

Appendix A
Public Consultation Records

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Public Information Centre #1 Summary	2
1.1 Introduction.....	2
1.2 Notification	2
1.3 PIC Presentation Material.....	2
1.4 PIC #1 Comments.....	3
2. Public Information Centre #2 Summary	6
2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 Event Format	6
2.3 Summary of Feedback	7
2.4 Future Road Network	7
2.5 Future Transit Network.....	8
2.6 Active Transportation	8
2.7 Requests for Clarity and Information	9
2.8 Other Comments	9
2.9 Questions	9
2.10 Summary of Questions and Answers Discussion	10
3. Public and stakeholder comments, Study commencement to May 2009	14
3.1 Summary of Written Responses	14
3.1.1 Road Network and NSTC Alternatives.....	14
3.1.2 Brampton Central Area Improvements	30
3.1.3 Transit Improvements	33
4. Agency comments on Draft TTMP Report, Aug 2009 to Sep 2009.....	41
4.1 North South Transportation Corridor	41
4.2 Compliance with other EAs and Studies	42
4.3 Transportation Demand Management	43
4.4 Recommended Road Network Issues	44
4.5 Land Use Assumptions	50
4.6 Transit Network Issues	51
4.7 Report Section and Exhibit Corrections	54
5. Comments received on Draft Final TTMP report, Nov 2009 to Jan 2010.....	65
6. Original submissions in response to Notice of Study Completion.....	79

Appendix A-1

Transportation & Transit Master Plan
Sustainable Update

Public Information Centre #1 Summary

1. PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1 SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

The first Public Information Centre (PIC#1) for the Transportation and Transit Master Plan Sustainable Update was held on Tuesday, September 23, 2008 in the City Hall Atrium, 2 Wellington Street West, in the City of Brampton.

The purpose of PIC#1 was to present members of the community with an introduction to the project, identified transportation needs, potential strategic alternatives, and an understanding of the environment. The format was an informal open house session from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm.

Approximately 30 members of the public attended the PIC. The following representatives from the City of Brampton and HDR | iTRANS were in attendance to answer questions and provide information to the public.

City of Brampton: Adrian Smith – Project Direction
 Kant Chawla – Project Manager
 Gwen Zhang – Project Planner
 Mathew Vaughan – Project Planner

HDR | iTRANS: Tyrone Gan, Consultant Project Director
 Elizabeth Szymanski, Consultant Project Manager
 Jonathan Chai, Consultant Project Planner
 Matthew McCumber, Consultant Project Planner

1.2 Notification

Advertisements informing the public of the PIC were placed in the Brampton Guardian on Wednesday, April 2 and in Caledon Enterprise on Saturday, April 5, 2008. Other individuals who had responded with an interest in the study since its commencement, conservation authorities, Federal and Provincial agencies, and utility companies were also notified of the study commencement and PIC#1 by email.

1.3 PIC Presentation Material

Upon arrival at the PIC, attendees were asked to sign a visitor registration sheet. Twenty-three people signed the registration sheet.

Twenty-three panels were displayed. The information panels included the following:

- Welcome

- Study Project Team and Timeline
- Background, Purpose, and Vision
- Relevant Policy - Brampton's Growth Plan
- Demographic and Transportation Characteristics
- Existing and Planned Transit Service
- Travel Demand Management Policy
- Goods Movement Issues
- Identified Employment Centres
- North West Brampton Transportation Issues
- Halton-Peel Boundary Transportation Issues
- York-Peel Boundary Transportation Issues
- Projected Traffic Volumes and Capacity
- Alternative Transportation Strategies (Potential Elements)
- Alternative Solution Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps and Contact information

A copy of the PIC panels is included on the project website at:
<http://www.brampton.ca/GrowthPlanResponse/>

1.4 PIC #1 Comments

Residents had many comments on a wide variety of issues, including transit, future transportation corridors in Bram West, heritage and natural environment, operations, as well as expressed concerns related to timing of the construction of Highway 427. The questions asked and comments received verbally or via comment sheets at the PIC are summarized below, along with the project team's responses:

Comment	Response
Request for a meeting and to stay involved with the Update's development of solutions for the north-south and east-west traffic in the Bram West area, as well as potential corridor protections areas (particularly those affecting the 40-3 property block).	
How will this project operate in conjunction with the ongoing Malton-Brampton Area Boundary Study?	
The Bram West transportation corridor needs to be completed for Caledon to complete its road and highway plan. Expropriate Halton if you have to.	Comment noted.
The location / accessibility of bus stops and sidewalk maintenance need to improve with respect to winter weather conditions and pedestrian safety.	Comment noted.
The introduction of "big box" retail stores has resulted in increased traffic and reduced air quality in adjacent area.	Comment noted.

Are there plans for bus-only lanes from Brampton to Toronto on Queen Street for Route #77?	
Major complaint concerning the impacts on noise and residential access resulting from a new bus transit service on Clementine Drive on.	
Support for bus-only lanes along Queen Street and Steeles Avenue.	Comment noted.
There is a need for larger or more buses for Routes #7 and #11, especially in the midst of a gas crunch.	Comment noted.
Support for Brampton transit service expansion considering the growing environmental concerns.	Comment noted.

Copies of the comments are on file with the City of Brampton. The PIC boards were posted to the project website after the PIC and sent out hard copies of the boards to those who requested it.

Responses to comments provided by letter and email were provided on an individual basis and will be documented in the Transportation Master Plan Report. Responses to comments made via comment form will also be documented in the Transportation Master Plan Report.

Appendix A-2

Transportation & Transit Master Plan
Sustainable Update

Public Information Centre #2 Summary

2. PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2 SUMMARY

The summary for PIC#2 was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura is providing third-party facilitation services as part of the City of Brampton's Response to the Provincial Growth Plan. This summary captures the key discussion points and comments from the TTMP PIC #2 on February 4th 2009.

2.1 Introduction

The City of Brampton's Planning, Design and Development (PD&D) Department is currently undertaking a Growth Plan conformity exercise to implement the policies of the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. One aspect of this Growth Plan response focuses on transportation and transit planning. At the same time, the City is conducting a study to review and update the City of Brampton's Transportation Master Plan. Both of these exercises include public engagement.

On February 4th 2009, the City hosted a dual function public consultation session for the Transportation & Transit Master Plan (TTMP) Sustainable Update, which served as both the fifth in a series of Growth Plan public workshops, and Public Information Centre (PIC) #2 for the TTMP Sustainable Update Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. The purpose of this consultation session was:

To seek public input on preliminary findings of the "Transportation & Transit Master Plan (TTMP) Sustainable Update Study" which will provide the basis for revisions and input to the transportation components of the City's Official Plan to conform to the Provincial Growth Plan policies.

This report provides a summary of the feedback received at the consultation session, as well as written comments submitted to the Project Team following the event.

2.2 Event Format

The event was conducted in two parts:

1. Part One: 5:30 pm – 7:00 pm Public Open House (City Hall Atrium)
2. Part Two: 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm Presentation and Discussion (Council Chambers)

Approximately 30 participants attended the event. Each participant was given an information package, which included:

- "How Should Brampton Grow?" pamphlet;
- "How Should Brampton Grow?" Newsletter #2;
- Copy of the presentation boards / slides; and

- Workbook (containing an introduction to the topic, key preliminary TTMP Sustainable Study findings and recommendations, and a comment form).

During the Public Open House, display panels summarizing preliminary study findings and recommendations were set up for attendees to review. Members of the Project Team were on hand to answer questions from participants.

At 7:00 p.m. participants were invited to the Council Chambers to hear a presentation and take part in discussion. Henrik Zbogor, Manager of Long Range Transportation Planning for the City of Brampton, welcomed participants and explained how the 2009 update to the TTMP coincides both with the need for a regular review of the Master Plan, as well as with the need to consider the requirements of the Provincial Growth Plan.

Facilitator, David Dilks, gave a brief introduction, stating the goal of the event was to orient participants to preliminary findings of the TTMP to date. Mr. Dilks described the importance of the session and how it fits into a larger process that includes multiple studies to address the requirements of the Provincial Growth Plan. Mr. Dilks reviewed the event materials and invited participants to submit their comments by the February 20th 2009 deadline.

Mr. Tyrone Gan, Project Manager from HDR | iTRANS, made a presentation of 37 slides that highlighted the information from the PIC display panels. The presentation is available as a PDF download on the City of Brampton website at www.brampton.ca/GrowthPlanResponse/planning.html.

Following the presentation, participants were invited to ask questions of the Project Team or provide comments on the preliminary recommendations. A full summary of the discussion is included in Appendix A.

In closing, participants were told the draft TTMP Sustainable Study report will go to Council in the Spring of 2009 and that participants who signed up for the project mailing list would be informed when there is a draft report available for public review.

2.3 Summary of Feedback

Below is a summary of key points raised by participants during the question and comment period or submitted in writing after the event. The comments are grouped by general topic area and are presented in no particular order.

2.4 Future Road Network

- Agree with the realignment of James Street across the GO Rail as the best solution for improving safety of the rail crossing.
- Oppose the John Street Extension, because of the following issues:
 - It is not a viable alternative to Queen Street

- There would likely be traffic at a new James Street intersection caused, in part, by all-day GO service
- There would likely be increased cross-town traffic in the downtown residential neighbourhoods e.g. Wellington Street and Mary Street
- The medium-density housing designated lands on both sides of John Street should be maintained for attracting quality residential developments
- Impacts to the historic downtown community that includes executive housing
- Concerns about the proposed extension of Ken Whillans Drive and the drainage improvements, in particular impacts to the potential to redevelop Rosalea Park in line with the City's vision to create a significant urban park in the downtown area
- The Halton-Peel Freeway option is a preferred alternative because it provides direct easy access to both Highways 401 and 407
- The reconstruction of Winston Churchill Boulevard is urgently required to satisfy long term north-south traffic requirements
- Prefer potential road improvements be designed within the existing constraints, e.g. avoid impacts caused by changes to road alignments
- Major traffic routes should avoid the settlement of Norval
- The most direct crossing of the Credit River should be selected.
- Support for channelling the movement of heavy truck traffic outside of the downtown core and for ensuring that truck routes are well identified and enforced
- Support 'dropping' the Brampton Freeway option from further consideration as a road network alternative

2.5 Future Transit Network

- Recommend Light Rail Transit (LRT) over Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Recommend a transit rapid-way down the centre of each major roadway to accommodate a BRT for Bovaird Drive, Steeles Avenue, and LRT for Hurontario Street, Main Street, and Queen Street
- Focus on the Queen Street corridor first for transit improvements
- Push for more funding of transit from the Federal Government
- There are limits and restrictions on the existing downtown transit hub that will need to be addressed
- Queen Street density is not sufficient to support increased public transit. Currently the buses are under-utilized.

2.6 Active Transportation

- Support the inclusion of Active Transportation as a key component of the overall transportation strategies for the city
- Provide new facts, concepts or ideas on how to get Brampton residents out of their vehicles and using public and active transportation

- Promote biking and walking to and within downtown Brampton, which also requires providing a safe network of pathways and bike routes

2.7 Requests for Clarity and Information

- The PIC #2 did not seem to provide much new information from the previous PIC
- Further details on specific dates and program deliverables would be appreciated, especially for the shorter 5 – 10 year road development forecasts
- Encourage final road alignments to be decided soon so that development planning can move forward
- Provide clarity on the plans for the North-South Corridor, Halton-Peel Freeway and the Bramwest Parkway, particularly how they relate to Embleton Road
- Provide clarification and ensure coordination of the allowances being made for a potential Halton-Peel Freeway and Brampton Parkway
- Participants look forward to the opportunity to review and comment on the final draft of the TTMP Update

2.8 Other Comments

- Support the inclusion of Travel Demand Management as a key component of the overall transportation strategies for the city
- Improve planning and coordination of road construction projects for efficiency, e.g. road widening at the same time as new curbs, sidewalk repairs, utility repositioning and asphalt resurfacing
- Ensure east-west connectivity to York Region is coordinated so related projects are ready at the same time, i.e. no dead ends
- Ensure consistent decisions and illustrations within the TTMP and in other related plans, such as the City of Brampton's Official Plan
- City road programs need to be correlated to secondary plans, block plans and draft approvals

2.9 Questions

- When will we see the BRT in action, including north-south routes?
- What are the considerations in selection between LRT vs. BRT vs. a traditional bus system?
- Will car lanes be competing with dedicated BRT? Will BRT take away driving lanes?
- Can more detail be given about the 407 transit way?
- Which routes will require road widening?
- What are the criteria and factors driving the corridor decisions?
- What is the modal split assumed in the study and how does that compare to current ridership?

2.10 Summary of Questions and Answers Discussion

Below is a summary of the discussion that followed the slide presentation made by Tyrone Gan of HDR | iTRANS:

Q: In your analysis, have you considered the limits and restrictions on the downtown transit hub? Will it have sufficient capacity for future needs?

A: This study does not go into that level of detail.

A: We are aware of limitations to that facility. The City is conducting a detailed review of the Hurontario corridor. Expect more public consultation. We will be looking at higher order transit connecting to the downtown.

Q: Do you have a slide that illustrates recommendations to Brampton East?

A: The Peel-Highway 427 study gives more detail on this area, and informed our study. See details on the Peel website. Our study does include some illustrations.

Q: Have you considered enhanced BRT vs. traditional bus system and related costing?

A: Building on the City BRT Network plans (i.e. AcceleRide), we are adding on the BRT network. City has prepared cost estimates. This is ongoing. For example, Mississauga Road from Bovaird to Steeles is new. As we go through costing, we will be looking for additional funding sources. The Eastern terminus on Bovaird is also in this study.

Q: Has Bus Rapid Transit vs. LRT been studied?

A: Technology has not been defined, BRT is the current plan. There are candidates for dedicated right-of-ways under Metrolinx. No decisions have been made.

Q: The Viva service is on the side of the road, now they have to move to centre lane, and eventually LRT. Why not jump straight to LRT?

A: AcceleRide is incremental. Going direct to right-of-way would take much longer. We want to build up ridership. Throw away costs are considered. Curb side service is still used for local bus routes after center lanes are added.

Q: When will we see BRT?

A: AcceleRide on Queen St should be in operation in 2010. Next Main St. and then Steeles. See AcceleRide link on City website.

Q: (BRT slide 26) Would these routes require road widening?

A: We are focused on what is the right corridor, and have not addressed road expansion issues.

Q: What is driving the corridor decisions? What are criteria and factors?

A: Slide 26 has a criteria table. E.g. connectivity, potential ridership, major destinations. A final recommendation will be given in the final report.

Q: Will car lanes be competing with dedicated BRT? Will BRT take away driving lanes?

A: We have not gotten that far yet.

Q: What is modal split assumed in your study?

A: The forecasts are for 24% transit.

Q: How does that compare to current ridership?

A: Currently it is about 10% transit.

C: I see a lot of empty buses on Viva. I'm not seeing increased ridership. It's just a glorified bus route. Should be separate, dedicated, and fast.

Q: Is the study ready for public review? I'd like to look at the assumptions.

A: The report is not ready at this time. A draft will be given to Council in April. We can include you on our mailing list to be informed when the plan is available for public review.

Q: Can you give more detail on the 407 transit way?

A: Today there is GO bus service on the 407. The Province has a plan for a transit way beside the 407. Our study incorporates this plan.

Q: Will east-west connectivity to York Region be coordinated to ensure projects are ready at the same time? i.e. no dead ends.

A: The plan is to integrate and coordinate with York.

C: Queen St. density is not there yet for transit. Currently buses are empty.

C: It is a chicken and egg problem.

A: Our City planning includes much more than just transportation, such as intensification and employment opportunities. The heart of the city is Downtown. We recognize previous growth was greenfield. Downtown needs to be higher density, with hotels and offices too. We also include plans for pedestrian friendly urban design.

A: If you signed-in tonight, you will receive notices about other planning processes.

Q: The 2004 TTMP included expanded BRT on Mississauga Rd, and Queen St extending further west. The City prioritizes AcceleRide on Queen and Steeles. Do you have further information on the phasing of the BRT going north-south?

A: Between primary routes (e.g. Mississauga Rd and Hurontario) there are also secondary bus transit routes. The City provides more service on demand. This study will inform further planning details.

A: When you need transit and when we have funding affects phasing. We are often reliant on Provincial and Federal government funding.

Q: I thought I saw a 2021 BRT display board?

A: The previous 2004 study looked at transit up to 2021, this one goes to 2031. The AcceleRide plan looked to 2021.

Q: I saw Queen go to Chinguacousy.

A: This plan takes Queen to Mississauga Rd. AcceleRide is looking to a Mississauga Rd - Queen St. connection.

Q: I know budgeting is challenged. Steeles was repaved last year. Are we making good use of tax payer money? Why not include transit upgrades during road upgrades?

A: Certain sources of money have restricted uses, e.g. money for roads may not be spread in to transit. 2004 was a watershed for transit planning in Brampton

C: There are systematic problems. There is not enough coordination between Region and City to take advantage of opportunities to maximize our budgets and minimize duplication.

A: We do coordinate and yes there are always more opportunities to improve.

Appendix A-3

Transportation & Transit Master Plan
Sustainable Update

**Public and stakeholder comments
Study commencement to May 2009**

3. PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS, STUDY COMMENCEMENT TO MAY 2009

Residents and stakeholders provided very detailed and important written feedback on a number of topics, including NSTC alternatives, Brampton Central Area improvements, and transit improvements. The comments and responses received specific to each of these topics is provided below. PDF versions of received letters follow this appendix. For some of the comments, the original letters received can be found in Appendix 6.

3.1 Summary of Written Responses

3.1.1 Road Network and NSTC Alternatives

Stakeholder	Date Received	Comment	Response
Toronto Region Conservation Authority	November 5, 2008	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff received the Notice of Public Information Centre (PIC) #1, Brampton Transportation and Transit Master Plan (TTMP) Sustainable Update Study boards dated September 23, 2008, Transportation and Transit Master Plan Update boards dated September 11, 2008, Transportation and Transit Master Plan Sustainable Update – Study Design report dated July 2008 and the Transportation and Transit Master Plan Start-Up report dated September 2008, on September 19, 2008. It is our understanding that the purpose of this study will further enhance the existing transportation system by focusing on various aspects of the transportation network.</p> <p>Staff has reviewed the above-noted reports and comments are provided below.</p> <p>1. The documents have identified the current modal split, heavy auto dependency, and a heavy proportion of single occupancy vehicles. The report does identify a number of potential measures to address this however, TRCA staff would encourage the City to emphasize the integration of measures that increase public transit ridership, shift the balance away from single occupant vehicles to make efficient use of existing roads, increase the carpooling resources and infrastructure, and promote alternate forms of transportation.</p>	<p>We are pleased to offer the following in response to each of your comments.</p> <p>1. We concur. The City’s Transportation Vision as outlined in its 2004 TTMP and now being reinforced in this TTMP update is to encourage higher transit usage, active transportation, and travel demand management.</p> <p>2. We concur. The TTMP study is estimating greenhouse gas emissions in the evaluation of transportation strategies. Under the umbrella of the TTMP the City is also developing the Air</p>

		<p>2. Staff would encourage the municipality to collect background information relating to carbon management. A study should be undertaken detailing the carbon footprint of today’s modal split statistics. Further study should then be incorporated into the project modal split calculations. In developing the master plan, all effort to reduce the municipality’s carbon footprint from a transportation perspective should be a key goal of the study. By reducing the carbon footprint in the municipality, it is therefore inferred that the municipality’s impact on climate change will also be improved. Through a recent study completed by York Region for their Water and Wastewater Master Plan Update (draft), vehicle emissions in the municipality are the second highest contributor to carbon emissions. As such, it is anticipated that efforts to reduce these emissions by the City of Brampton could be significant. We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss this in greater detail, or we would refer you to Paul May, the Director of Infrastructure Planning at York Region for further information.</p> <p>3. The documents conceptually show the road alignments and major transportation routes to the year 2031. These should be identified as preliminary and conceptual in nature, and it should be identified that additional analysis on the feasibility of routes conceptually shown in the Master Plan will need to be analyzed at a more detailed and comprehensive level at a later date, such as with Individual Environmental Assessments (EA) which are broad enough in scope to consider a range of options and potential locations for additional infrastructure, other than the preliminary preferred route.. These should also explore other opportunities and options at that time, to consider a broader array of potential impacts to achieve the City’s more broad objectives.</p> <p>4. Future connections and extensions to Highway 427, for instance, should be shown conceptually on the figures within this report and not as a potential arterial alignment. The ultimate connections need to be thoroughly examined in an EA document to determine natural and socio-economic impacts. Please ensure that all figures proposing new alignments or extensions are shown in a broader scale.</p> <p>5. The Sustainable Update Report, Section 3.2.1, Background Reports and Constraints, states that the scope of work will include an inventory of the natural environment, and that the deliverable will include constraints mapping and a final start-up report. The Start-Up report does not include discussion of the natural environment and contains only one figure (Exhibit 4-3, Natural Heritage Features and Areas) that addresses natural features. Please ensure that subsequent reports include a detailed environmental analysis of the impacted areas. In addition, the above-noted constraints map does not make reference to flood plains, Special</p>	<p>Quality Strategy. The goal of the Strategy is to identify opportunities to decrease air emissions. The study team will circulate the Draft Air Quality Strategy document prior to the next meeting of Transportation Advisory Committee.</p> <p>3. We concur.</p> <p>4. New corridors will be noted as “conceptual” only.</p> <p>5. The TTMP study is examining impacts on the natural environment at a very high level, in keeping with the strategic nature of the study. The Constraints and Opportunity map you referred to will be presented in the Interim Report and discussed at the very high level. We are not intending to show more details on the natural environment. For this reason as you suggest, all potential road improvements are conceptual only, and will need to go through future environmental assessments to confirm their feasibility. Detailed environmental impact analysis will be carried out in subsequent EA studies in consultation with the TRCA.</p> <p>6. Noted.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Policy Areas (SPA), conservation lands, regulated areas, or take into account some of the smaller watercourse features, for example. All of these factors will have an impact on where future roads will be permitted for construction.</p> <p>6. Section 4.1.3 of the Study Design Report notes that the Draft TTMP Study Report will summarize growth scenarios, travel forecasts, etc., but does not include impacts to existing natural features. Section 4.1.6 then indicates that the Final TTMP Study Report will contain an assessment of existing conditions. This assessment should be included in the draft report for review and comment prior to finalizing the TTMP.</p> <p>7. The reports identify that standard transportation modeling software (i.e., EMME/2) will be used to assess potential options, and to determine future needs. While it is identified that this software can consider environmental elements, such as greenhouse gases, the model has not to date effectively considered potential direct or indirect impacts to natural features and systems caused by road expansions, and the addition of new routes. Please ensure that a thorough analysis of the impacts to natural features is examined in the TTMP.</p> <p>8. TRCA staff would encourage the City of Brampton to consider accepting less than optimal levels of service on routes that are directly adjacent to, or traverse, significant natural areas that would be adversely impacted by road widenings, or new roads. This approach (of accepting lower than optimal levels of service) is consistent with the recommendations that were made in the recent Town of Caledon transportation needs update study.</p> <p>9. Section 3.6.1 of the Study Design Report notes potential alignments for the GTA West Corridor will be examined as part of this study. A separate study is currently underway for the GTA West and TRCA staff is presently involved in the review of these options. Although reference should be made in this Master Plan update to the GTA study, the preferred solutions for the GTA West corridor will need to be determined through a separate process.</p> <p>10. The Key Issues – Alternative Strategies board identifies 4 alternative strategies however, detail is not provide for each of these alternatives. Please clarify whether the preferred alternative and draft TTMP strategies report, the TTMP implementation plan and the draft TTMP report will be sent to TRCA for review and comment, prior to finalizing the update, and whether an analysis of the alternative strategies will be included.</p> <p>11. Section 4.1.6 of the Study Design Report notes that 50 printed copies of the Final TTMP Study Report will be submitted. Please ensure that TRCA staff also receives 4 hard copies</p>	<p>7. Please see #5.</p> <p>8. Noted.</p> <p>9. We concur.</p> <p>10. The Draft TTMP report will be submitted to TRCA for review.</p> <p>11. We will submit four copies of the final report to the TRCA.</p>
--	--	--

		for review.	
Janet Kuzniar, Resident	November 5, 2008	Traffic is a growing concern on Winston Churchill Boulevard, and upcoming plans for the Brampton Brick quarry could exacerbate the problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholder added to the contact list for both the Brampton TTMP study and HPBATS
Northwest Brampton Landowners (Turkstra Mazza)	November 27, 2008	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>We represent the North West Brampton Landowners Group ("NWBLG"). As you know, the NWBLG has been very active in the planning of all aspects of the development of North West Brampton ("NWB"), including the necessary and appropriate planning infrastructure to support the full build-out of NWB.</p> <p>To that end, our client has been very supportive of the City's efforts to protect lands within West Brampton for the planning and development of the North-South Transportation Corridor (N-STC) (now commonly referred to as the Aaron Laidlaw Parkway), as well as other transportation infrastructure as may be required to specifically support NWB.</p> <p>NWBLG supported the City's Corridor Protection Interim Control By-law and the City's corridor protection initiatives in OP93-255, By-Law 300-2005 and the 2006 Brampton Official Plan.</p> <p>Similarly, to the extent that transportation infrastructure is necessary to support the full build-out of NWB, the NWBLG recognizes the need to clearly identify how that infrastructure is to be financed. Our client supported the inclusion of the N-STC from south of the Credit River to future Sandalwood Parkway in the Region of Peel's Development Charge By-Law Update and endorses the City's efforts to clarify how the construction of the Bram West Parkway will be financed.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the recent "Status Report" of City Staff, dated October 20, 2008, introduces a new concept; namely, that the financing arrangements for the N-STC between Sandalwood Parkway and Mayfield Road need to be determined now and further that this portion of the Corridor may be funded by certain NWB landowners as a "local service". We are writing to advise that the NWBLG has concerns regarding this proposition. Our concerns are premised on two facts:</p> <p>1. The N-STC between Sandalwood Parkway and Mayfield Road is not required to accommodate traffic from NWB and is not necessary to support the full build-out of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comment noted

		<p>NWB. 2. It is premature to determine if that portion of the Corridor is required at all and, certainly, how it will be financed.</p> <p>To be clear, this does not mean that the NWBLG opposes the protection of land within NWB between Sandalwood Parkway and Mayfield Road for some sort of higher order transportation facility. Based on input from our clients' transportation engineer, it is our understanding that this higher order transportation facility may be required to accommodate development elsewhere in the Region of Peel, within Halton Region or to support an interregional facility between the City of Vaughan and the City of Guelph.</p> <p>Our client continues to support the Corridor Protection area between Sandalwood and Mayfield as a prudent planning tool to ensure that the opportunity for a higher order facility in this area is not foreclosed by development, even though such a facility will never be needed to accommodate development within NWB. Our client is simply not prepared to finance it and believes that it is premature to address this issue at this time.</p> <p><u>ISSUE OF NEED</u></p> <p>As stated above, a higher order transportation facility between Sandalwood Parkway and Mayfield Road is not needed to accommodate development within NWB.</p> <p>Three years ago, the NWBLG retained BA Group to conduct a series of transportation forecast model analyses with the overall objective of assessing the medium and long term road network requirements for growth within NWB. A summary of that work along with a cover letter from Paul Sarjeant is attached.</p> <p>BA Group concluded that a higher order facility across the Credit River and between Sandalwood Parkway and Winston Churchill is necessary to accommodate the full build-out of NWB. However, the continuation of the facility north of Sandalwood is not.</p> <p>These conclusions were critical inputs into the decision by the Region of Peel to include the N-STC up to, but not beyond, Sandalwood Parkway within the Region's Development Charges By-Law to be funded 100% through development charges. If the extension of the N-STC between Sandalwood and Mayfield was necessary to accommodate the planned build-out of NWB, logically, the Region would have included that portion of the facility within the DC By-Law. It did not.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Consequently, the identification on Figure 4 of the October 20, 2008 Status Report of that portion of the N-STC north of Sandalwood as a facility to be financed as a "local service" is not appropriate nor necessary. The construction of a road that is not required for development within NWB cannot be a local service to the NWB landowners. If that facility is ultimately required to accommodate development elsewhere, the funding approach will be tied to the nature and location of the development that it will serve. All we know for certain at this point is that development in NWB is not dependent on such a facility.</p> <p><u>ISSUE OF PREMATURITY</u></p> <p>We believe that it is premature to determine how the N-STC, north of Sandalwood Parkway will be financed; if even necessary.</p> <p>If the N-STC north of Sandalwood is required at all, it will be required to accommodate development outside of NWB and possibly outside of Peel Region. Presumably, this will be determined through the ongoing Transportation and Transit Master Plan update ("TTMP") and/or the Halton Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study ("HP BATS") if not some other future transportation planning exercise undertaken by the City of Brampton, Region of Peel and the Region of Halton.</p> <p>Until the need for the facility has been confirmed, it is premature to attempt to define how it should be financed. However, we do know for certain now that it is not needed for NWB and, therefore, it cannot be a local service to be funded directly by landowners within NWB. Given that the Corridor south of Sandalwood Parkway is being funded 100% through Regional Development Charges, it is reasonable to expect that any extension of the N-STC will be similarly financed unless contributions from outside Peel are warranted. Regardless, under no circumstance would it be appropriate to look to the NWB landowners to directly fund it.</p> <p>Until the TTMP and HP BATS studies are completed and decisions made with respect to the N-STC north of Sandalwood, it is appropriate to continue to protect a Corridor of land for whatever facility may be needed for development outside of NWB.</p> <p>Recently a sub-set of Landowners known as the Heritage Heights Community Landowners Group formally requested that the City of Brampton commence the secondary planning process for the area west of Mississauga Road, west to the City limits. It would be helpful to advance the secondary planning in this area to help refine that Corridor as soon as possible.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>We trust this clarifies the NWBLG's position on this issue. We respectfully request that the City Council direct staff to issue an addendum to the Status Report to correct and clarify the City's position. We would gladly make ourselves available to meet with City staff to help redraft Figure 4 as may be appropriate, as well as assist in the preparation of the wording of any specific directives which may be deemed appropriate and helpful. We look forward to hearing back from you with respect to possible meeting dates.</p>	
Maple Lodge Farms	January 19, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basically, Maple Lodge Farms is looking for a road network solution in which there is no road west of the TCPL and south of the northern boundary of the existing plant. They are curious as to whether you have looked further at the option of having the parkway cross over north of the plant rather than through Lot 1. What impact would this have on Winston Churchill Blvd? ▪ In your version of the option where BW Pkwy crosses through Lot 1, what is the configuration of the intersection at Steeles? ▪ At our meeting in December, you mentioned an upcoming Public Information Meeting. Is there any update on the timing of such meeting? Will there be a "Maple Lodge Farms friendly" option proposed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ iTRANS had discussed with Maple Lodge Farms the possibility of having Bramwest Parkway cross over to Winston Churchill north of Maple Lodge Farms. This alternative and others would be evaluated as part of a future Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HP BATS) and environmental assessment study, which would also examine their impacts.
Orlando Corporation	February 4, 2009	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>The “dropping” of the Brampton freeway option from further consideration / evaluation as a road network alternative is supported and agreed to.</p> <p>Of the remaining 2 options, we recommend that the study should focus on the Halton Peel Freeway Option as the preferred alternative. The Halton Peel Freeway represents the most optimal road network solution, providing direct and easy access to both Hwy 401 and 407 ETR.</p> <p>The “Super Arterial” option is essentially the same as the Brampton Freeway option which is being dropped from further evaluation and cannot provide the road network functionality and benefits of the Halton Peel Freeway alternative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The future corridor of the North-South Transportation Corridor will be determined through the on-going Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HP BATS) study. The preferred alignment of option recommended by HPBATS will be finalized during the future environmental assessment study for the corridor. Any alignments currently shown in the 2004 TTMP, 2008 OP and 2009 TTMP are conceptual only, and

			will need to be confirmed.
Brampton Brick	February 18, 2009	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>I attended PIC #2 on February 4th on behalf of my Client, Brampton Brick Limited. The Company has recently filed a rezoning application for a proposed shale quarry on the east side of Winston Churchill Boulevard, in Lot 12, Concession 6 WHS. It is City File C06W12.002, situated within the designated North-South Corridor Protection Area.</p> <p>My Client and its technical advisors, including Paradigm Transportation Solutions Inc. generally agree with your preliminary findings for the alternative locations for a 2031 north-south road network. We wish to submit the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Major traffic routes should avoid the settlement of Norval; 2. The most direct crossing of the Credit River should be selected; 3. Winston Churchill Boulevard is already designated a “Regional Arterial”; and 4. Studies by SNC, 2005 and Paradigm, 2008 indicate that the reconstruction of Winston Churchill Boulevard, proposed as a joint project by the Regions of Peel and Halton for 2011 reconstruction, is urgently required and should satisfy long term, north-south traffic requirements, including our Client's proposed shale quarry, in the vicinity of the Peel-Halton boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comment noted
Northwest Brampton Landowners (Turkstra Mazza)	February 25, 2009	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>We represent the North West Brampton Landowners Group ("NWBLG"). As you know, the NWBLG has been very active in the planning of all aspects of the development of North West Brampton ("NWB"), including the necessary and appropriate planning infrastructure to support the full build-out of NWB.</p> <p>To that end, our client has been very supportive of the City's efforts to protect lands within West Brampton for the planning and development of the North-South Transportation Corridor ("N-STC") (now commonly referred to as the Aaron Laidlaw Parkway), as well as other transportation infrastructure as may be required to specifically support NWB.</p> <p>We have carefully reviewed the Status Report dated January 7, 2009 that was submitted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments noted ▪ The final list of alternatives to the North-South Transportation Corridor, its role and function, and other transportation improvements in north-west Brampton will be developed and assessed in the Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HP BATS).

		<p>to the Committee in respect of the ongoing TTMP Update. We note that, among other things, the Report identifies that one of the goals of the TTMP is to identify an "optimum transportation system in North West Brampton including the need and justification along with the potential role of North-South Corridor/Bram West Parkway."</p> <p>The Report attaches a series of "slides" that were used at the second Public Information Centre to summarize the preliminary findings of the TTMP. While NWBLG recognizes that these slides are meant to convey general, preliminary findings, the landowners have concerns with the "West Brampton Network Options" slide that we feel should be brought to your attention, as follows:</p> <p>1. The three network options that are being considered in West Brampton are not sufficient</p> <p>The slide indicates that the TTMP (in coordination with the Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study: "HPBATS") is considering three network options in West Brampton;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brampton "Super Arterial" 8-lane option - which is depicted running from Highway 407 through to Mayfield Road; ▪ Brampton Freeway option – which is depicted running from Highway 407 through to Mayfield Road; and ▪ Halton-Peel Freeway option – which is depicted running from Highways 407/401 north through Halton and then veering east into West Brampton. <p>NWBLG has the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All three of the options depict a higher order transportation facility running through North West Brampton all the way to Mayfield Road. The N-STC between Sandalwood Parkway and Mayfield Road is not required to accommodate traffic from NWB and is not necessary to support the full build out of NWB. This was the conclusion of BA Consulting Group which has never been contradicted. We stressed this essential fact in a letter dated November 27, 2008 to Brampton Council which is attached. It is unclear why, nevertheless, all three options depict a higher order transportation facility running through to Mayfield Road. ▪ The "Super Arterial" option depicts an 8-lane facility throughout its length. However, the work completed by BA Consulting Group (which was relied on by the Region of Peel in its Development Charge By-law Update) indicates that a 6-lane facility is only required to 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Bovaird Drive. From Bovaird Drive north to Sandalwood Parkway, the N-STC need only be four lanes in order to support the full build out of NWB. We are attaching a graphic prepared by BA Consulting Group which shows the road network that was tested and found to be sufficient to support the full build out of NWB and BramWest. As you will see, the NSTC is shown as six lanes to Bovaird Drive, four lanes between Bovaird Drive and Sandalwood Parkway and is not shown at all North of Sandalwood Parkway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only the "Halton Peel Freeway" option is shown as utilizing higher order transportation facilities within Halton. However, as shown on the BA Consulting Group graphic, there are arterial road options which would include a higher order Winston Churchill Boulevard bypass within Halton rather than a freeway. This road is highly desirable from Halton's perspective as it provides relief in the form of a bypass for traffic currently passing through Norval. It is also consistent with options that Halton tested in their Norval Bypass Environmental Assessment. ▪ These other options should be considered as part of the TTMP. Indeed, in our view, these other options tested by BA Group will likely emerge as the preferred transportation facilities to support development in West Brampton. <p>2. The focus on "freeway options" is problematic</p> <p>NWBLG recognizes that the TTMP is structured as a transportation master plan in accordance with the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>. As such, the City is required to consider a range of options as part of the environmental assessment. However, the NWBLG is concerned that two of the three network options are so called "freeway" options. Not only is any kind of freeway unnecessary to support the full build out of West Brampton, freeway options do not appear to be realistic because they are dependent on provincial involvement. We are unaware of any current plans from the province to extend a freeway through NWB. Consequently, we do not believe it is prudent to show two of the three options as "freeway" options.</p>	
<p>Bram West Secondary Plan Area landowners (LEA Consulting)</p>	<p>March 4, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>As you are aware, we are the transportation consultants retained by a group of landowners within Block 40-5, which is within the Bram West Secondary Plan Area. This letter is in response to the ongoing City of Brampton Transportation and Transit Master Plan ("TTMP") Sustainable Update.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Block 40-5 landowners group has been in the process of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The future alignment of the North-South Transportation Corridor will be determined during a future environmental assessment study for the corridor. Any alignments currently shown in the 2004 TTMP, 2008 OP and 2009

	<p>developing a Block Plan for the last several years but has been stymied by the process relating to the Bram West Parkway and the North-South Transportation Corridor. Although we currently question whether or not such connections are necessary and whether they will be constructed in the future, our clients are encouraged that the TTMP process has commenced. Further, our clients are hopeful that this process will be completed in short order so that the necessary environmental assessment processes can commence, ultimately defining the final road alignments.</p> <p>We would like to take this opportunity to provide our comments with respect to the TTMP and request further clarification for the matters which are outlined in this letter.</p> <p>Specifically, this letter was written to request clarification and further definition of the depicted road options within block 40-5. The Block 40-5 landowners group are concerned that the alignment and location of any potential connection between a Halton-Peel Freeway and Bramwest Parkway continues to vary within the TTMP update process. Currently, the various potential road options and connection locations being considered in the TTMP update each result in very different impacts upon the block. The landowners are, therefore, requesting that any potential road improvements be refined within the perceived existing constraints. In doing so, the landowners would be provided some degree of certainty that would be able to serve as a foundation for the development of the block plan.</p> <p>Proposed Road Network Option Inconsistencies</p> <p>Through a review of the materials associated with the TTMP update, various depictions of the potential Bramwest area road network are presented. The variations specifically occur regarding the location of the Halton-Peel Freeway and Bramwest Parkway connection, the consideration being given to the Halton-Peel Freeway, the Bramwest transit network, and Bramwest pathway network.</p> <p>First, in the 2004 TTMP, the area where the North-South Corridor and the Bramwest Parkway was illustrated to connect was north of Embleton Road (see Figure 1). However, in the City of Brampton’s Official Plan (October 2008), this connection was illustrated south of Embleton Road in Schedule B (see Figure 2). Regarding the materials prepared during the TTMP update, the location of the connection has been maintained from the 2004 TTMP in the illustration of the 2031 Road Network – Preliminary Findings (Display Board #27; see Figure 3). However, when the road network options are specifically considered for Bramwest (Display Board #28; see Figure 4), this connection of the two roads appears to occur farther south at</p>	<p>TTMP are conceptual only, and will need to be confirmed during a future environmental assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A future environmental assessment for the freeway connection will evaluate alternative alignments and their environmental impacts ▪ At this time, the potential H-P Freeway is not part of the recommended 2031 Transit Network
--	--	---

		<p>Embleton Road.</p> <p>Further verbally and in the presentation given at the second public information centre, it was expressed that the preferred location for the connection of these two roadways would be south of Embleton Road, however, this has not been substantiated in any of the materials associated with the TTMP update.</p> <p>Understanding the importance of not precluding or predetermining the outcome of any future environmental assessments, the illustrated road allowances will potentially serve as a component of the needs and justification for each of the roads. As a result, consistent illustration of the potential plans can be seen to have future importance. In comparing the materials, should it be concluded that the connection of the two roads is intended to occur south of Embleton Road? Further, will this be consistently depicted in the potential scenarios that are ultimately depicted?</p> <p>Second, while Display Board #29 notes that Halton-Peel Freeway is still under consideration and that it should be protected for, which is also supported in the illustrations on Display Boards #27 and #29, the potential Halton-Peel Freeway is notably missing from the illustration of the 2031 Transit Network (Display Board #22; see Figure 5). Should it then be inferred from this that the Halton-Peel Freeway will not be a component of the 2031 base road network?</p> <p>Third, neither the Halton-Peel Freeway nor the Bramwest Parkway is illustrated in Display Board #25 that notes potential BRT connections to the Lisgar GO Station. Since the Bramwest Parkway transit corridor, which will service most of the future development in the Northwest and Bramwest areas, is not depicted, the Bramwest Parkway transit corridor, nor any other feeder routes, appears to have been included in the evaluation of the preferred route.</p> <p>Lastly, on Display Board #35 it is noted that the Pathways Routing Plan developed in 2006 will continue to be supported. Specifically, within the Bramwest area, the Pathways Routing Plan depicts a Class 1 Pathway, which appears to coincide with the above noted potential alignments of the Bramwest Parkway (see Figure 6). Is it the intent that this pathway will be a boulevard path, and in doing so follow the alignment of a Bramwest Parkway? Furthermore, does this also then imply that there will be a connection to Williams Parkway?</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Perceived Existing Constraints</p> <p>Considering the various potential Bramwest road network options, a number of perceived constraints can be identified. Regarding the potential location of a connection between the Halton-Peel Freeway and Bramwest Parkway, through the materials its location was shown to vary north and south of Embleton Road. If the connection would be located north of Embleton Road, it is likely that environmental and social impacts would occur. Specifically, the environmental impacts would result from the connection of these two facilities occurring closer to the Credit Valley, while the social impacts would come from the required expropriation of likely a large number of properties along Embleton Road.</p> <p>As the location of the connection between the Halton-Peel Freeway and Bramwest Parkway shifts farther to the south to Embleton Road, it will likely have less environmental impacts on the Credit Valley, but will continue to require the expropriation of a large number of properties along Embleton Road. The perceived environmental impacts on the Credit Valley and the property impacts along Embleton Road are potentially mitigated when the connection of the two facilities occurs well to the south of Embleton Road, until the point where it begins to interfere with Maple Lodge Farms.</p> <p>The intent of noting the constraints in this letter was not intended, at this time, to reduce the corridor protection area illustrated in the Official Plan and Bramwest Secondary Plan, or preclude or predetermine any alignment option of a future environmental assessment, but rather to contribute a conclusion that it is reasonable to illustrate the connection of any Halton-Peel Freeway and Bramwest Parkway to the south of Embleton Road. Therefore, based on the noted variations in the proposed future road network for the Bramwest area and existing constraints, the Block 40-5 Landowners Group are requesting that a clarification and coordination of the allowances being made for a potential Halton-Peel Freeway and Brampton Parkway be conducted</p>	
<p>Block 5 Landowners Group within the Credit Valley Secondary Plan - Fieldgate Developments</p>	<p>March 16, 2009</p>	<p>Over the past several months Block 5 residents have been engaged in discussions with various departments about the delivery of James Potter Road through Block 5 lands. We have worked to craft the preliminary agreements for the early delivery of this road through the development program within the block. Brampton has expressed that it is their intention for James Potter Road to be part of the first phase of the Block 5 development as this roadway is required to meet the immediate needs of existing residents not only from a traffic perspective but also to deliver key regional facilities which will be serviced by this road (district schools and parks). Consequently, it is imperative that the final TTMP recognize that the delivery of James Potter Road is essential in the short term and respectfully request that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comment noted

<p>Northwest Brampton Landowners (BA Group)</p>	<p>March 30, 2009</p>	<p>its timing be brought forward to 2010, not 2015 as previously stated. <i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>On the evening of February 4th I attended the Public Information Centre #2 held for the above captioned study on behalf of the Northwest Brampton group of landowners. Since that evening, I have taken the opportunity to review the material that was made available, and have conferred with the landowner’s group as to the approach this study is taking with respect to their specific interests.</p> <p>In general, the material provided and the presentation that was made at the PIC were self explanatory. Information of a more detailed nature with respect to both the inputs (such as growth projections) and outputs would have been useful. It is hoped that this information will all be made available in the draft report expected in April.</p> <p>With respect to the specific interests of the Northwest Brampton landowners, these clearly relate to the significant proposed road network improvements in west Brampton, which include the North South Transportation Corridor and associated Bramwest Parkway (as illustrated on page 28 of the PIC material). In a letter addressed to John Corbett and dated February 25th, Scott Snider of Turkstra Mazza Associates presented the position of the Northwest Brampton landowner’s group with respect to these roads.</p> <p>In this letter, we seek to clarify the status of the work being done within the TTMP study with respect to the North South Transportation Corridor (NSTC), and the City’s intentions with respect to related work that is beyond the scope of the TTMP study.</p> <p>Environmental Assessment Status of the NSTC through the TTMP Process</p> <p>City of Brampton staff have indicated on several occasions that the completed and approved TTMP is intended to fulfill the requirements of a Transportation Master Plan under the Environmental Assessment Act, and thereby to fulfill the Phase 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment requirements for the proposed 2031 City of Brampton road network components. In this regard, BA Group has made specific inquiries with respect to the NSTC. The response we have received indicates that in the specific case of the NSTC, the TTMP cannot fulfill Phase 1 and 2 requirements. This is because the full range of options for implementing the NSTC cannot be appropriately dealt with except through the multi-agency Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HPBATS).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA master plan process for Bramwest Parkway and the North-South Transportation Corridor are to be fulfilled as part of the Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study ▪ The TTMP confirms the need for the North-South Transportation Corridor between Sandalwood Parkway and Mayfield Road. ▪ Growth assumptions for Brampton and Caledon are documented in Section 5 of the TTMP report. ▪ All recommendations in this area are subject to Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HP BATS)
---	-----------------------	---	--

		<p>1a. Can City of Brampton staff confirm that BA Group’s understanding is correct and that the TTMP study will not fulfill the Phase 1 and 2 EA requirements for the North South Transportation Corridor?</p> <p>1b. Can City of Brampton staff clarify whether or not the TTMP study will fulfill the Phase 1 and 2 EA requirements for the Bram West Parkway?</p> <p>Range of NSTC options to be Assessed In the material provided at both PIC #1 and PIC #2 for the TTMP study, we noted that the options being investigated for the west Brampton road network do not include any arterial road components within the Region of Halton. We would draw your attention in particular to a concept developed by BA Group a number of years ago (and submitted to the City most recently as an attachment to Scott Snider’s letter of February 25th), as well as to the Norval Bypass Environmental Assessment Study commenced by the Region of Halton about 10 years ago and currently on hold. There are clearly road network problems to solve on both sides of the Halton-Peel boundary, and thereby the opportunity to solve these problems in a coordinated and integrated manner which will benefit the communities on both sides of the boundary. We note that the NSTC options presented on page 28 of the TTMP material do not provide solutions to, for example, the Norval Bypass issue, nor the need to provide significant additional capacity along the sensitive Winston Churchill Boulevard corridor.</p> <p>2. Can City of Brampton staff confirm that during the HPBATS process (a process in which to date our clients and ourselves have not been privy to the scope, inputs, or interim findings of the work) a broader set of arterial road alternatives are being considered?</p> <p>Continuation of the NSTC north of Sandalwood Parkway The NSTC options illustrated on page 28 of the PIC material do not show an option that stops at Sandalwood Parkway. This suggests that one of the findings of the TTMP is that the NSTC is required to be built north as far as Mayfield Road in order to support future growth in Brampton. As indicated to City staff in the past, and most recently through Scott Snider’s letter of February 25th, BA Group’s findings in this regard were quite different when we conducted an assessment of the NSTC on behalf of our clients in 2003. Our conclusion was that the significant capacity constraint that warranted the construction of a high capacity road corridor (the NSTC) was the Credit Valley. Having crossed the valley and connected as</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>appropriate to the east-west road network at Williams Parkway, Bovaird Drive and Sandalwood Parkway, there was no road capacity related reason to continue this corridor further north. This was tested by assessing networks with and without this link (between Sandalwood Parkway and Mayfield Road) in place.</p> <p>It is unclear what options for the NSTC have been tested as part of the TTMP and in particular, whether the option of stopping the NSTC at Sandalwood Parkway has been examined.</p> <p>3a. Can City of Brampton staff confirm that the necessity for an NSTC link from Sandalwood Parkway to Mayfield Road has been specifically tested by the TTMP team, and that it is supported by their findings?</p> <p>3b. Can the future Brampton and Caledon growth assumptions used to make this determination, as well as the results of the relevant analysis, be provided to us?</p>	
<p>Mount Pleasant Community Landowners' Group (BA Group)</p>	<p>April 3, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>On the evening of February 4th I attended the Public Information Centre #2 held for the above captioned study on behalf of the Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Area group of landowners. Since that evening, I have taken the opportunity to review the material that was made available, and have conferred with the landowner's group as to the approach this study is taking with respect to their specific interests. As you know, the TTMP is a critical document with respect to the City's new Development Charge By-law and consequently of considerable importance to the Landowners Group.</p> <p>With respect to the specific interests of the Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Area landowners, these relate primarily to the timing of the road works related to the development of this community. While no information related to interim (pre 2031) timing of roads was made at the PIC, it is understood that this comprises a part of the remaining work being undertaken by the City's consultant, and that recommendation regarding timing will be included in the draft report.</p> <p>The landowner's consultants, Urbantech and BA Consulting Group, have on several occasions over the last few years provided City staff with information as to the timing of infrastructure projects (roads and utilities) necessary for development of the Mount Pleasant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comment noted

		<p>Secondary Plan Area. Based on the current status of the various studies under way, and the anticipated timeline for development of this community, the landowner’s consulting team currently estimates the required timing of City road works in this area as shown in the table below.</p> <p>We note that in the TTMP material provided at PIC #2, the graphic illustrating the recommended 2031 road network included a number of collector roads, including the Mount Pleasant Community Transit Spine Road. While it was not explicitly indicated that this road was to be included in the Development Charges road program, it does seem to be a logical candidate for inclusion in the DC as it is not a “typical” collector road. This road will play a key role with respect to the successful delivery of transportation services to this transit oriented community. The need for it, and consideration of it’s unique role and character have been addressed in the transportation reports prepared for this community by both Entra Consultants (Transportation Master Plan EA) and Poulos and Chung (ADS).</p> <p>(See table in attached letter)</p> <p>The ability to deliver some of these projects (such as Wanless Drive between Creditview Road and Mississauga Road, and the Spine Road) will depend on their status with respect to the roads EA process currently underway. As such, the achievable timing for delivery may be sooner or later as the case may be.</p>	
--	--	---	--

3.1.2 Brampton Central Area Improvements

Stakeholder	Date Received	Comment	Response
Brampton Downtown Development Corporation	September 30, 2008	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Opposed to John Street Extension for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Street is not a viable alternative to Queen, since it is one-way eastbound between Main and Chapel Street. ▪ Queen and James intersection would be too close to a John extension and James intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Street is a viable alternative if part of a network solution, supporting intensification and redevelopment ▪ Part of existing collector road network identified in OP ▪ Connect to Main via Wellington

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Negative impact on other streets in the downtown area – especially potential doubling of traffic on Wellington Street and Mary Street. ▪ Potential negative impact on desirability of new developments in the area. ▪ Potential negative impact on attracting businesses both to the Downtown area and the City as a whole. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John extension will serve local traffic ▪ Intersection spacing will not be an issue based on forecast traffic volumes ▪ James realignment proposal does not and should not preclude John St. extension ▪ Anticipated increase in traffic on Wellington and Mary can be accommodated by these roads
<p>Brampton Downtown Development Corporation</p>	<p>February 17, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>I attended the Public Information Centre for the TTMP on February 4, 2009 and have subsequently reviewed the hand-out materials. The BDDC is interested in all of the potential transportation connections identified on the Central Brampton slide and would like to be kept informed of the outcome of the detailed analyses.</p> <p>The BDDC Board of Directors has already taken a position supporting the realignment of James Street across the GO Rail line and opposing the John Street Extension. Our rationale is outlined in the two attached letters. We also submitted the attached letter related to the Ken Whillans Drive Extension EA Study, but are awaiting further information from the consultant and the City to address our question about the impact on the future redevelopment of Rosalea Park.</p> <p>We are supportive of the inclusion Travel Demand Management and Active Transportation as key components of the overall transportation strategies for the city. In particular, we are interested in promoting biking and walking to/within downtown Brampton, which also requires providing a safe network of pathways and bike routes.</p> <p>We are also supportive of channeling the movement of heavy truck traffic outside of the downtown core and for ensuring that truck routes are well identified and enforced.</p> <p>In conclusion, we request the opportunity to provide further comments once the detailed analyses for the Central Area have been completed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments noted

<p>Richard Hahn</p>	<p>February 20, 2009</p>	<p>While the presentation [PIC #2) was clear and easy to decipher there did not seem to much new information from the previous PIC.</p> <p>With the exception of the extension of the horizon date from 2021 date to 2031. I suppose that not much should have changed given that the previous TTMP which was quite thorough in scope and detail. The conclusions have been presented without any detailed back up because they just simply appear. Few specific dates, or programs deliverables which is rather astonishing since it all exists in the previous TTMP up to 2021. I am aware that this detailed information may not be available for some time well into April. Again that is rather astonishing since the majority of the short to mid term information already exists and that the further 10 year horizon is composed of some more wishful thinking based upon some very long term population forecasts all of which are updated as the years go by.</p> <p>At this stage and level of work I would have thought a more detailed and precise working could be offered in connection which the shorter 5 – 10 yr road / development forecasts. That could have been keyed and echoed to coincide with existing approved development and future development. These City road programs need to be correlated to Secondary plan, Block plan and draft approvals. Projected dates need to be shown and specific roads and programs deliveries need to be coordinated.</p> <p>How can proper commentary be provided when the details are omitted?</p>	<p>▪ Comments noted</p>
<p>Toronto Region Conservation Authority</p>	<p>February 20, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff received the Draft Meeting Minutes for the TTMP Update on January 15, 2009. Staff has reviewed the minutes and, although we (Beth Williston, Sharon Lingertat) were unable to attend the Technical Advisory Committee meeting of December 19, 2008, clarification regarding future development within the Brampton downtown core is required.</p> <p>The minutes identify in Item #3 that the Ken Whillans Extension EA is underway and that there is a need to find another north-south route. The minutes further state that iTRANS will meet with the City of Brampton regarding the status of some of the improvements within the Downtown core. It is important to clarify that TRCA and City of Brampton staff are still in discussions regarding the Ken Whillans Drive and Flood Protection Study EA. A significant portion of the downtown core is within the flood plain and Special Policy Area (SPA) in which development restrictions and flood related requirements have been established. TRCA</p>	<p>▪ Comments noted</p>

		<p>staff is also in discussions with Provincial staff regarding development of flood prone areas within the Brampton downtown core. All development, including road and transit applications, are reviewed by TRCA staff on a case by case basis and may have restrictions based on existing natural hazards.</p> <p>Please keep us informed as the project progresses</p>	
Brampton Downtown Development Corporation	May 22, 2009	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>The BDDC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continues to oppose the extension of John Street across Etobicoke Creek, and continues to support the realignment of the James Street crossing of the GO line. 2. Has concerns about how the extension of Ken Whillans Drive will impact the redevelopment of Rosalea Park. 3. Recommends that the City have a meeting with the Peel Memorial Hospital Steering Committee, members of Council, City staff and public agencies to discuss transportation and transit issues in the area. The TTMP shows John Street running as a collector road through the Peel Memorial Hospital property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments noted

3.1.3 Transit Improvements

Stakeholder	Date Received	Comment	Response
Resident, Chris Bejnar	October 29, 2008	<p>After attending the Sept. 23, 2008 Public Information presentation for the Brampton Transportation and Transit Master Plan, I have some suggestions to submit for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Metrolinx looks at integrating all transit authorities under one Metrolinx banner. So not to lose identity of each city, one could have distinctive colours representing the various regions of the GTA that Metrolinx would operate and control. <p>Ex. Orange- Mississauga Dark Blue-Brampton Red-Toronto Light Blue- Vaughan</p> <p>The second part would take more time. Develop common policies and standards for all</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments noted

	<p>Metrolinx buses, LRT rail cars and subway cars. This would create a uniform fleet that would be more accommodate to maintain. Purchasing for all infrastructure would be made from one source to create enormously and save precious tax dollars. This of course would need the cooperation of all municipalities and would take anywhere from 10-15 years to develop. At the end of the day, we would truly have an integrated transit system.</p> <p>2) Please consider changing Brampton Transit Route # 51 for it to stop right at the RBC Centre located just south of Financial Dr. and Derry Rd. in Mississauga. There is a unique route #81 operated by Mississauga Transit that goes directly from this location straight to the Islington subway station during the morning and afternoon rush hours. Having the Brampton bus integrated with this stop would provide Route 51 users an opportunity to commute to the TTC subway. At present, Route 51 makes a turn west onto Derry from Financial. This route can be easily re-worked.</p> <p>3) Queen Street corridor from Main St. to Dixie Rd. Make provisions today when improvements are planned to accommodate a future “electrified” LRT line that could one day connect the Hurontario LRT line to the Bramalea City Shopping Centre area. Millions of dollars are being spent to renovate and improve the BCC at present. This area has many high density residential buildings that would provide the needed density to support transit.</p> <p>4) The Hwy # 407 corridor that spans the entire GTA from Burlington to Pickering has an enormous potential to become a rail transit corridor. Imagine the thousands of commuters having the option to be able to travel from one end of the GTA to the other! There is plenty of land adjacent on the north and south sides of Hwy. # 407 to accommodate such a transit initiative.</p> <p>5) That the proposed Metrolinx Hurontario line be diverted to the Peel Memorial Hospital site via Meadowland Park just north of the Brampton Mall located at Nanwood Dr. and Main St. S. The existing GO/VIA/ Brampton Transit Bus Terminal located at Main St. N. and Nelson St. W. is too small and too congested to accommodate the future population growth of Brampton, estimated at 700,000+ in 20 years. By moving the GO Train/Bus, Metrolinx Hurontario LRT and Brampton Transit to a new large modern Transit hub that could be built at the south end of the Peel Memorial Hospital site property would have a huge impact on the future growth and revitalization of Brampton’s downtown core. The VIA rail station would remain at it’s present site and be</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>connected to the new transit hub/re-developed Peel Memorial Hospital site by a Brampton Transit route.</p> <p>6) That the old Orangeville Rail line that cuts a north/south corridor from north Brampton to the Streetsville GO station in Mississauga be re-activated as a quiet, electric LRT line that could connect residents from south Caledon, to Downtown Brampton, to the Streetsville Go Station in Mississauga. The rail line is there and has not been used for at least 5 years now.</p>	
<p>Resident, Chris Bejnar</p>	<p>January 28, 2009</p>	<p>As we move forward into 2009, I believe we must take one step back, to move two steps forward with our planned transit initiatives in Brampton. There are several key projects that could literally transform the future of Brampton if done properly. I believe missing these opportunities will severely hamper the potential for Brampton’s downtown core.</p> <p>1) Metrolinx LRT/BRT Hurontario line into the south side of the Peel Memorial Hospital site via Etobicoke creek and Meadowland Park. Current proposals to take this new transit line into the existing Nelson St. bus and GO station will be extremely challenging. The present station is already too congested and too small to expand for a city that will have over 700,000 residents in the next 15-20 years. I believe that this has such huge potential that I have been dedicating many hours of my own personal time trying to share my ideas with key individuals and decision makers. By working with the WOHC, Central West LHIN, Brampton’s Planning Dept. GO Transit and property holders, we can transform downtown Brampton and make it the envy of the GTA! We can be the model for Ontario’s Places to Grow initiatives. We won’t have to spend hundreds of thousands of tax dollars for consultants on how to attract hotels, business and developers into the downtown, they will come to us! By having a GO Station, and Acceleride LRT station integrated into the site will create tremendous momentum for future development of the downtown. WOHC is in the process of revamping the PMH site. I am still hopeful for a full service hospital to be located there, but fear that we will be only getting an Ambulatory and Urgent Care Centre.....that’s another e-mail! To make the Hurontario line a huge success, it must be a light rail system, not buses. Light rail is quiet and environmentally friendly. More importantly, it’s what residents want. There is a negative stigma taking the bus. If we make our main corridors more like European streets, we will see residents wanting to use transit more.</p>	<p>▪ Comments noted</p>

		<p>2) Acceleride- Queen St. Corridor. We have almost 100 million dollars ready to be spent just to “glorify” taking the bus. I recently took some time to observe the VIVA system in York Region. Millions and Millions of dollars have been spent on fancy buses and fancy bus shelters and a fancy website. I observed lots of empty buses and bus stops even during the peak rush hour. We are now going to duplicate a system like this? If we are going to stop using the car (including myself) we have to create transit that the people will actually want to use. In Europe, trains and light rail are everywhere! As well, they use Canadian technology from Bombardier to accomplish their transit goals and initiatives. Where do we see the same technology in Canada? In fact the VIVA system will transform to light rail in the future. The following is a excerpt from the VIVA website:</p> <p>“vivaNext” is where viva is going next. for starters, it will take viva rtvs out of mixed traffic and run them on dedicated rapidways along segments of some of the region’s busiest corridors – highway 7, yonge street, davis drive – speeding riders past traffic and reducing ride times by up to 40%. vivaNext rapidways will improve connections among regional growth centres and provide links to other key transit services such as GO rail and the subway system. Eventually, vivaNext will replace buses on the dedicated rapidways with an even faster light rail transit system.</p> <p>Does this make any sense? After spending millions of dollars creating the system as it is today, they still have to create these dedicated rapidways down the centre of the street and move all of the infrastructure from the curbside to the centre? Why not do this in the first place? I hope we are not looking down the same path. In my opinion, shared by many other Brampton residents, the Queen St. Corridor and the Hurontario corridor should be light rail transit. Other Acceleride corridors like Steeles Ave. and Bovaird should use dedicted rapidways with bus rapid transit.</p> <p>Imagine linking the Bramalea City Centre to the PMH site then down Hurontario to Mississauga. There are already a few vacant lots of land along Queen St. ready for development if only the environment is created. By running a light rail system down Queen would be the best way to transform the Queen St. corridor from the downtown to BCC.</p> <p>I would encourage yourself and members of council to go and ride the VIVA system yourself and see if this has truly changed the mindset of the York Region resident to take public transit and leave the car at home. I would be very interested to see what ridership was</p>	
--	--	---	--

		prior to VIVA and how much has it actually increased after the system was implemented. I have e-mailed VIVA to see if they can provide these #'s but have not received a response to date.....I wonder why?	
GO Transit	January 29, 2009	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>I am writing to follow up to the TTMP Technical Agencies Committee meeting on December 19th, and the minutes recently distributed by iTRANS. GO Transit is overall supportive of the direction of the plan, in particular the increased emphasis on public transit service and the implementation of the AcceleRide BRT. We submit the following comments for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GO acknowledges the proposals for grade separation from the rail corridor along Mississauga Road, Heritage Road and the proposed West Brampton arterial / freeway connecting Mayfield Road to Highways 407 and 401. In addition, we would like to see additional traffic projections for the level crossing at John Street if the Clark Blvd-Eastern Ave-John Street connection is pursued. We reserve the right to comment further on these candidates for grade-separated crossings at subsequent planning and design stages. ▪ GO Transit is generally supportive of the City’s proposal to develop a transit-supportive node at Queen Street and Highway 50 and would like to participate in more specific discussions with the City and iTrans regarding the development of this node. A challenge of this location will be in creating a walkable, transit-oriented development pattern that would complement the transit node and ensure that public transit is an attractive alternative for travel to and from the area. ▪ GO Transit supports the proposal to have the Main Street BRT connect to the Highway 407 Transitway. If at all possible, we would like to see the GO Park and Ride facility at Highway 10 and Highway 407 served by Brampton Transit in advance of the BRT launch. This Park and Ride will be opening in spring 2009 and will serve 407 express services including to Mississauga, Guelph University and York University. ▪ GO Transit supports the preferred option of using Bramalea Road for the north-south BRT connection in eastern Brampton, rather than the other alternative routes being considered. In addition to other key destinations, the Bramalea Road option will provide optimal access to the Bramalea GO station (a significant local trip generator), as well as to express services on Highway 407. ▪ GO Transit will be undertaking a study to assess the feasibility of constructing a westbound onramp onto Highway 407 at Bramalea Road as well as examining other measures to improve bus access to Bramalea GO Station for both GO and Brampton Transit buses. As a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments noted

		<p>key stakeholder in this initiative, the City of Brampton will be forwarded more information as this study moves forward. It would be valuable for the Bramalea GO Station to be identified in the TTMP as a key location for transit improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GO Transit’s recently released strategic plan (GO 2020) includes the objective to double the proportion of passengers accessing GO Stations by walking, bicycling and local transit by 202. We will be working to improve the pedestrian and cycling friendliness of GO Stations, as well as working with local municipalities to develop better walking and cycling routes to GO Stations. Considering that a clear need has not been demonstrated for a vehicular Denison Avenue connection to Mill Street, we suggest that the City consider completing this portion of the central City network with a pathway connection for pedestrians and cyclists only. This will help improve options for non-motorized travel to access transit services at both the GO Station and the Brampton Transit Terminal. 	
<p>Resident, Chris Bejnar</p>	<p>February 6, 2009</p>	<p>After attending the Brampton Transportation and Transit Master Plan Public Information Session on Feb. 4, 2009, I did not find the information presented by iTRANS consulting to be very informative. The same old information from the past few years was presented with very little new facts, concepts or ideas on how to get a Brampton resident off their car dependency and start using public transportation.</p> <p>Some of the discussions that evening revolved around York Region’s VIVA transit project. If we are to duplicate VIVA’s BRT “Phase 1” concept, I believe we will not be spending our tax dollars wisely. To create a “glorified” bus service at the curb side of the roadway is wasting time and money. What we need is rapidways down the centre of each major roadway able to accommodate a BRT for (Bovaird, Steeles) and LRT for (Huronario/Main, Queen).</p> <p>Better coordination of our tax dollars has to take place. As an example, we have identified Acceleride East / West corridors as early as 2004, those being Bovaird, Queen and Steeles. Major road construction projects have taken place over the past few years along Queen and Steeles, with new curbs, sidewalk repairs, utility repositioning and asphalt resurfacing. Why weren’t plans made to incorporate widening or adding infrastructure to accommodate a future centre rapidway for BRT or LRT? We know that these corridors must one day exist, why not take advantage of funds that were available at the time? Both the Region of Peel and the City are aware of these projects. Better planning and coordination between different levels of governments must take place in the future.</p> <p>The reason I am writing everyone today is to share an excellent website with you. It is www.lightrailnow.org This website addresses all of the facts when comparing Bus Rapid</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments noted.

	<p>Transit vs. Light Rail Transit. It has many case studies from other municipalities across North America, Europe and Australia. It offers excellent information on why Light Rail is better to increase transit ridership, has a lower cost of ownership, help's revitalize downtown's and is overwhelmingly the preferred choice of transit riders worldwide. It casts doubt on the advantages of BRT systems specifically that they are a "cheaper" system. I encourage everyone to review this site. I found it to be very interesting, factual and informative!</p> <p>The following are some excerpts from just some of the articles I've read:</p> <p>1) The Bottom Line: The planning process, and particularly the analysis of LRT vs. "BRT" alternatives, needs a stronger dose of real-world experience, and less speculation and rigid reliance on rather mechanistic modeling. The <i>performance records</i> of numerous examples of LRT and "BRT" systems in actual operation should speak for themselves. <i>It's certainly difficult to ignore or dismiss what to most reasonable people would seem to be a rather distinctive superiority of rail transit services in attracting the public away from motor vehicles and into public transport.</i></p> <p>2) Is the ability of "BRT" ("Bus Rapid Transit") to attract rider's equivalent to that of light rail? Recent experience with new light rail vs. new "BRT" starts, an historical review, and other evidence suggest that theory-based ridership forecasting models, approved by an FTA promoting "BRT", may not tell planners, decision makers, and the public the whole story.</p> <p>As I stated at Wednesday's Public meeting, have members of City Planning, Brampton Transit and City Council actually taken a ride on the VIVA BRT system? Is this what we want for our "showcase" corridors along Queen and Main/Hurontario?</p>	
--	--	--

Appendix A-4

Transportation & Transit Master Plan
Sustainable Update

**Agency comments on
Draft TTMP Report
August 2009 to September 2009**

4. AGENCY COMMENTS ON DRAFT TTMP REPORT, AUGUST 2009 TO SEPTEMBER 2009

Comments from agencies and organizations on the Draft TTMP Final Report dated July 2009, and the response and / or action taken, are summarized in this Appendix. The comments are summarized by key themes and then by the commenting agency or organization.

4.1 North South Transportation Corridor

Comment #	Name / Organization	Date Received	Comment	Response
1	Region of Peel	September 4, 2009	The Region acknowledges that the network performance evaluations and subsequent recommendations and depictions in exhibits in the 2009 TTMP are based on the “working assumption” of the North South Transportation Corridor (NSTC) operating as a high order arterial road (given the TTMP’s scope of determining roadway improvements within Brampton’s boundaries and its use in the updating of Brampton’s DC bylaw). We note, however, that completion of the Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HP BATS), which will confirm the need for a NSTC and other potential transportation improvements in west Brampton, may require refinement of the recommendations in the TTMP. HP BATS will also define the role and function of the NSTC, which will provide the basis for determining jurisdictional responsibility for ownership and maintenance.	The TTMP Report states that final recommendations on the NSTC corridor, its role and function, and other transportation improvements in west Brampton will rely on the outcome of the Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HP BATS).

4.2 Compliance with other EAs and Studies

Comment #	Name / Organization	Date Received	Comment	Response
2	City of Mississauga	August 31, 2009	<p>Long Term Transit Network</p> <p>As you are aware, the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Metrolinx Business Case Analysis for the Hurontario Corridor are still underway and will inform the appropriate transit technology for the corridor. Accordingly, we suggest that the TTMP transit schedules note that the BRT technology along the Hurontario corridor is subject to outcomes of the ongoing EA.</p>	Comment noted; wording will be added to Section 7.2.1.
3	Halton Region & Town of Halton Hills	August 27, 2009	<p>Also, it is unclear whether Recommendation 9 of the Brampton Council Report, dated June 30, 2009 is requesting that the findings of the TTMP with respect to the Norval By-pass be incorporated into HP BATS, or be reconsidered under the HP BATS work. It is our opinion that the environmental work completed to date is not sufficient to be able depict the crossing associated with a by-pass as having "significant environmental impacts", and that the pinch point created within Norval must be addressed in conjunction with the widening of Bovaird Drive West (Hwy 7) and Winston Churchill Boulevard.</p>	Comment noted. In the TTMP Report, the need for improved east-west connections and alternative network improvements in west Brampton are referred to the Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study.

4	Halton Region & Town of Halton Hills	August 27, 2009	Recommendations related to the initiation of the Bram West Parkway EA would also appear to anticipate the outcome of the on-going HP BATS work which will establish a preferred North-South Transport Corridor. We would ask that this and any other recommendations specifically related to matters under consideration through HP BATS, recognize that they are subject to the finding of the HP BATS.	Comment noted. The TTMP is clearly recognizing the ongoing HP BATS process and any future EA initiated by the City would recognize and protect for that process and its ultimate conclusions to be incorporated.
---	--------------------------------------	-----------------	--	--

4.3 Transportation Demand Management

Comment #	Name / Organization	Date Received	Comment	Response
5	Region of Peel	September 4, 2009	Regional staff recommends that the TTMP say more about the planning and implementation of TDM measures. The TDM efforts mentioned in the TTMP are a step in the right direction. We believe that it would be beneficial for Brampton to accelerate their actions in both the planning and implementation of TDM measures (and to mention this in the TTMP). The Region will be happy to work collaboratively with Brampton in this area, as we are implementing a number of TDM projects that have been identified in the Region's Five Year TDM work plan.	Comment noted. The TTMP will strive to deepen the planning and implementation of TDM measures and to reflect the cooperation opportunities between The City and the Region.

4.4 Recommended Road Network Issues

Comment #	Name / Organization	Date Received	Comment	Response
6	City of Mississauga	August 31, 2009	<p>Long Term Road Network</p> <p>We note that the 2021 long term road network recommends the widening of Bramalea Road and Torbram Road to 6 lanes to the Mississauga boundary. As mentioned in our 2004 comments on the Brampton TTMP, the City of Mississauga does not support these widening projects and recommends that the TTMP be revised to reflect a 4 lane cross section to be consistent with Mississauga's Official Plan and avoid bottle necks at the Brampton / Mississauga boundary.</p> <p>We would be happy to meet with you and the consultant to review their modelling forecasts on this issue.</p>	<p>We have confirmed that the TTMP model is forecasting need for 4 lanes on Bramalea Road and on Torbram Road, south of Highway 407, for the 2031 road network. The figures will be adjusted to reflect this.</p>
7	Halton Region & Town of Halton Hills	August 27, 2009	<p>Specifically, the 2031 recommended road network (exhibit 7-8, Transportation Report) has identified the need to widen both Bovaird Drive West (to Halton Hills boundary) and Winston Churchill Boulevard (North and South of Norval) to four lanes. The Regions concern is that there has been no consideration that Highway 7 and Winston Churchill Boulevard though Norval cannot physically be widened beyond its current configuration. As the TTMP relies on the widening of these facilities to accommodate the projected growth in Brampton, it is imperative that the excessive congestion though the Hamlet of Norval be considered.</p>	<p>We recognize that Highway 7 and Winston Churchill Boulevard cannot be widened through Norval. Congestion problems in Norval and alternative transportation solutions are being addressed in HP BATS which will produce final recommendations for transportation improvements in the Norval area.</p>

8	Region of Peel	September 4, 2009	<p>At this time, Regional staff cannot support some of the recommended road network improvements pertaining to Regional roads that are included in the TTMP. As noted in our comments on the Draft TTMP, the Regional Road improvements depicted in Exhibits 7-8 to 7-12 – recommended road network needs by 2011, 2016, 2021, 2031 and Beyond 2031 – are not consistent with the current Regional Road Program (Capital Plan and Development Charges by-law). Inconsistencies include Queen Street between McLaughlin Road and Mississauga Road, Bovaird Drive west of Mississauga Road and Winston Churchill Blvd from Steeles to Bovaird. The Region is currently undertaking a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update, which will recommend Regional Road improvement needs for the future horizon years. Through the LRTP Update exercise Regional staff will review and confirm the Regional road improvements included in these TTMP exhibits.</p>	<p>The TTMP is intended as a needs based analysis that will feed future input into the Regional LRTP and Regional Capital Budget. The same philosophy is true for the City. The TTMP will be used as basis for input to City budget forecast but will not always be reflected in the budget as other factors such as logistics and funding availability are factored in.</p>
9	York Region	August 28, 2009	<p>Table 7-5 (Northeast Brampton Road Improvements) has identified a widening of Castlemore Road through to Highway 50 and the Mayfield – Major Mackenzie Link to 6 lanes. It is important to note that York Region’s draft update to the Transportation Master Plan and ongoing West Vaughan IEA have recommended a future widening of Major Mackenzie Drive and Rutherford Road to 4 general purpose lanes plus transit priority including such measures as HOV lanes, queue jump lanes and / or transit signal priority through to the York Peel Boundary.</p>	<p>Comment noted, section 7.1, Implementation Philosophy, will include language specific to boundary area connections allowing for appropriate transitions.</p>

10	York Region	August 28, 2009	<p>Further, to accommodate the Region’s design standard for 6 lane Regional roads identified in our Towards Great Region Streets – A Path to Improvements (Design Guidelines for 6-lane Regional Streets), the rights-of-way requirements along both roads have been increased from 36m to 43m in the Region’s draft Official Plan. The Region understands that the City of Brampton maintains a 36m ROW through these corridors.</p> <p>Further coordination will be required between the City of Brampton and the Region of York in constructing these boundary area connections, to ensure that the transition between the ROW standard is accommodated. In an effort to maintain intersection operations at Highway 50, it is recommended that the TTMP identify that in the vicinity of the York Peel Boundary appropriate measures must be included in the detail design of the Arterial Road extension of Major Mackenzie Drive and Rutherford Road to adequately transition from the proposed HOV network east of Highway 50 to potentially 6 general purpose lanes west of Highway 50.</p>	<p>Comment noted, section 7.1, Implementation Philosophy, will include language specific to boundary area connections allowing for appropriate transitions.</p>
11	York Region	August 28, 2009	<p>Notwithstanding such, the Region recognizes that Section 7.5 (Transportation System and Demand Management) makes reference to TSM strategies which could include the provision for HOV lanes on 6-lane roadways. The Region further recommends that in the vicinity of the York – Brampton boundary, the design standard for 6 lane roads consider HOV lanes.</p>	<p>These strategies are recommended by the TTMP to be analyzed during the EA process</p>

12	York Region	August 28, 2009	<p>Improvements along Major Mackenzie Drive have been identified in York Region’s 10-Year Roads Construction Program for completion by 2015, which is consistent with the staging identified in the TTMP. However, the Transportation Master Plan identified the widening of Rutherford Road to 6 lanes for the purpose of HOV by 2031. In contrast, Brampton TTMP has assumed these needs by 2014 (opening of Highway 427 extension).</p> <p>The Region is currently reviewing the timing for both Major Mackenzie Drive and Rutherford Road Region through the West Vaughan Individual Environmental Assessment. Further coordination will be required between the City of Brampton and the Region of York. The Region reviews the 10-Year Roads Construction Program annually.</p>	<p>We agree that coordination is important between the City of Brampton, Peel Region, and Region of York. The recent York-Peel BATS study identified the widening of Rutherford Road to 6 lanes by 2021, west of Highway 27. The TTMP report will state that the timing of road improvements at the York-Peel boundary will be carried out in consultation with Peel Region and York Region.</p>
13	York Region	August 28, 2009	<p>There is a contradictory recommendation between 7.3.2 (Short Term Road Network) and 7.3.3 (Medium-Term Road Network) with regards to the Highway 427 Extension. Section 7.3.2 notes that Highway 427 extension to Major Mackenzie Drive or beyond (Short-term or by 2016). The Region’s experience in working with the Province to extend other 400 series highways northerly would suggest that a more definitive statement would be of benefit to the plans recommendations. Notwithstanding this, it is recommended that the Master Plan remove the reference of “or by 2016.”</p>	<p>Comment noted, wording to be revised to remove the entire phrase within parentheses on p. 87, 7.3.2, 5th bullet.</p>
14	York Region	August 28, 2009	<p>It is recommended that the City review section 7.4.6 (Impacts of the GTA West Corridor) as it contains contradicting statements. On the one hand, the GTA West Corridor is depicted as a positive benefit to the City. For example, paragraph 3 notes that the inclusion of the GTA West Corridor will result in a diversion of peak direction traffic from a V / C ratio of</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment – wording in the noted sections to be revised to provide stronger support for GTA West corridor.</p>

		<p>1.0 or more, to 0.86. In addition, as noted in paragraph 4, the corridor is expected to provide network choices for heavy truck traffic, and inter-provincial goods movement. Further, paragraph 5 concludes that “In all, while beneficial to accommodating growth in Brampton, reducing congestion over certain screenlines and providing additional capacity for heavy vehicles, the corridor is quintessential [essential / fundamental] to the City’s transportation...”</p> <p>On the other hand, section 7.4.6 suggests that the GTA West Corridor has minor impacts on the transportation needs of Brampton. Paragraph 2 continues to argue that the “[City of Brampton’s] transportation network not contingent on the Provincial Corridor”, and paragraph 5, “[GTA West Corridor] has no bearing on the recommendations of this document”. A casual read of section 7.4.6 implies that the transportation network within the City will be operating at acceptable LOS without the Provincial Corridor.</p> <p>It appears that, notwithstanding the benefits of the GTA West Corridor, as I have cited above, the transportation requirements identified in the TTMP, will be required to support the long term growth in the City. In other words, the GTA West Corridor will not reduce the East / West requirements within the plan by X number of lanes; however the corridor will provide significant operational improvements to the corridor.</p> <p>One role that the TTMP will play is in providing support for the City, the Region of Peel, and in partnership with adjacent municipalities, is to support future work with the Province in lobbying for early implementation of strategic highway corridors, such as the GTA West Corridor and extension of Highway 427. The TTMP and supplemental analysis, serves as a document source for identifying the needs, and</p>	
--	--	---	--

			timing for this infrastructure. As such, it is recommended that this section be revised to provide stronger support for the GTA West corridor with emphasis on its benefits to the town.	
15	Toronto Region Conservation Authority	September 23, 2009	With regards to a realignment of Coleraine Drive, an east-west connection from the realigned Coleraine Drive to the Gore Road, and new roads from Coleraine Drive to Hwy 50, Coleraine Drive to Mayfield Road, the Gore Road to Clarkway Drive and from Clarkway Drive to Coleraine Drive: these roads pass through areas which are regulated under Ontario Regulation 166 / 06 and will require comprehensive EA studies to determine the need and justification for this new infrastructure. Specifically, comments regarding the need for new alignment between Coleraine Drive and Clarkway Drive still need to be clarified and expanded upon. All proposed alignments should be identified as preliminary and conceptual in nature. A detailed review and analysis of this infrastructure, consideration of a range of options and potential locations for additional infrastructure, as well as the impacts to existing natural features will need to be evaluated to determine if the structure is in fact required and so that impacts can be mitigated to the extent possible.	All potential road improvements are conceptual only, and will need to go through future environmental assessments to confirm their feasibility. Detailed environmental impact analysis will be carried out in subsequent EA studies.
16	Toronto Region Conservation Authority	September 23, 2009	Section 7.8.2, Road Network Improvements in the Central Area, discusses 4 new road connections or extensions within Brampton’s downtown core. The Clark Boulevard-Eastern Avenue Connection will cross through a regulated area and watercourse, the John Street extension will cross over the main Etobicoke Creek, through a regulated area and flood plain, and the Ken Whillans extensions is proposed through an area of downtown Brampton that experiences high flood levels. Since most of downtown Brampton falls into a Special Policy Area (SPA) which is highly prone to flooding, all newly proposed infrastructure will require a detailed EA	Comment noted. Detailed environmental impact analysis will be carried out in subsequent EA studies.

			study.	
17	Toronto Region Conservation Authority	September 23, 2009	Please consider revising Table 10-1, as road projects within Brampton’s downtown core may need to be evaluated as Schedule C EAs (ie Ken Whillans drive EA is not proceeding as a Schedule C).	Comment noted; Table 10-1 will be revised.
18	Toronto Region Conservation Authority	September 23, 2009	The Road Hierarchy should be shown as conceptual at this point. Road alignments and locations will need to be reviewed through the EA process as impacts to existing natural features will need to be quantified and evaluated.	Comment noted; the wording of this section will be revised.

4.5 Land Use Assumptions

Comment #	Name / Organization	Date Received	Comment	Response
19	City of Mississauga	August 31, 2009	<p>Land Use Assumptions</p> <p>The Draft TTMP used land use assumptions for the City of Mississauga that do not reflect the latest 2008 growth forecast. Mississauga's latest growth forecast suggests a population of 812,000 and 519,000 employment by 2031. These forecasts should be reflected in the final TTMP.</p>	The City of Brampton will be updating the TTMP forecasts once the final population and employment projections for the City are approved. The revised population and employment forecasts for the City of Mississauga will be incorporated at that time.

4.6 Transit Network Issues

Comment #	Name / Organization	Date Received	Comment	Response
20	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 19, Exhibit 3-5 – The recommended transit network for Brampton shows a major transit node in the vicinity of Bovaird Drive and Highway 410 that does not appear to be connected to higher order transit. It would be important to clarify the role of this node in relation to the rapid transit system.	The node in question is major Transit Station Area at Trinity Commons Terminal. The definition of Major Transit Station Area is provided on pg. 70, Section 7.2.1.
21	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 69, Exhibit 7-1 – The Ultimate Transit Network shows a great increase in planned higher order transit, for which the City is to be commended. It is recommended that, in order to align with The Big Move, transit corridors identified as part of the Regional Rapid Transit Network in The Big Move be shown as distinct (e.g. in a different colour) from the other transit corridors identified by the City of Brampton. The Regional Rapid Transit corridors identified in The Big Move are: Highway 10, from Mayfield West to Downtown Brampton Main Street AcceleRide, from Downtown Brampton to Highway 407 Queen Street AcceleRide, from Downtown Brampton to the Peel-York Boundary Steeles AcceleRide, from Lisgar GO to Highway 427 Highway 427, from Queen Street to Kipling Station 407 Transitway The corridors shown on Bovaird Drive, Airport Road, and on Queen Street between Hurontario Road and Downtown Brampton have not been identified as part of the Regional Rapid Transit Network in The Big Move. With respect to Bovaird Drive, it was found in the development of The Big Move that the inclusion of	The definition of transit stations and hubs is provided on pg. 70, Section 7.2.1. The description of transit corridors and their status under Metrolinx RTP is discussed within the text of Section 7.2. High order transit on Bovaird Drive will be a longer term initiative as part of a gradual implementation of high order transit in Brampton to support the growth objectives of the City. GO’s preference for Bramalea Road will be incorporated in the evaluation of the alternative north-south high order transit corridors.

			<p>higher order transit on Bovaird Drive would detract from ridership on both Queen Street and Steeles Ave, and that densities along this corridor were insufficient to support higher order transit.</p> <p>From a GO operations perspective, the potential BRT on Bramalea Road is a preferred future service over the proposal for Airport Road due to the additional service it will provide to the Bramalea GO station.</p>	
22	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	<p>Page 70, Section 7.2.1 – Within the variety of transit nodes listed in Brampton, the TTMP has designated Mount Pleasant GO Station as a “future mobility hub”. Mount Pleasant GO Station does not meet the criteria to be designated a mobility hub. It is recommended that Mount Pleasant GO Station be listed as a Major Transit Station Area in the TTMP.</p>	<p>The Mount Pleasant GO Station area has been identified by the City of Brampton and the TTMP as a future mobility hub. The definition of Future Mobility Hub, provided on pg. 70, Section 7.2.1, acknowledges that this node has not been designated as such in the Metrolinx RTP. However, the City’s position is that Mount Pleasant will meet Metrolinx’s criteria as a mobility hub.</p>
23	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	<p>Page 80, Section 7.2.3 – The Medium-Term Transit Network indicates that the Steeles Avenue AcceleRide will terminate at Humber College in the east, connecting to the TTC. While The Big Move promotes integration of transit services and connections between major trip generators and transit services, the terminus of this line as part of the Regional Rapid Transit Network has not yet been finalized.</p>	<p>The first paragraph on pg.80, Section 7.2.3 will be revised to address this comment.</p>

24	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	<p>Page 131, OP Policy Recommendations – Recommendations to the OP should be coordinated with policies and plans in The Big Move. The TTMP should recommend that the OP be consistent with The Big Move. For example: Recommendations for new roads should consider The Big Move Policy 2.12, that sidewalks be included on all new regional and local roads inside settlement areas Recognition that designated ROW widths be wider at intersections should be balanced against The Big Move Policy 7.8, that the transportation system be planned, designed, built and operated to create pedestrian-, cycling-, and transit-friendly communities. Wider ROW widths should also include features to create safe crossing environments for pedestrians. Public Transit policy updates should reflect the regional rapid transit network described in The Big Move, as previously discussed in these comments.</p>	<p>OP Policy recommendations discuss on pgs 130-131, Section 1-.1 will be revised to reflect Metrolinx comments.</p>
25	York Region	August 28, 2009	<p>The short term transit network including AcceleRide BRT improvements along Queens Street (Highway 7) are consistent with the existing infrastructure in York Region.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

4.7 Report Section and Exhibit Corrections

Comment #	Name / Organization	Date Received	Comment	Response
26	Region of Peel	September 4, 2009	Exhibits 7.10 to 7.12 show a new east-west road from Coleraine Drive to The Gore Road (with a note stating “subject to SP 47”). Regional staff would like clarification as to why the east-west road is depicted (i.e., whether this is included as part of the Peel / Highway 427 Extension Area Transportation Master Plan or if it is included as a new local road). If the former, we note that the preferred alternative identified in the Peel 427 TMP is a new arterial road connecting Mayfield Road and Major Mackenzie Drive. We would also like clarification as to why only the SP 47 area, and not the other Secondary Plan areas under development in Brampton, is shown on these exhibits.	<p>The east-west road from Coleraine Drive to The Gore Road has been identified in the City of Brampton Official Plan and the DC program. Its role and function in relation to transportation network serving Secondary Plan 47 is at this time undetermined. The study just initiated for the Secondary Plan Area 47 will define the role and function of this road.</p> <p>The SP Area 47 has been shaded since the transportation network is under review by the ongoing Secondary Plan Transportation Network Study</p>
27	Region of Peel	September 4, 2009	Regional Staff strongly recommend that the TTMP include a section addressing the issue of accessible transportation (transportation services for persons with disabilities). Such a section could be comparable to sections 7.6 (TDM) and 7.7 (Goods Movement) in the Final Draft Report – a high level summary and a listing of relevant OP objectives and / or policies. Inclusion of a section on accessible transportation would round out the TTMP’s discussion of elements of the transportation network in Brampton (transit, roads, TDM, active transportation and goods movement).	Section on Accessible Transportation will be added to the Final TTMP Report.
28	Region of Peel	September 4, 2009	The depiction of sections of Queen Street in Exhibit 4-5 – Existing Road Network Number of Lanes – requires a few corrections. Queen Street between Airport Road and The Gore Road is currently four lanes and the section between The Gore Road and Airport Road is six lanes.	Comment noted. The depiction of sections of Queen Street in Exhibit 4-5 – Existing Road Network Number of Lanes will be corrected.

29	Region of Peel	September 4, 2009	Regional staff would like to see the Mayfield Road / Highway 50 carpool lot shown on an exhibit within the TTMP (and suggest that Exhibit 7-1 would seem to be a good fit for this). Inclusion of the carpool lot in this exhibit would indicate the potential for Brampton Transit connections to this lot (in line with the arrows showing potential transit service extensions). Indication of potential service to this lot by Brampton Transit would complement GO Transit’s involvement in the development of the carpool lot and the interest York Region Transit has expressed regarding the eventual need to access the carpool lot when the need for transit service to this site materializes.	The TTMP does not address specifics of carpool lots. The location, size, role and function of carpool lots will be addressed in a separate study.
30	City of Brampton	August 31, 2009	Section 4.1.1 Page 21 – 1st paragraph - references service area population as the total residents living within 500 metres of a transit route (OP states 300 to 400 metres) Page 22 – 1st paragraph – should reference date of January 2009 as these numbers have now changed to 38 high-floor and 196 low floor buses with 24 accessible routes. Page 24 – list of inter municipal transit services – should include “Route 51 on Mississauga Road, connecting to Mississauga”	Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.
31	City of Brampton	August 31, 2009	Section 4.4 Page 34 – we suggest to verify the VIA Rail service to Chicago (we believe that this service was cancelled in 1998). The reference to “CP” Orangeville-Brampton Railway should be verified.	Comments noted; Information provided in Section 4.4 and reference in the comment will be verified.

32	City of Brampton	August 31, 2009	<p>Section 7.2.1 Page 71 – the last sentence of the 1st paragraph – “the area at Highway 50 and Queen Street is an existing major bus depot” – this statement is untrue as there is no existing infrastructure located at this intersection; there is however future plans for a terminal to be incorporated into a future development on the S / W corner of the intersection.</p> <p>Page 71 – when discussing the frequencies of services, can we insert the word “peak”, so that people do expect that there will be this service level seven days a week, 20 hours per day?</p> <p>Page 71 – in the section explaining “Secondary Corridors” change “lower needs” to “lower demand”.</p>	Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.
33	City of Brampton	August 31, 2009	<p>Section 7.2.2 Page 75 – last paragraph – change “good transit service” with “higher quality transit service” Page 79 – 2nd paragraph – “The plan has received funding commitments from Federal, Provincial, and local municipal governments” – the funding agreement with the federal government only relates to Phase 1 of AcceleRide.</p>	Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.
34	City of Brampton	August 31, 2009	<p>Section 7.2.3 Page 81 – missing BRT corridor along Bovaird (between Mt. Pleasant GO and Airport Road) – this is covered in the language (see 1st sentence of section 7.2.3 on page 80), but should be reflected on the map.</p>	Comments noted; revisions will be made to the 2016 transit exhibit as suggested.
35	City of Brampton	August 31, 2009	<p>Section 9.2 We would recommend removing the actual budget amounts that have been provided in the past for the various financing resources.</p>	Comments noted; budget amounts will be removed.

36	City of Mississauga	August 31, 2009	<p>Introduction Overall the study is a good update to Brampton's existing TTMP. We note the following comments for your consideration in preparation of the final TTMP report.</p>	
37	Brampton Works & Transportation	September 1, 2009	<p>1. Pg 64, Table 6-3 (and Table 8-1), the GHG numbers for the alternatives seem quite high compared to 2006 considering the population is only increasing about 300,000 + employment. A note was added that "Future GHG estimates do not account for improvements in vehicle emissions. Technological advancements to reduce GHG emissions are expected to further reduce transportation related emissions". Can a percentage or range of expected decrease in GHG emissions be stated in the note based on any known commitments to improve emissions (e.g. at end of sentence add" by approx. 20 to 30%)? The issue is that the 2006 model results are doubling in the future when compared to alternative 4. The public will use the 2006 results to state that air quality will become twice as bad as 2006 levels. Either we need to include a percentage reduction based on known commitments by the Federal government and revise the calculations accordingly, or remove the 2006 results from the table.</p>	<p>By 2031 Brampton's population and employment will increase by 78%; equally high increase is forecasted for areas surrounding Brampton (Halton, York) causing the number of trips that occur in Brampton or traverse the City to increase even more (Brampton only, inter-municipal and inter-regional trips). Hence GHG emission increase is higher than the increase in Brampton land use forecast alone. However, suggestion to account for advancements in technology is valid. The GHG statistics will be adjusted accordingly.</p>
38	Brampton Works & Transportation	September 1, 2009	<p>2. Pg 65, Table 6-4, may change depending on item # 2 above.</p>	<p>See the response to comment # 25.</p>

39	Brampton Works & Transportation	September 1, 2009	3. Exhibit 7-8, previous comments related to BRT service proposed on Hurontario St up to Mayfield Rd (Caledon) which may be HOV in the future, Hurontario St should be widened to 6 lanes as it also has a large ROW. The widening of Hurontario St would replace the need for Kennedy Rd. Kennedy Rd widening has been removed (except from Bovaird to Williams for some reason- check if still needed); however, Hurontario St is still shown as 4 lanes. Confirm with removal of widening of Kennedy Rd, whether Hurontario St widening to 6 lanes is required. Certainly, widening the short stretch of Kennedy Rd to 6 lanes between Bovaird Dr and Williams Pkwy is not correct.	Neither Hurontario nor Kennedy Rd volume forecasts warrants widening to 6 lanes. Widening of Kennedy to 6 lanes shown in earlier exhibits was caused by a coding error. Treatment of Hurontario north of the Downtown Core will be determined through a separate study.
40	Brampton Works & Transportation	September 1, 2009	4. Pg 122, Section 8.3. Similar to comment # 1 above, the proposed changes and effects of improvements to vehicle emissions in the future needs to be discussed in this section.	See the response to comment # 25.
41	Brampton Works & Transportation	September 1, 2009	5. Pg 124, Section 9, refers to costs of DC program which may need to be updated based on recent changes.	Comment noted; the costs of the DC program will be revised to reflect the final DC totals.
42	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	The maps included throughout the Draft Final Report, including Exhibit 2-1, Exhibit 2-2, and others, are difficult to read due to poor image resolution and small image size. It is recommended that full page images be used to show the detail in each exhibit.	Comment noted. The final TTMP report will incorporate higher resolution exhibits.
43	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 13, Section 3.2 – The Big Move includes nine priority actions, which as listed in the TTMP. The City of Brampton is commended for actively considering the policies of The Big Move in the development of the TTMP recommendations. The wording of the first priority action should be updated to read “A fast, frequent, and expanded regional rapid transit network”, reflecting the language used in the regional transportation plan.	Comment noted; the wording of the first priority action will be updated.

44	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 35, Exhibit 4-7 – The Big Move emphasizes that an effective transportation system is one that makes provision for, and encourages, walking, cycling and other forms of active transportation. The pathway network shown in Exhibit 4-7 is an excellent contribution to this, as it highlights a grid-network, practical for commuting and utilitarian trips, and includes higher order connections to neighbouring municipalities.	Comment noted.
45	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 66, Section 7 – To further support Brampton’s commitment to making cycling a key component of the transportation system, it is suggested that the Recommended Transportation Network highlight specific policies related to cycling.	Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.
46	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	<p>Page 78, Exhibit 7-5 – The purpose of this figure is not apparent, and a more clear title would be helpful in explaining its role relative to the other figures. It is suggested that projected years associated with the implementation of the "support corridors" be included in the legend.</p> <p>The transit "support corridors" appear that they will have a high frequency of service (5 to 10 minutes) which is encouraging and will be effective in terms of attracting people to use them to feed into the higher-order transit services. The Implementation Philosophy, in Section 7.1, makes reference to the benefit of dedicated HOV / Bus only lanes on corridors with 6 lane cross sections; it would be valuable to reiterate the benefit of these when discussing the short, medium, and long term plans. Considering the existing traffic levels and the high frequencies of bus service being proposed, dedicated lanes may be required to prevent bunching and unpredictable service.</p>	<p>Comment noted; more discussion about the relationship between Exhibit 7.5 and other exhibit in this section together with labelling will be provided.</p> <p>Comment noted. Location and timing for the provision of HOV or RBL treatments are, in part, governed by specifics of local road and traffic conditions and as such are left at the discretion of the City and location specific infrastructure plans.</p>

47	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 94, Section 7.4.3 – The preferred alternative for the north-south transportation corridor studied in the Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study is identified as a “Super Arterial”. To minimize confusion about what this means, it is suggested that the TTMP use, where possible, commonly accepted and used terms to describe roadways and transportation infrastructure.	Wording of the first paragraph on pg. 94, Section 7.4.3 will be revised to introduce the term “Super Arterial” to emphasize the exceptional characteristics of this facility. Common high-capacity / high-speed urban arterial roads provide up to 6 lanes of through flow capacity while the Super Arterial is envisioned to provide 8 lanes of through flow capacity.
48	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 97, Section 7.4.5 – Northeast Brampton Road Improvements includes support for the extension of Highway 427 beyond Major Mackenzie. This project is not in existing provincial plans, including the MTO’s 5-year capital plan, the Growth Plan and The Big Move. The TTMP should not include policies that are at odds with existing provincial plans. This endorsement is reiterated on page 104.	The fact that the 427 extension is not in existing provincial plans does not negate the findings of independent studies (i.e., Peel-427 TMP), and the recommendation that the province be encouraged to consider / advance / initiate planning to extend Hwy 427 beyond Major Mackenzie Drive. The TTMP is a needs based analysis regardless of the limitations of current Provincial 400 series highway network planning; the analysis has demonstrated the need for the extension of Hwy 427 beyond Major Mackenzie.
49	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 100, Section 7.5 – The focus on active transportation is commendable for its vision of active transportation as a key component of a sustainable transportation system, and its emphasis on proper infrastructure and a safe environment to encourage its use. It is suggested that the first line of paragraph three be reworded as “Multimodal paths, sidewalks and / or bike paths are included in the City’s design standards.” This change will clarify that bike paths and sidewalks are not multimodal paths.	Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.
50	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 102 – There appears to be a typo where “Z.m” is described as a potential location for queue jump lanes and bus bays.	This will be corrected.

51	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 103, Section 7.7, Goods Movement – It is suggested that the objective to obtain data needed to track goods movement activity include provincial agencies as a partner.	Comment noted.
52	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 106 – The TTMP uses the acronym HOT to describe Higher-Order Transit, BRT or LRT. The term HOT is frequently used to describe High Occupancy Toll roads or lanes. It is recommended that the TTMP remove HOT in place of Higher-Order Transit, to minimize confusion between these terms.	Comment noted, the acronym HOT will be replaced with Higher-Order Transit.
53	Metrolinx	September 9, 2009	Page 134, Section 11 – To measure Brampton’s progress in increasing walking and cycling, it is recommended that Plan Monitoring include performance indicators and measures to track metrics related to these modes.	Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.
54	York Region	August 28, 2009	An additional section should be added to Section 7.1 (Implementation Philosophy) that recognizes that staging opportunities should include not only the staging of infrastructure within the City of Brampton but with adjacent municipalities.	Comment noted, discussion text will be added to Section 7.1

55	Toronto Region Conservation Authority	September 23, 2009	<p>Consideration of the environmental impacts on the various alternative solutions appears to be missing from this report. Section 1.3.3, Interdependent Transportation, Economic, Social and Environmental Goals, contains no discussion of any environmental goals.</p> <p>Appendix F, Table 5-5, Evaluation of Transportation Alternatives, includes a criterion for “Protecting Natural Environment”; however, the only discussion with respect to this section is with regards to greenhouse gas emissions. Environmental factors, including loss of core areas, impacts to wildlife species and habitat, impacts to linkage functions and connectivity, construction within highly flood prone areas, and alteration of surface and ground water quality, for example, are missing from this evaluation.</p>	<p>Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.</p> <p>The TTMP study is examining impacts on the natural environment at a very high level, in keeping with the strategic nature of the study. For this reason all potential road improvements are conceptual only, and will need to go through future environmental assessments to confirm their feasibility. Detailed environmental impact analysis will be carried out in subsequent EA studies in consultation with the TRCA.</p>
56	Toronto Region Conservation Authority	September 23, 2009	<p>TRCA Staff supports the City’s emphasis on discouraging single occupant vehicle travel while encouraging public transit. It is anticipated that efforts to reduce emissions by the City through the TTMP may be significant.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
57	Peel Region Health Department	October 19, 2009	<p>We would like to see more attention in the Master Plan to expanding and improving pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in Brampton for both health and environmental benefits. Although the Brampton Pathways Master Plan makes provision for recreational purpose pathways, additional recommendations to develop a pedestrian and cyclist system for utilitarian purposes (commuting) would be a good complement to the plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.</p>
58	Peel Region Health Department	October 19, 2009	<p>We would like to see the Transportation Demand Management Master Plan go further and include more detailed cycling and pedestrian policies. This will allow for consideration in the shorter term.</p>	<p>Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.</p>

59	Peel Region Health Department	October 19, 2009	<p>Add TTMP recommendations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure a complete and high quality sidewalk network on all streets serviced by transit -Consider raising bike lanes above street level -Create designated bike lanes on major streets -Consider planting buffer strips between roadways and sidewalks -Work with local road safety or cycling groups for an educational campaign -Add secure bicycle parking facilities. 	Comments noted; revisions will be made as suggested.
----	-------------------------------	------------------	--	--

Appendix A-5

Transportation & Transit Master Plan
Sustainable Update

**Comments received on
Draft Final TTMP Report
November 2009 to January 2010**

5. COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT FINAL TTMP REPORT, NOVEMBER 2009 TO JANUARY 2010

After the Notice of Study Completion was released on November 20, 2009, members of the public and project stakeholders were able to provide feedback about the plan during the statutory review period. This review period lasted until January 26, 2010. The Master Plan was then reviewed and revised taking into account these comments. The table below includes the full text of the comments that were received during the review period. For some of the comments, the original letters received can be found in Appendix 6.

Stakeholder	Date Received	Comment	Response
Maple Lodge Farms	November 26, 2009	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Maple Lodge Farms has reviewed Brampton TTMP and finds it to be thorough beneficial to Brampton and a necessary exercise however in the vicinity of MLF there are serious problems that require immediate attention as outlined below.</p> <p>The Brampton TTMP (Exhibit 7-8) indicates (subject to HP Bats) the potential that by 2031 the Brampton road network would potentially include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A major transportation facility; extending south from north west Brampton, crossing the Credit River between Norval and Huttonville, crossing Winston Churchill Blvd. in the vicinity of Embleton Rd. and extending toward the confluence of Hwy 401 and Hwy 407 in south east Halton Hills (The Halton Peel Transportation Facility) 2. An eight lane facility intercepting the Halton Peel Transportation Facility between the Credit River and Embleton Rd. and extending through Concession Six Brampton to provide a connection to Hwy 407 between Heritage Rd. and Winston Churchill Blvd. (Bramwest Parkway). <p>HP Bats prefers a freeway option alignment (the Halton Peel Freeway option) similar to the Halton Peel north south Transportation Facility complete with the Bramwest Pkwy appendage (the Appendage). Maple Lodge Farms has no objections to the Halton Peel Freeway option as superior to any of the other HP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Bramwest Parkway will be necessary to serve future development in the Bramwest Area ▪ Previous studies and traffic forecasts completed for the TTMP Update confirm the need for this arterial. The role and function of Bramwest Parkway in relation to the planned north-south transportation corridor and the overall road network serving Brampton west will be further assed by the on-going HPBATS.

		<p>Bats options but does not see the need for the Appendage. Is the Appendage needed to bleed traffic from the Halton Peel Freeway and deliver it to Hwy 407 such a short distance east of the delivery point that would be provided by the Halton Peel Freeway? Is the Appendage needed (all six lanes by 2016 and eight lanes by 2021) to serve the community of Brampton located south of the Credit River? Is it necessary to provide any road in that location? Wouldn't direct connections to Hwy 407 and the Halton Peel Freeway option when combined with existing connections to Hwy 401 and Hwy 407 satisfy the origin/destination traffic demands of the future community anticipated to develop in Brampton south of the Credit River?</p> <p>With respect to Exhibit 7-1 in light of the foregoing the north south transit corridor indicated in the vicinity of mid concession six would be an inappropriate isolated corridor and would be disruptive to MLF operations. Exhibit 7-6 and 7-7 show transit routes on existing Right of Ways and not truncating the MLF operating zone.</p> <p>Exhibits 7-8, 7-10, 7-11 and 7-12 all indicate: a transportation facility with an alignment similar to the HP Bats Halton Peel Freeway option complete with the Appendage. The Appendage is an unnecessary expense. Exhibit 4-7 indicates a future walkway alignment truncating the MLF operating zone which is opposed by Maple Lodge Farms.</p>	
<p>Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Area Landowners</p>	<p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Re: Transportation and Transit Master Plan Sustainable Update, Notice of Study Completion: Comments on behalf of the Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Landowner's Group</p> <p>BA Group has been following the progress of the above captioned study on behalf of the Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Area group of landowners. These landowners are also involved with the larger Northwest Brampton Landowner's Group and share the interests and concerns expressed in the letter submitted by BA Group on behalf of that group concerning the proposed North South Transportation Corridor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The intention of the TMP is to provide strategic directions for transportation development. Detailed timing of improvements will be determined by the Capital Plan and Budgeting Process. ▪ Comments regarding the Station Road Extension noted.

		<p>BA Group has previously submitted comments on behalf of the Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Area group with respect to our concerns about the timing of the funding for the road infrastructure required in support of the Mount Pleasant Community. These were most recently addressed in a letter submitted on July 17th of this year, of which a copy is attached.</p> <p>We note that the 5 year timing windows used in the TTMP final report make it hard to interpret the year in which a particular project should be undertaken. Notwithstanding this, we would draw your attention to the table in the attached letter, and submit the following comments:</p> <p>There are a number of roads projects that appear appropriately in the TTMP as being needed in the 2016 timeframe in the TTMP, but that have been scheduled (through the DC process) towards the end of the period rather than the beginning as is required. These are highlighted in “yellow” in the attached letter, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sandalwood Parkway, from Creditview Road to Mississauga Road ▪ Chinguacousy Road, from Wanless Drive to Mayfield Road ▪ North-South Collector Spine Road between James Potter Road and Wanless Drive and Mayfield Road <p>There are a number of roads projects that appear in the TTMP as being needed beyond the 2016 timeframe in the TTMP, but that have been scheduled (through the DC process) beyond the year 2016. These are highlighted in “orange” in the attached letter, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Creditview Road from Wanless Drive to Mayfield Road ▪ Wanless Drive from Creditview Road to Mississauga Road ▪ McLaughlin Road from Wanless Drive to Mayfield Road ▪ East-West Collector Spine Road from the North-South Collector to McLaughlin Road <p>We re-iterate our concern from the attached letter that “it can be clearly seen that the Development Charges Background Study, as it stands, does not reflect a schedule for delivery of these roads projects that is consistent with what is required to advance development in this area.”</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>With respect to the two collector spine roads identified in Exhibits 7-10, 7-11 and so on, these are shown as 4 lane collector roads. Our understanding is that these roads are to be of a unique transit oriented nature. The cross sections, accordingly, are to be assessed and determined through the Collector Road Environmental Assessment process undertaken in conjunction with the development of the block plans.</p> <p>We recognize the need to identify a nominal cross section of 4 lanes for these roads for purposes of the analysis underlying the TTMP, but will rely on the more detailed EA study to conclude what the ultimate cross sectional requirements will be.</p> <p>We note that there is no mention in the TTMP final report of the need for an extension of Station Road as a collector connection between future James Potter Road and Mississauga Road to the west. (To be clear, Station Road lies between the CNR line and Bovaird Drive, and is currently planned to provide a direct east-west connection between future James Potter Road and the Mount Pleasant GO Station.) An extension of this road to create a direct connection from the GO Station to Mississauga Road does not appear in the TTMP Exhibits showing the recommended road network (7-8 through 7-12), nor does it appear on the list of Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Area Road Improvements in section 7.4.2.</p> <p>We concur with this finding. From the perspective of the development of the Mount Pleasant community there is no need for the extension of Station Road to be built as a continuous collector connection. Furthermore, the technical challenges and commensurate costs of building this connection would be significant as it will require one and possibly two significant crossings of the Huttonville Creek natural heritage system. Notwithstanding, if the City does intend to ultimately pursue a connection in this alignment, then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The preservation of an appropriate right of way will need to be discussed during the block planning process for this area south of the CNR line. ▪ The City would need to finance the road and related structures directly as no allocation has been made in the DC for a project of this nature. 	
--	--	--	--

<p>Northwest Brampton Landowners' Group</p>	<p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Re: Transportation and Transit Master Plan Sustainable Update, Notice of Study Completion: Comments on behalf of Northwest Brampton Landowner's Group</p> <p>BA Group has been following the progress of the above captioned study on behalf of the Northwest Brampton group of landowners. The key interest of the Northwest Brampton landowners is with the significant proposed road network improvements in west Brampton, which include the North South Transportation Corridor and associated Bramwest Parkway as illustrated in Figures 7-8, 7-11 and 7-12 of the final report.</p> <p>BA Group has previously submitted comments after Public Information Centre #2 for the TTMP held in March 2009. We would also draw your attention to a letter addressed to John Corbett and dated February 25th 2009 from Scott Snider of Turkstra Mazza Associates. In that letter, the position of the Northwest Brampton landowner's group with respect to this corridor was made clear.</p> <p>In this letter, we seek to re-iterate our concerns and position on behalf of this group of stakeholders in the context of the final TTMP report dated July 2009. We are pleased to see that the 2021 Recommended Road Network illustrated in Exhibit 7-11 shows an alignment for the NSTC that while very conceptual, is <i>generally</i> consistent with preliminary road network options that have been developed by BA Group on behalf of the Northwest Brampton Landowner's Group (copy attached). The key elements of this alignment are that the road should be a 6 lane arterial road, and that it should extend from the top of the future Bram West Parkway to the future extension of Sandalwood Parkway.</p> <p>Insofar as the corridor is identified as a 6 lane "super arterial" and not as a freeway (that would require Provincial involvement at an early stage in the development of the corridor), this is a road that the City of Brampton and/or the Region of Peel could undertake to fund and construct within this time frame, and as such we are supportive of this description of the undertaking.</p> <p>With respect to the timing of this corridor, and recognizing that the TTMP report deals with time in 5 year slices we would recommend that it is likely required closer to 2016 than it is to 2021. Insofar as this is a significant undertaking, the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic forecasts indicate the need for ultimately extending the north-south corridor to Mayfield Drive. This extension will serve growth in Brampton and Caledon and will provide crucial connectivity with the potential GTA West Corridor. Strategic corridor protection has been identified in the TTMP report and reflected in the City of Brampton Development Charge by-law. The role and function of the north-south corridor will be further assessed in the on-going HPBATS. The HPBATS is also expected to comment on timing of the construction of the section north of Sandalwood Pkwy.
---	-------------------------	--	--

		<p>planning and approvals process for it must be engaged as soon as possible. We are pleased to see how quickly the HPBATS process was re-engaged once this report was finalized, and see this as evidence that there is an intention to move forward quickly with this corridor.</p> <p>With respect to the alignment of the corridor, based on our preliminary review of horizontal geometric constraints, environmental constraints, and the likely crossing point of the corridor over the Credit River valley (at the Trans Canada Pipeline crossing), the NSTC would most easily be aligned approximately mid block between Heritage Road and Mississauga Road to the north of the Credit River valley. We would point out that it is critical that this issue be resolved as quickly as possible so as to allow planning of the future Heritage Heights Community to proceed. Again, we are pleased to see that the HPBATS process has been re-engaged as rapidly as it has, and are hopeful that this alignment decision will be resolved through that process.</p> <p>Exhibits 7-11 and 7-8 show the recommended “Potential” configuration of the NSTC approaching the 2031 horizon year and beyond. The corridor is shown as being extended north of Sandalwood Parkway, and widened ultimately to 8 lanes. Our position on this extension of the corridor remains the same has been identified in the previous correspondence noted above. An appropriately sized and located Right of Way should be protected for such that if and when deemed necessary by future conditions and requirements, the corridor can be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • widened to accommodate a provincial freeway and associated grade separated interchanges • extended north into Caledon to connect with a future GTA West corridor. <p>The future conditions and requirements deemed necessary to trigger the need for a higher order and longer corridor would include growth in the west part of Caledon hitherto unidentified, and/or the identification of a recommended GTA West corridor through Caledon in such a manner that a north south connection along the NSTC alignment is both practical and recommended by the GTA West Study Team. Only in these situations should extension and upgrading of the corridor beyond what is recommended for 2021 be contemplated.</p> <p>We note that while the first paragraph on page 96 of the final report is consistent with this viewpoint with respect to preserving right of way for a freeway, the question of the extension north of Sandalwood is not directly addressed. We</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>believe that such an extension north of Sandalwood should be predicated on a recommendation from the GTA West Study that this link is required, and that this condition should be documented in the TTMP Report.</p>	
<p>Town of Halton Hills</p>	<p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Further to the Notice of Study Completion issued on November 20, 2009 and the letter to you dated August 27, 2009, the Town of Halton Hills continues to have concerns regarding the TTMP Sustainable Update.</p> <p>Specifically, the Recommended Road Network Needs by 2031 (Exhibit 7-8, TTMP Report) has identified the need to widen both Bovaird Drive West and Winston Churchill Boulevard to four lanes. This would result in a bottleneck through Norval as the infrastructure cannot be widened in the hamlet.</p> <p>With respect to the discussion in Section 7.4.4 regarding the Norval By-pass, the Town continues to have concerns regarding the statement that the environmental impacts of another crossing of the Credit River will outweigh the transportation benefits of a Norval By-pass. It is our view that this conclusion should be left for an Environmental Assessment to determine.</p> <p>The Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HPBATS) is nearing completion. The study has shown that traffic capacity through Norval cannot be improved. Highway 7 and Winston Churchill Boulevard through Norval cannot physically be widened beyond their current configuration. The existing infrastructure will soon be at capacity.</p> <p>The Town’s concerns with the TTMP can be addressed with a qualifying statement on Exhibit 7-8 by noting that the number of lanes, road locations and terminus points will be the subject of future Environmental Assessments of these Regional Road improvements, and the removal of the “Norval By-pass” section and replacement with a reference to the HPBATS</p> <p>In addition, it would be appropriate for Brampton to introduce protection corridors into your Planning documents to address the emerging east-west connections that have been identified as part of the HPBATS process. It would also be beneficial for Brampton and Peel to discuss the corridor protection framework, as the jurisdiction of this facility is unknown at this time.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As stated earlier (Appendix A-4) we recognize the right-of-way limitations through Norval. Congestion problems in Norval and alternative transportation solutions are being addressed in HP BATS. Once the HPBATS is completed the City will update the TTMP forecasts, recommendation to road and transit network and the Official Plan policy recommendations.

<p>Halton Region</p>	<p>December 3, 2009</p>	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Further to my letter dated August 25, 2009, and the letter of October 16, 2009 from Ron Glenn the Region’s Chief Planning Official, I would like to reiterate our concerns regarding Brampton’s draft Transportation and Transit Master Plan as it relates to issues that are still being considered under the on-going Halton Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HPBATS). Although the HPBATS work is acknowledged, the Master Plan document makes assumptions which are premature.</p> <p>The 2031 Recommended Road Network (Exhibit 7-8) has identified the need to widen both Bovaird Drive West (to Halton Hills Boundary) and Winston Churchill Boulevard (North and South of Norval) to 4 lanes. The Region continues to have concern that there has been no consideration that Highway 7 and Winston Churchill Boulevard through Norval cannot physically be widened beyond its current configuration. As the TTMP relies on the widening of these facilities to accommodate the projected growth in Brampton, the congestion through the Hamlet of Norval must be considered. The ultimate determination of the need to widen Bovaird Drive and Winston Churchill may be impacted by the preferred alternative to address congestion in Norval.</p> <p>With respect to the discussion in Section 7.4.4 regarding the Norval Bypass, it is our opinion that the environmental work completed to date is not sufficient to depict the crossing associated with a by-pass as having “significant environmental impacts”. Although the text acknowledges the HPBATS work, the congestion within Norval must be addressed in conjunction with any consideration of the widening of Bovaird Drive West (Highway 7) and Winston Churchill Boulevard.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like the response to the December 2 letter from the Town of Halton Hills above, we recognize the right-of-way limitations through Norval. Congestion problems in Norval and alternative transportation solutions are being addressed in HP BATS. Once the HPBATS is completed the City will update the TTMP forecasts, recommendation to road and transit network and the Official Plan policy recommendations.
<p>Resident, Christopher Bejnar</p>	<p>December 17, 2009</p>	<p>1) Please explain why we are digging up 2-3 feet down along the centre of Queen, and then replacing it with new soil and gravel? I believe that we could have just as easily made a centre lane “Rapidway” for the Zuum BRT as a first Phase. We’re going to do this all over again at some point in the near future to move it from the curbside to the centre of Queen?</p> <p>As I’ve stated, we could have easily started with a Centre Lane concept from Centre Street S. to the new Bramalea City Centre station and implemented future phases as road work and transit ridership increased. I’m sure that the business owners will not be pleased when we start moving from curbside to centre in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments noted. It should also be recognized that there is a substantial difference in cost to building a centre-median running way. Based on currently available funding from 3 levels of government, the City is proceeding with its first phase implementation of Zūm BRT service on Hurontario and Queen. This new service is intended to raise

		<p>near future. Having a centre lane “Rapidway” would have accelerated much needed development along the Queen St. corridor from Centre St. S. to Hwy. 410</p> <p>2) There should be a big push for LRT not BRT for the planned Metrolinx Main/Hurontario line. I don’t see any BRT system for Toronto, only new LRT lines. The residents who you are trying to entice to take transit want LRT, not BRT. I have conducted my own casual surveys over the past year; I get 90%+ voting LRT vs. BRT. Having a LRT system connecting Port Credit, Mississauga City Centre to Downtown Brampton would be a fantastic project that would encourage intensification along this corridor.</p> <p>3) What is the plan for the rarely used Orangeville Railway corridor? Trains travel down this rail line rarely. Why not look at an LRT line from the north to the south of the city? One could convert the rail into a great bicycle path. I have not seen or heard of any ideas as of yet for this valuable resource within our city.</p> <p>4) One of the biggest questions I’ve had for the past year to your staff, Council and the Mayor has been...How are we going to accommodate all the transit uses at the current Nelson & Main station site? With a city projected to be 700,000+ residents, we will have VIA and GO trains, Brampton Transit and Zum BRT, a future Metrolinx Main/Hurontario line (LRT or BRT), Taxi’s and Passenger Car pick-up/drop-off all converging onto this one site. I have attended every meeting and workshop and have yet to see how this will all work? This will be further complicated with new development that will occur at the GO station parking lot and surrounding area. (i.e. Blade condos, Hotel /convention centre etc.) Again, no plan has been put forward as to how this will all work at the current site. I had suggested creating a new Transit Hub at the south end of the Peel Memorial Hospital Site. I still believe that having some of the transit services moved to this site does make sense for the future of our downtown development.</p>	<p>the profile and effectiveness of public transit by introducing improved services (comfort, reliability, technology), as a first step in meeting and growing transit ridership along the corridor. The City continues to encourage the province and Metrolinx to initiate the necessary work (eg. Feasibility and business case analyses) to support construction of a Higher Order Transit service on Queen Street, and to secure the requisite funding support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The City is committed to advance, where feasible the implementation of BRT corridors and specifically Hurontario/Main Street corridor. This commitment has been verbalised in Section 7.1 of the Final Report. Work is currently underway through a joint Mississauga/Brampton study, to plan for a Higher Order Transit service running in a dedicated centre-median right of way for most of the length of the Hurontario Corridor, from Port Credit to Downtown Brampton. ▪ Plans for Orangeville Railway corridor have not been assessed at this time ▪ As a Regional Transit Hub identified by the Metrolinx Brampton GO will be expanded and modernized in the future. The City of Brampton, GO Transit and Metrolinx will play active part in developing these
--	--	--	---

<p>John Court (from Leacrest – Lascelles Residents Association)</p>	<p>December 23, 2009</p>	<p>Along with other ratepayer-residents who are members of the Leacrest-Lascelles Residents Association, I object to the designation of Dixie Road for widening north of Queen Street, from the existing 4 lanes to 6 lanes. That so-called "improvement" -- which in point of fact would be a detriment -- is proposed to come into effect by 2016, as shown on Exhibit 7-10 on page 112 of the TTMP Final Report (Nov. 2009).</p> <p>Dixie Road is, as you know, a regional road. The Region of Peel has NOT approved such a widening, nor amended its O.P. for same. The Region launched a Public Consultation Study into precisely that proposed widening, which was met with resounding objections by the neighbourhood residents along that stretch of Dixie Road. That proposed widening will fail at the regional level, and should not, therefore, be included in forecast "improvements" or changes by the City in the TTMP or other planning documents.</p> <p>We ask that the City of Brampton respond to the wishes of its ratepayer-residents by supporting our insistence that Dixie Road must remain with only 4 lanes indefinitely, beyond 2031. That is the proposal for Kennedy Road, one concession west of Highway 410, and it should be consistently maintained for Dixie Road, which as you know is immediately to the east of Hwy 410.</p> <p>We, the citizens of Brampton and Peel along the Dixie Road corridor north of Queen Street, object to any widening of that stretch of Dixie Road for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) Widening Dixie Road would negatively impact all of the adjacent residential neighbourhoods -- for example, through noise, exhaust pollution, higher speeds and volume, resulting in traffic and pedestrian accidents.</p> <p>(2) Widening is not needed by those who use the road; it is not presently overcrowded nor congested, even during rush hours. TTMP data arguing to the contrary are flawed. It is not conceivable that demand will increase to a point where widening Dixie Road will be essential.</p>	<p>plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments have been received and shared with the Region of Peel ▪ The Peel LRTP (2005), ongoing work on the Regional LRTP update and the Brampton TTMP (2009) have found that widening of this section of Dixie Road is justified and required to support future residential and commercial developments north and north-west. ▪ The Problem Statement for the Dixie Road Widening EA states that improvements are necessary and continued growth in the study area will contribute to increased traffic congestion and deterioration of road conditions over the next 25 years. ▪ The currently existing Right of Way on Dixie will be able to accommodate a 6-lane arterial cross section, although additional Right of Way will be required at intersections
---	--------------------------	---	---

		<p>(3) If a widened north-south arterial road were needed in this area (which we dispute), it should be done to another concession road further removed from Hwy 410, such as Bramalea Rd., Torbram or Airport Rd. Dixie Road is much too close to Hwy. 410 -- barely more than a stone's throw -- such that a proper spacing of high-volume traffic to the north and south would be overly-concentrated in this area, rather than properly spaced apart.</p> <p>(4) Dixie Road north of Queen Street is exclusively used as an arterial access route for residential neighbourhoods -- it is NOT used by, nor required for industrial nor commercial areas -- which are the types of use for which a wider road might be appropriate, if / when justifiable. There is no justifiable rationale for widening Dixie Road.</p> <p>(5) A widening of arterial roads is NOT actually a proper use of public funds from our Regional or local municipalities at this time. The TTMP traffic-flow data are not accurate nor realistic. Great expense will be saved by NOT proceeding with this deeply-flawed proposal. Those funds can better be deployed elsewhere in the municipal budgets, or taxes reduced.</p> <p>(6) Stands of young-to-mature, healthy boulevard trees exist along the Dixie road allowance -- for example, along both sides of Dixie Road from Williams Parkway north to Bovaird. Those would have to be clear-cut to make way for any street widening along that stretch. That would substantially diminish the beauty of natural landscaping, the air quality and hence the integral values of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>(7) The Province is now in process of enacting legislation to protect historic cemeteries from so-called "improvements" such as road-widenings and other development infringements. The City and Region will thus not be permitted to widen Dixie Road where the historic cemetery has long existed, on the west side of Dixie north of North Park Drive. Accordingly, there is no point in widening Dixie Road in the stretches directly north or south of that historic cemetery.</p> <p>In sum, a widening of Dixie Road would serve no purpose, while causing great harm and unnecessary expense.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		We believe that our Mayor and Councillors should direct the Planning staff to abandon that proposal from the TTMP, and to oppose it at the Region, to avoid a lengthy, time-consuming, acrimonious, expensive, and ultimately futile confrontation.	
Candevcon Limited	December 24, 2009	<p>With reference to the following Exhibits of the draft Final Report I wish to bring the following matters to your attention concerning the section of Humberwest Parkway between Airport Road and Castlemore Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 4-5: The Exhibit shows the section of road between Airport Road and Castlemore Road as existing...we note that a section of this road has not yet been constructed. • Exhibit 7-10: The Exhibit shows a 6 lane improvement...we note that the right of way is 36m in this area and the Class EA Study was based on a four (4) lane road between Airport Road and Castlemore Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exhibit 4-5 has been modified to reflect this comment ▪ The EA for Humberwest Parkway was completed for the ultimate scenario which was at least 6 lanes
Toronto Region Conservation Authority	January 26, 2010	<p><i>(Original letter attached)</i></p> <p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff received the Notice of Study Completion and the final Transportation and Transit Master Plan dated November 2009, on November 20, 2009. Staff previously provided comments on the Draft Final Report in a letter dated September 23, 2009, and a response to our comments was provided with this submission in Appendix A3. Based on the response received from the City of Brampton it is our understanding that all proposed new roads, road improvements and road extensions are conceptual and will need to be further examined in future detailed Environmental Assessments (EA) to confirm their feasibility.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a response to comments 1 and 2 from our September 2009 letter were not provided in the Appendix. Specifically comment 1 noted that, " ... Environmental factors, including loss of core areas, impacts to wildlife habitat and species, impacts to linkage functions and connectivity, construction within highly flood prone areas and alteration of surface and ground water quality, for example, are missing from this evaluation." Since the Master Plan establishes a framework for future EA's by defining the problem (Phase 1), identifying alternative solutions and considering environmental implications (Phase 2) it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The TRCA letter dated November 5th 2009 and the subsequent response from iTRANS have been added to Appendix A-3 (Section 3.1.1) ▪ The TTMP study is examining impacts on the natural environment at a very high level, in keeping with the strategic nature of the study. For this reason all potential road improvements are conceptual only, and will need to go through future environmental assessments to confirm their feasibility and environmental impacts. Detailed environmental impact analysis will be carried out in subsequent EA studies in consultation with the TRCA.

		<p>would appear that this analysis remains outstanding.</p> <p>Since the Master Plan is complete, it is expected that our concerns will be addressed through the EA process, for each of these road works, to determine whether the proposed works, including alternatives and alignments, are supported by TRCA staff. This is of particular interest where road network improvements, such as those within Brampton's downtown core, Special Policy Areas, flood plains and those that cross watercourses and valley systems are expected.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Appendix A-6

Transportation & Transit Master Plan
Sustainable Update

**Original submissions in response to
Notice of Study Completion**

6. Original submissions in response to notice of study completion