly development and asks that this be reconsidered.

Page 47 – Tall Buildings

- Reference is made to 'density increase must be able to be accommodated by the road network'. The submitter comments that this is another example of auto-oriented focus in planning and suggests that discussion paper should talk about 'transportation network' instead.

Page 52 – Roofscape

- The submitter suggests that this would also be a good place to add rooftop landscaping and gardens. He says they help cool down the cities and provide better living conditions for high rise dwellers.

5. RETAIL WORKSHOP SUMMARY

August 10, 2005, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Caledon East Room, Holiday Inn
30 Peel Centre Drive
Brampton, Ontario**

5.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

The session welcome was provided by Mr. David Waters, Manager of Land Use Policy. He noted that this was the second last in a series of workshops that had been taking place since late June/early July. Mr. Waters then introduced meeting facilitator, David Dilks.

Mr. Dilks welcomed the participants to the workshop and said the purpose of the workshop was twofold. The first was to get in-person feedback from participants about proposed changes to the Official Plan, specifically relating to the topic of retail. The second was to provide participants with the opportunity to ask questions or obtain clarification about the discussion paper contents. Mr. Dilks then guided the participants through the workbook.

Mr. Dilks then introduced Mimi Ward of Malone Given Parsons Ltd. to provide a presentation on the Retail Policy Review Study.

5.2 OVERVIEW PRESENTATION

Ms. Ward presented the highlights of the Retail Policy Review Study that was conducted by Malone Given Parsons Ltd. A copy of Ms. Ward's presentation is included in Appendix D.

A question and answer session followed the presentation and is documented below.

Q: With respect to the definition of "retail", the amount of entertainment retail space has grown significantly in the past 30 years. Was this trend identified in the study?

A: *Yes. The Brampton Official Plan addresses the retailing of goods and services. The range of retail uses has gone beyond that of traditional retailing of goods, to include uses such as entertainment. Entertainment use was included in the study as part of retail.*

Comment: Lee Parsons, one of the consultants from Malone Given Parsons Ltd, noted that they made a distinction between district and neighbourhood supermarkets. He said that users of neighbourhood centres should be able to access traditional supermarkets, such as grocery stores. Larger retail supermarkets that consist of a combination of food

and non-food retail use do not have a neighbourhood function. These serve a larger trade area and hence constitute a district function.

Q: Would the new, Official Plan policies be just incorporated into new Secondary Plans or also applied to existing Secondary Plans?

A: *Mr. Waters said that the municipality has existing Secondary Plans that were adopted in the 1970s. The commercial policies in these secondary plans need to be revised, and such revision will be done after the completion of the current Official Plan Review.*

5.3 ROUNDTABLE FEEDBACK

This section includes the roundtable discussion highlights.

Key Issues to be Addressed

1. From your perspective, what are the top 3 or 4 issues relating to retail that the Official Plan Review must address?

The workshop working groups identified a number of priority issues. One common issue was recent **retail trends**, or more specifically, **how the nature of retail has changed** in recent years. For instance, the OP's policies on retail are 10 years out-of-date; there are now more mixed-use areas, "Mom and Pop" stores are disappearing, and entertainment has evolved beyond just consisting of theatres.

Another common issue expressed was that of **retail floor space** and whether the estimated floor space was expected to be all on ground level.

A summary of comments is presented in the table below.

PRIORITY ISSUES AND GENERAL COMMENTS
<p>Priority issues raised and comments received included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of designated retail space – Infill development could provide significant retail space. Infill development can be addressed using better design, i.e. not all single level big box retail. Provide incentives to rezone and process applications quicker.• Retail trends – The OP is 10 years out-of-date. Focus should be more on mixed use. The suburban model of big box stores is more common. Formulate definitive policies for entertainment use, recognising that entertainment is not just movie theatres anymore.• Floor space – Is the estimated retail space to be provided all at ground level? Consider density and build upwards instead of keeping it on ground level. Consider the impact of spending habits on floor space and floor space per person.• OP policies outdated - OP policies need updating. Plan for commercial and neighbourhood plazas before the plans are approved. Separate higher order

retail and neighbourhood retail and focus more on neighbourhood access points

- **Weak retail policy** development - The current approach to Retail policy development is weak and not comprehensive. How will it become a building block?
- **Minimum anchor tenant sizes** - Include minimum anchor tenant sizes instead of just maximums;
- **Urban design** – Urban design is important. Brampton is rapidly growing, and urban design is key in keeping Brampton up-to-date with current trends and meeting the needs of residents. There should be a commitment from the City to enforce urban design policies; be flexible but assertive.
- **Flexibility** – Provide flexibility in the retail hierarchy to allow responses to changes in retail trends. Allow flexible interpretations of 'primary anchors' – don't be overly concerned about uses that fill the commercial spaces.
- **Protection and enhancement of central area** – This was part of the recommended strategy but was not identified as issue. Strong policies needed to support renewal and intensification of central area. Provide financial incentives for redevelopment. The identification of regional and district retail centres in OP should be textual but not on a schedule.
- **Strategic commercial uses** - Allow commercial uses within strategic locations in industrial areas. Establish high quality uses along key corridors.
- **Mixed use** – Mixed uses should be permissive, not prescriptive.
- **Secondary plans** - should the existing plans be updated to reflect current trends, in addition to new Secondary Plan requirements?
- **Accessible neighbourhood commercial services** - Residents require services to be accessible and the ability to do daily shopping/activities within a relatively short distance. There is a need to plan for commercial early, perhaps at Secondary Plan stage. Provide certainty for residents and an opportunity for developers.
- **Corridor commercial** – It is the category defined for service commercial or areas acting as buffers or unifying two distinct commercial communities. It is intended to replace the 'highway commercial' designation.

2. Does the Retail discussion paper effectively identify these key issues?

The general feeling was that the Retail study did not effectively address the issues listed above. One working group said that it partly did but mainly did not. One general comment noted that the analysis reflects projections and is value free.

The participants raised a number of questions with respect to the study. These included the following:

- Are consultants working with recent real estate info, as sometimes that data is outdated?

- Are there more enclosed retail centres planned?
- What neighbourhoods should retail centres be near? What about community centres, such as pools and ice rinks?
- Can unique uses, such as a 'farmers market' be incorporated into the commercial hierarchy, such as St. Jacob's market?
- How will issues be translated into policy?

Some additional retail issues to consider include:

- Urban links, transit, and transportation opportunities;
- Ensuring that the 'neighbourhood retail' or 'district retail' is focused on the community that will be served;
- Use incentives to attract retail that will service the daily needs of the community;
- Central Area (i.e. Queen Street) revitalization.

3. What Retail issues are missing in the discussion paper, if any?

The working groups suggested a number of issues that they felt were missing from the discussion paper. The key issue identified was to **focus on improving retail in the Central Area**. These issues raised are presented in the table below.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES
<p><i>Improving Retail in the Central Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote downtown as the specialty niche area. • Encourage 'Lifestyle centre' in downtown. • Need special retail policy provisions to encourage and enhance central area. • Policies for channelling food and retail to downtowns do not work. Downtowns are more mixed-use/entertainment/niche areas. • Policy direction should seek higher-end shops (like Toronto). <p><i>Mixed Uses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will happen to obsolete centres? If fitness centres, call centres, and anchors leave, there will have to be flexible policies to add different uses. • Apartment buildings are planned by retail centres, and when supermarkets leave, people can't buy food. • Provide transition zones between residential/employment on arterials. • Limit mixed uses to appropriate areas. • Services like dry cleaning cannot be ignored and should be accessible. • Need encouragement for local restaurants, cafes to locate in neighbourhoods <p><i>Urban Design</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De-mall the mall and take the roof off. • Provide a high quality of urban design, including features such as attractive fountains, interlocked pavers, and plantings. <p><i>General Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits to commercial corridor (regular retail, retail warehouse). • Infilling in commercial corridors.

- Designated areas (property) increase land values.
- Market studies - need a clear definition of how and when they will be required.

Proposed Policy Recommendations and Official Plan Revisions

1. Do you have any general comments about the proposals? Are you generally comfortable with them?

The workshop participants raised several general concerns with the proposals and made a number of suggestions and comments regarding specific recommendations. The specific comments are presented below under question 3.

General comments provided included:

- The purpose of the different centres is to create structure for retail.
- The retail framework does not fit in downtown, so create a centre for it elsewhere.

2. Are there any proposals that you believe will face implementation challenges? If so, how can these challenges be overcome?

A number of challenges were identified. Comments included:

- There are too many requirements in the policies, which are too restrictive to accommodate change.
- The level of detail too detailed (by property versus blobs on a map).
- There are three kinds of centres defined (by size/anchor). It may fail by designating this way. There may be too many hierarchies.
- Industrial/business and industrial/commercial should be separate.
- Retailers don't care about "type of centre"; instead, it's the draw area.

3. Do you have any specific changes to the proposed recommendations/revisions? Is there anything you would change or add? Why?

There was a range of general comments received about the proposed OP recommendations. These include:

- Limit commercial uses in industrial areas. Some craft types retailers such as picture framers and brewpubs are combination retail/industrial facilities that do not belong in an industrial area.
- There needs to be forethought at the beginning of the process of development. For example, Krispy Kreme and Pizza Pizza type outlets have a unique architecture that makes it difficult for another retailer to come in to the space if they leave. Blend architectural features of area with the corporate image.
- Consider convertible projects (e.g., retail/office now, residential/retail later on).

Some possible problem challenges might arise in the following areas:

- Grey areas – how do we revitalize outdated retail developments.
- Independent, ethnic businesses that commercial centres don't want.
- Minor variances to remain in industrial areas.
- Cheap space in industrial areas.
- Parking problems.

A number of comments were received about specific proposed policy changes. These comments are provided in the table below.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SPECIFIC POLICIES	
Proposed Revision	Comment or Suggested Change
1. Clarify and refine the existing commercial hierarchy.	
The concept of regional centres should be broadened with greater emphasis on the size and number of anchors since these are the strategic elements that define market areas, as well as commercial role and function.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are anchors doing? • Should we designate based on number of anchors? • Encourage independent retailers in local areas and create distinct mixed communities. It should be a community effort, e.g. Hess Village in Hamilton
A commercial corridor designation should be established to replace Highway Commercial. Commercial Corridor areas would generally focus on commercial land uses that are not the anchors for regional, district, or neighbourhood centres. This could include automotive, selected retail, entertainment, accommodation, and restaurant uses. Commercial Corridor, as determined through Secondary Plans, could be a stand-alone designation along arterial roads or a transition between other commercial designations and non-commercial land uses, particularly residential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it lead to more strip malls? This destroys placemaking. Or will it be a downtown like Queen Street West – transit-oriented. • Wording is important. Focus on the urban aspects - urban/residential, look at an 'urban corridor', or avenues style. • Emphasize "urban" in the term mixed-use <i>urban</i> corridor.
Convenience and other smaller scale commercial definitions need to be updated.	
The recommended commercial hierarchy of designations and the description of function and major retail uses for each element of the hierarchy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really focus on '<u>urban</u>'. The description should focus on the urban function of retail uses and not address details.
2. Give greater emphasis to place making.	
Place more emphasis on mixed use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep the term <i>urban</i> in the designations; make it a priority focus.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SPECIFIC POLICIES	
Proposed Revision	Comment or Suggested Change
Make strong locations stronger rather than trying to make weaker locations not weak.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strip malls vs. mixed- use urban malls – better placemaking. • Strong locations are due to strength in attributes that are evident in existing established areas. • Statement is too general. • Deal with locations on individual basis. • Tweak statement - focus on positive aspects of all locations and enforce policies.
High standards of urban design should be a component of all commercial projects, site plans and Secondary Plans. Consideration should be given to establishing a private/public initiative to seek a practical set of commercial area design guidelines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern: driven by cost/tenants, but should be by design? • Design requirements of City of Brampton should be tempered by market considerations/costs. • Appropriate level of detail should be required at appropriate stage. • Statement is far too general.
3. The general locations for existing and future Regional and District Retail Centres should be identified in the new Official Plan.	
The text of the OP should identify the role, function, scale, defining retail uses, location criteria, and urban design objectives for all retail designations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be better addressed at a local level due to market changes. • Flexibility is important.
The general locations for new Regional Retail centres and new District Retail centres should be identified in the new Official Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that OP will be too specific to market changes and not flexible. • Should not be too specific in addressing role and function. • Text only, not on schedule.
Maps illustrating existing and recommended potential regional and district retail locations in Brampton. The potential retail locations shown are general in nature and not intended to specify a specific site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand areas for regional retail to allow greater access and more flexibility for sites – market driven. • State where 'regional centre' to be located.
4. Renewal and intensification in the Central Area.	
The Central Area policies should continue to promote a mixed-use area with important associations with civic functions, office development, higher density residential, and cultural and other entertainment activities although recognize commercial trends.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide further incentives to locate entertainment and civic uses within central core/area. • Implementation issues with respect to fragmented properties/ownership.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SPECIFIC POLICIES	
Proposed Revision	Comment or Suggested Change
5. Limit commercial within industrial designations.	
With the exception of warehouse membership clubs, all large general merchandise establishments including department stores and home and auto supply stores, should be located in Regional Retail centres and District Retail centres, not in Industrial Areas or Business Parks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. • Why allow only WMC? • Should allow other big boxes.
Supermarkets should be located in Regional Retail, District Retail, and Neighbourhood Retail centres, not in Industrial Areas or Business Parks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally in agreement but exceptions at interface between industry and residential use as commercial buffer and transition to residential.
The retail function of Industrial Areas and Business Parks should focus on regional serving land extensive warehouse retail which would not ordinarily locate in Regional or District Retail centres, automotive, entertainment, and specialized retail and service commercial associated with employment land uses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree.
6. Designations in Secondary Plans should be consistent with the retail hierarchy.	
	No comments.

5.4 INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

One written submission was received by City planning staff, which was submitted by the Sustainable Urban Development Association. The submission addressed issues from both the Office and the Retail discussion papers. The key comments and recommendations from the written submission are presented below. The written submission is presented in full in Appendix D.

A summary of comments made in the submission included:

- The level of energy consumption related to accessing both retail and office destinations cannot continue at their present levels as energy prices continue to rise.
- Brampton has practically ignored the environmental damage caused by low-density settlement patterns, damage that includes the elimination of natural and agricultural lands and the emission of greenhouse gases and toxins.
- Brampton is facing a transportation crisis that has been created by low-density development and a separation of uses zoning policies.
- The retail policy seems to give priority to large retailers at the expense of small and/or new businesses that are not usually permitted in retail centres.

A summary of the submission's recommendations include:

- The City of Brampton needs to plan retail and office spaces with more regard to the critical need to reduce both land and transportation requirements.

- The City needs to move toward more intensive use of the land than is currently planned. The City should plan for a model where properties housing retail or office activities are more intensively used. This includes mixed-uses, multi-story buildings, and access by means other than the personal automobile.
- Urban intersections where both employees and visitors have close access to amenities such as restaurants and shopping should be established, which would allow office and retail employees to live near their place of work.
- Intensification proposals in the proposed official plan amendments should be met. Greenfield lands should be developed at much higher densities than currently planned in order to improve the traffic situation and to minimize future energy shocks.
- Single-story and single-use areas should be replaced with more urban environments that use vertical space and reduced transportation spaces to stretch out the supply of useable land.
- The City should not simply follow marketing trends, which focus on multi-national chain stores dependent on imported goods from distant origins.
- Create mainstreet urban environments that give equal visibility and/or access to both large and small businesses.

6. OFFICE WORKSHOP SUMMARY

August 10, 2005, 2:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Caledon East Room, Holiday Inn
30 Peel Centre Drive
Brampton, Ontario**

6.1 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

The session welcome was provided by Mr. David Waters, Manager of Land Use Policy. He noted that this was the last of five workshops that had taken place since late June/early July. Mr. Waters then introduced David Dilks, meeting facilitator.

Mr. Dilks welcomed the participants to the workshop and said the purpose of the workshop was twofold. The first was to get in-person feedback from participants about proposed changes to the Official Plan, specifically related to the topic of office uses. The second was to provide participants with the opportunity to ask questions or obtain clarification about the discussion paper contents. Mr. Dilks then guided the participants through the workbook.

Mr. Dilks then introduced Pam Cooper from the City of Brampton to provide a presentation on the Office Strategy Discussion Paper.

6.2 OVERVIEW PRESENTATION

Ms. Cooper delivered a presentation on Brampton's Official Plan Review process and on the Office Strategy Discussion Paper. Ms. Cooper's presentation is included in Appendix E.

A question and answer session followed the presentation and is documented below.

Q: What is the basis of Hemson's prediction for 25% growth for Bram West?

A: *They looked at the forecast of employment growth and saw that the location is in a good position for growth. The Mississauga corridor can be used for office space. It is also located near industrial parks by Mississauga Road.*

Q: The Hemson population forecast went to 2031. Why did you only use the forecast until 2021 in the presentation?

A: *The Stamm forecast only went to 2021, and so this slide just went to 2021 for the purpose of comparison. The forecast goes to 2031 in the discussion paper.*

Q: One of the recommendations is to prohibit certain uses from the office nodes. Can you elaborate?

A: *In Bram West, certain uses would be non-complementary, such as lower order employment or commercial uses.*

Q: Would non-retail uses be allowed?

A: *It could be considered.*

6.3 ROUNDTABLE FEEDBACK

This section includes highlights from the roundtable working sessions.

Key Issues to be Addressed

1. From your perspective, what are the top 3 or 4 issues relating to the Office Strategy that the Official Plan Review must address?

A summary of issues identified by the working groups is presented below. One key issue mentioned was **terminology**. Some participants wanted clarification of the term “node” and other office-related terms. Other participants questioned if the term “node” was appropriate as it was being used.

Another key issue identified was keeping **mixed or multi-purpose uses** included in the planning design. Also raised was **how to attract lead tenants or encourage businesses** to locate in certain areas.

A more detailed list of the issues raised is presented below.

PRIORITY ISSUES AND GENERAL COMMENTS
<p>Priority issues raised and comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Terminology and clarification - Is “Node” the correct term? It is not a traditional urban style. Clarification is needed on the amount of existing venues (nodes) proposed and how many are to be reduced. Clarification is needed on types of nodes. For example, what is a central urban corridor? And is it being expanded or deleted? Which are being deleted? There needs to be a clear definition of what constitutes an office node.• Mixed-use flexibility: There needs to be flexibility in the use and type of office functions. It should be market driven, and market forces should determine the form and use of building. For example, Heartland includes a multi-purpose facility/component with high office component. Location is also influenced by market demands. There should be fewer restrictions, such as height, parking, size, uses, design, etc. Bram West will have office uses but there should be an opportunity for multi-purpose uses.• Attracting tenants - Can office developers be encouraged to locate in certain areas? Why label an office node? How do prestige industries fit in? There is a need for lead tenants to cover the costs of construction, especially outside of the main office area. It needs to be made attractive for lead tenant. Need to identify magnets that would draw anchor tenants in.• Bram West Primary Office Node – There could be an office corridor along Mississauga

Road that has multi-purpose uses around it. But the corridor would be strictly for office uses.

- **Projections** - Earlier projections not did not materialize. The maturity of infrastructure may allow earlier projections to be realized in the future.
- **Isolation of Meadowale Model** – The Corporate Meadowale model is isolated from amenities and is dependant on auto transportation.
- **Use of older buildings** – Office occupation of older buildings in commercial centres and industrial areas should be considered.
- **Bram East location not optimal** – The Bram East area is not optimal for office location. It is more warehouses, manufacturing and mixed uses.

2. Does the Office Strategy discussion paper effectively identify these key issues?

It was generally felt that the issues outlined above **were not effectively identified** in the discussion paper. One of the groups noted that they want to see flexibility included, for example, with offices being able to locate outside of nodes. They also said that they did not want to wait until the next Official Plan Review to address any changes.

3. What office strategy issues are missing in the discussion paper, if any?

In addition to the issues identified above, issues felt by participants to be missing in the discussion paper included:

- Policies that direct office uses to industrial areas.
- Shared amenities (e.g., parking).
- How office areas evolve or transform over time.
- Promotion of mixed-use, in particular office and retail.

There were also requests for clarification, in particular:

- Why are some nodes being deleted?
- What is the definition of “office nodes”?
- What is the scope of the Bram West office node?
- How is the Central Urban Corridor defined?

Proposed Policy Recommendations and Official Plan Revisions

1. Do you have any general comments about the proposals? Are you generally comfortable with them?

There was a general desire to see **mixed uses addressed more clearly** in the discussion paper. One group commented that mixed-uses should be stressed but they do not currently appear in the discussion paper. Another group expressed a desire to see businesses in the Central Area provide more user-friendly operating hours. For example, restaurants are currently closed evenings and weekends.

Other comments included:

- The proposed revision for the Bram West policy 4.2.1.3 to re-designate the Bram West Office Node as the Primary Office Node and add a policy to prevent the intrusion of non-complementary lower order commercial or employment uses is too strong.
- The Central Area transit corridor should be referred to as an office area specific to the central area. The Bram West area is less a transit corridor and more of an urban corridor. It should reflect different uses.
- The working group was generally comfortable with the recommendations but wanted further clarification on how the secondary plan would be affected.

2. Are there any proposals that you believe will face implementation challenges? If so, how can these challenges be overcome?

The workshop participants raised a number of possible challenges that may arise during the implementation of the proposed office policy revisions. These include:

- **Attracting office users** - How will the municipality attract office users beyond the Official Plan designations? Possible options may include the use of competitive tax rates, attractive land values, and a skilled workforce. For example, possible tax rates may offer advantages, lower land values may be prime motivation, and Brampton has high skill rates relative to other GTA locations.
- **Timely amendments** - Amend the office plan and expeditiously amend secondary plans.
- **Protection of existing nodes** - Protect what Brampton currently has, for example, conserve existing node areas.
- **Absent stakeholders and short comment period** – Not all affected stakeholders were aware of this workshop, and the deadline for comments may be too short.

It was suggested that **urban design** could be used to address some policies and solutions for office and retail.

3. Do you have any specific changes to the proposed recommendations/revisions? Is there anything you would change or add? Why?

There was a range of general comments received about the proposed OP recommendations. General comments included:

- Bram West was renamed the primary office Node. Re-consider the directive to prohibit all non-intrusive uses. Instead, allow mixed uses beyond only offices.
- Reconsider the removal of the “Office Court” office node.
- Reconsider the minimum unit size of tenancies (e.g., Nortel).
- Encourage office development by using reduced parking requirements and better transit opportunities.

Comments on specific revisions are presented below.

Existing Policy	Proposed Revision	Suggested Change/Addition
4.2.1 Role and Function of Key Areas		
Central Area		
<p>4.2.1.1 The Central Area designation identifies an area which shall collectively serve as the location for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full range and concentration of commercial uses, including office, retail, and service activities; • the major location for entertainment and cultural uses. In this regard, the Central shall serve as the major location for movie theatres, museums, art galleries and live theatre; • governmental, institutional and community facilities and uses; and • compatible residential uses, both free-standing and in mixed use forms. 	<p>Add wording referring to the "Central Area Transit Corridor" as a higher order transit area that represents one of the city's prime locations for office development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "C.A.T.C." May not be appropriate term i.e. urban corridor. • Why prime areas? Why not prime nodes with different characteristics? • Will businesses be open for longer hours (e.g. restaurants in the evenings and week-ends)? • Will PAC be supported by local businesses (i.e. see show and leave town)?
Bram East		
<p>4.2.1.2 The Bram East Secondary Plan area has significant locational and infrastructure attributes, including proximity to Highways 7, 50 and 427, Lester B. Pearson International Airport, and environmental and outdoor recreation lands, such as the Claireville and Ebenezer conservation lands, and several nearby golf courses. These attributes provide the basis to attract the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prestige industrial uses along the Highway 7/Ebenezer Road corridor; • Personal and business service uses along the Highway 7 and Highway 50 corridors; • Regional and local scale retail and service uses; and, • Office development at the Highway 7 and Highway 50 node, and along Highway 7; 	<p>Delete this node but add policies to establish minimum office space requirements and specific urban design policies to maintain the planned "gateway", and add policies to protect this area from shorter term lower order and incompatible uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not attractive for office. • What happens to secondary plan when office node is removed? • What does this mean? Expand. "to protect this area from shorter term lower order and incompatible uses." • Expand info re: minimum office space. • Market research has shown that people want commercial retail.

Existing Policy	Proposed Revision	Suggested Change/Addition
<p><u>Bram West</u></p> <p>4.2.1.3</p> <p>The Bram West Secondary Plan area, with access and visibility to Highway 407, has the potential and infrastructure attributes to attract the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prestige and general industrial uses; • Office and research uses; and, • Regional and local scale retail and service uses along Mississauga Road and Steeles Avenue. 	<p>Redesignate this area as a Primary Office Node.</p> <p>Implement policies to prevent the intrusion of residential uses or other non-complimentary lower order employment uses, and provide more direction within the Official Plan for business industrial areas that contain office nodes that may develop as a business park district developing with corporate head offices, research and development uses. In this respect, policies need to be added to the Official Plan that provide clearer guidelines regarding the range of relevant uses and associated urban design criteria.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Suburban office node." Rely on multipurpose buildings. • Large footprint and different types of uses. • Access/location east access. • Highway exposure. • Why discourage residential use? • Could homes be located here too?
4.2.3 Office Dominant Sector		
<p>4.2.3.3</p> <p>The City shall require proposals to expand or add to the Primary Office Node or Office Node designations to be subject to an Official Plan Amendment.</p>	<p>Remove reference to the Office Node, add "Central Area Transit Corridor."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.A.T.C.- Urban office node.
4.2.4 Primary Office Node		
<p><u>Policies</u></p> <p>4.2.4.1</p> <p>The Primary Office Node designation is located within the Central Area, bounded by Queen Street, Highway Number 410, the CNR rail corridor and the rear property line of the properties fronting the west side of Rutherford Road. This area shall be developed and reinforced as the major office activity area for the City of Brampton and will contain the highest density and greatest concentration of office development. The uses permitted in the Primary Office Node designation shall include offices, services, retailing, entertainment, hotels, business support activities, community services, and all uses consistent with the Central Area designation.</p>	<p>Reword this section to refer to Bram West node as the "Primary Office Node".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suburban office node. • Why call it primary node?

Existing Policy	Proposed Revision	Suggested Change/Addition
4.2.4.3 The development of the Queen Street/ Highway 410 Primary Office Node as a major office area is predicated on the provision of enhanced access from the abutting Highway Number 410 and the provision of higher order transit services including a new GO Train Commuter Station and a transit terminal to be operated as part of a planned North-South Transit Corridor along Highway 410 in accordance with the Transportation section of this Plan.	Remove this section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is urban corridor with mixed use and some office use still. Connect with core area.
4.2.4.5 The Primary Office Node designation on Schedule "A" of this Plan is intended to recognize the long-term potential of this area for redevelopment for a full range of higher order uses. Notwithstanding this designation, existing industrial uses both within and adjacent to the Primary Office Node designation will continue to be permitted by this Plan and the relevant Secondary Plan, and the potential impact of such development and redevelopment on the viability of existing industrial uses will be considered as part of the comprehensive land use and transportation studies that are required to provide for the transition of this area to an appropriate mix of higher order uses, in particular, the impact of the type and volume of vehicular traffic on the use, activities and operation of nearby industrial uses.	Remove reference to the Primary Office Node, refer to the area as the "Central Area Transit Corridor".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban office node.
4.2.5 Office Node		
4.2.5.4 The Downtown Brampton Office Node area is located in the general vicinity of the intersection of Queen and Main Streets. This area will be developed to permit significant office development that is compatible with the local historic character of the area.	Revise to re-designate the node as part of the "Central Area Transit Corridor", and also add policies to protect this area from shorter-term lower order or incompatible uses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban office node.
4.2.5.5 The Bramalea Centre Office Node is generally bounded by Highway Number 7, Dixie Road, Clark Boulevard and Central Park Drive. This area will be developed as a focus of higher density development, which is based on the provision of higher order transit services to accommodate future population and employment growth.	Re-designate the node as part of the "Central Area Transit Corridor", and also add policies to protect this area from shorter-term lower order or incompatible uses. The Bramalea City Centre will be identified as a Regional Center in the Official Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban office node.

Existing Policy	Proposed Revision	Suggested Change/Addition
4.2.5.6 The Courthouse Area Office Node is located in the general vicinity of Highway Number 10 between Steeles Avenue and Highway 407, focused on the County Court Boulevard and Highway Number 10 intersections. This area will be developed as an office node incorporating retail, a significant amount of institutional space, and residential uses, where appropriate.	Remove this node since there are no vacant sites available for new office development and potential office growth would therefore be limited to infill and small redevelopment/retrofit of existing buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Built out.
4.2.5.7 The Airport Road/Highway 7 Office Node area is located at the intersection of Highway Number 7 and Airport Road. This area will be developed as a small-scale office employment area that also contains complementary business support services, generally serving the surrounding industrial designations.	Remove this node, add policies to allow additional employment uses, which would still be compatible with the surrounding area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can something like this be used for Bram East?

6.4 INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

One written submission was received by City planning staff, which was submitted by the Sustainable Urban Development Association. The submission addressed issues from both the Office and the Retail discussion papers and is summarized in section 5.4. The written submission is presented in full in Appendix D.

APPENDIX A: CULTURAL HERITAGE PARTICIPANT LIST, SUBMISSIONS AND WORKSHOP MATERIALS

Cultural Heritage List of Participants

June 29, 2005

Public Stakeholders

Sharron Peet, Brampton Heritage Board
Lynda Voegtle, Brampton Heritage Board
John Cutruzzola, Inzola Construction
Carl Brawley, Glen Schnarr
Ron Miller, City of Mississauga

Michael Avis, Brampton Heritage Board
Bob Hooshley, Metrus
Nadia Zuccaro, EMC Group
Bob Lackey, Candevcom Ltd
Lindsay Popert, City of Mississauga

Brampton Councillors

Councillor Di Marco

Councillor Hutton

Brampton Staff

Jim Leonard
Nancy Johnston
David Waters
Dan Krazewski
Paul Aldunate
Adrian Smith

Christina Lo
Steve Solski
Ohi Izirein
Tara Buonpensiero
Pam Cooper

APPENDIX B: ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN SPACE PARTICIPANT LIST, SUBMISSIONS AND WORKSHOP MATERIALS

Environment and Open Space List of Participants

June 29, 2005

Public Stakeholders

Calli Citron, EMC Group	Darren Steedman, Metrus
John Cutruzzola, Inzola Construction	Carl Brawley, Glen Schnarr
Bob Lackey, Candevcom Ltd	Leo O'Brien, Friends of Heart Lake
Gary Kramer, Orlando Group	Anna Przychodzki, Sierra Club of Peel
Tushar Mehta	Wei Guo, Great Gulf Homes
Nancy Mather, Stantec	Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee
Eva Kliwer, City of Mississauga	Paul Mountford, Peel District School Board
Steve Hare, Peel District School Board	Craig Moffitt, Peel Region
Wayne Chan, Peel Region	Tom Slomke, Peel Region
Mark Head, Peel Region	Chris Hibberd, CVC
Bill Buchan, West Humber Claireville Subwatershed Committee	
Josh Campbell, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	
Quentin Hanchard, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	

Brampton Councillors

Councillor Hutton

Brampton Staff

Adrian Smith	Bill Winterhalt
Christina Lo	Kant Chawla
David Waters	Karen Fraser
Ohi Izirein	John Kennedy
Dan Krazewski	Malik Majeed
Tara Buonpensiero	Michael Hoy
Pam Cooper	John Spencer
Donna Kell	

APPENDIX C: *URBAN FORM/DEVELOPMENT DESIGN* PARTICIPANT LIST, SUBMISSIONS AND WORKSHOP MATERIALS

Urban Form/Development Design List of Participants

July 6, 2005

Public Stakeholders

Yurij Pelech, EMC Group
Mirjana Osojnicki, MMM
Darren Steedman, Metrus
Bob Lackey, Candevcom Ltd
Wei Guo, Great Gulf Homes
Al Cormier

Steven Weisz, Paradise Homes
Rick Mangotich, Fieldgate Development
Carl Brawley, Glen Schnarr
Marion Bartlett, Brampton Heritage Board
Gary Kramer, Orlando Group

John Stillich, Sustainable Urban Development Association

Brampton Councillors

Councillor Di Marco

Brampton Staff

Alex Taranu
Gabe Charles
Nancy Johnston
Tara Buonpensiero
Pam Cooper
Kant Chawla
Donna Kell

Christina Lo
Dana Jenkins
David Waters
Bill Winterhalt
Adrian Smith
Malik Majeed

APPENDIX D: RETAIL PARTICIPANT LIST, SUBMISSIONS AND WORKSHOP MATERIALS

Retail List of Participants August 10, 2005	
<p>Public Stakeholders</p> <p>Joe Digiuseppe, History Hill Margaret Knowles, Morguard Investments Kelly Pardy, First Gulf Kelly Olive-Sched, Walmart Canada Andrew Ferancik, GLB Lee Parsons, MGP Harry Froussios, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. Calli Citron, EMC Group Naoko Nakamura, Remax Ron Miller, City of Mississauga John Stillich, Sustainable Urban Development Association</p> <p>Brampton Staff</p> <p>David Waters Pam Cooper Dana Jenkins Kant Chawla</p>	<p>Terry Korsiak, Morguard Investments Neil Robb, Sheridan College Larry Regan, Walmart Canada Glen Williams, Indusite Realty Corp Philip Wong, First Pro Mimi Ward, MGP Mirjana Osojnicki, MMM Oz Kemal, MHBC Tom Slomke, Peel Region</p> <p>Malik Majeed Christina Lo Bill Winterhalt Brian Stittle</p>

APPENDIX E: OFFICE PARTICIPANT LIST, SUBMISSIONS AND WORKSHOP MATERIALS

Office Strategy List of Participants August 10, 2005								
<p>Public Stakeholders</p> <p>Joe Digiuseppe, History Hill Neil Robb, Sheridan College Brain Sutherland, Glenn Schnarr Mimi Ward, MGP Tom Slomke, Peel Region John Stillich, Sustainable Urban Development Association</p> <p>Brampton Councillors</p> <p>Councillor Susan DiMarco</p> <p>Brampton Staff</p> <table><tbody><tr><td>David Waters</td><td>Malik Majeed</td></tr><tr><td>Pam Cooper</td><td>Christina Lo</td></tr><tr><td>Tara Buonpensiero</td><td>Bill Winterhalt</td></tr><tr><td>Brian Stittle</td><td>Donna Kell</td></tr></tbody></table>	David Waters	Malik Majeed	Pam Cooper	Christina Lo	Tara Buonpensiero	Bill Winterhalt	Brian Stittle	Donna Kell
David Waters	Malik Majeed							
Pam Cooper	Christina Lo							
Tara Buonpensiero	Bill Winterhalt							
Brian Stittle	Donna Kell							