

Results of Public Meeting and Correspondence Received

City File: OZS-2020-0011

Monday, December 7, 2020

Members Present via Electronic Participation:

Regional Councillor M. Medeiros – Wards 3 and 4 (Chair)

Regional Councillor P. Fortini – Wards 7 and 8 (Vice-Chair)

Regional Councillor P. Vicente – Wards 1 and 5

Regional Councillor R. Santos – Wards 1 and 5

Regional Councillor M. Palleschi – Wards 2 and 6

Regional Councillor G. Dhillon – Wards 9 and 10

City Councillor D. Whillans – Wards 2 and 6

City Councillor J. Bowman – Wards 3 and 4

City Councillor C. Williams – Wards 7 and 8

City Councillor H. Singh – Wards 9 and 10

Members Absent:

Nil

Staff Present:

D. Barrick, Chief Administrative Officer

Planning, Building and Economic Development:

R. Forward, Commissioner

A. Parsons, Director, Development Services

R. Conard, Director of Building, and Chief Building Official

B. Bjerke, Director, Policy Planning
J. Humble, Manager, Policy Planning
E. Corazzola, Manager, Zoning and Sign By-law Services
D. VanderBerg, Manager, Development Planning
C. Owusu-Gyimah
R. Nykyforchyn, Development Planner
N. Mahmood, Development Planner
M. Michniak, Development Planner
K. Henderson, Development Planner
N. Jagtiani, Development Planner
N. Deibler, Development Planner
M. Gervais, Policy Planner
M. Palermo, Policy Planner

Corporate Services:

A. Wilson-Peebles, Legal Counsel

City Clerk's Office:

P. Fay, City Clerk
C. Gravlev, Deputy City Clerk
S. Danton, Legislative Coordinator

Members of the Public:

Prashanth Panda, Karmbir Singh, and Vijay Bhatt, Brampton residents
Shridhar Shah and Shilpa Shah, Brampton residents
Gloria Shan, Brampton resident

Results of the Public Meeting:

A meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on December 7, 2020 via electronic participation, commencing at 7:00 p.m. with respect to the subject application. Notices of this meeting were sent to property owners within 240 metres of the subject lands in accordance with City Council procedures and which exceed the Planning Act notice requirements of 120 metres.

As indicated in Appendix “8”, there were approximately 6 members of the public that advised that they were attending the virtual meeting and were directed to be delegates for other residents in the community to speak on their behalf. In addition, approximately 125 emails / correspondence were received in opposition to the application. The majority of this information has been submitted as two form emails which have been forwarded by the area residents. The applicant has consolidated the information and which has been attached as Appendix 14 of this report.

Rob Nykyforchyn, City Development Planner, provided a presentation of the application which included the location of the subject lands area context, design details, current land use designations, preliminary issues, technical considerations, along with an explanation of the concept plan the next steps, and the applicable contact information.

David Milano, Malone Given Parsons’, the planner for the applicant, high lighted features of the revised plan. Also in attendance and available to answer questions on behalf of the applicant and the owner were Joan MacIntyre, Malone Given Parsons; Wei Guo, Great Gulf; and Katy Schofield, Great Gulf.

After the presentation, the following members of the public addressed Committee and expressed their views, suggestions, concerns, and questions on this application:

1. Prashanth Panda, Karmbir Singh, and Vijay Bhatt, Brampton residents:

Concerns were raised about area residents purchasing housing in the area based on the original land use and lotting concept. Residents feel that they have been deceived and overcharged if the proposed density increase and land use changes are approved. It is questioned why executive housing can no longer be marketable for the builder and how they can now request density and land use changes once area residents paid to locate in this prestige area. In addition, there is a concern that the area infrastructure is not designed to accommodate this additional development. Lastly, there is a need for the City to initiate the construction of the area Community Centre and Community Park for the local youth given that the adjacent Community Centres are operating above capacity. The additional density being proposed by this application is problematic given the lack of hospital beds and road infrastructure to currently serve the area.

Staff Response: Planning staff provide the following response:

First, it is noted that the area residents purchased residential housing within the “Low / Medium Density Residential” area and that there is no evidence of which staff is aware

that the conversion of the “Executive Residential” to the same “Low/Medium Residential” development will reduce house values in the area. The concern that housing values will depreciate as a result of the proposed development is difficult to prove. Notwithstanding this, staff is basing their planning opinion on policies identified in the planning policy framework, such as the creation of complete communities as discussed in the Planning Analysis section of this report. These are the relevant considerations to consider in the review of the application.

Second, there are no guarantees that changes to the overall land use and lotting layout will not change over time as a result of Provincial or municipal housing policy changes. The applicant’s planning rationale report stated that the “Executive Residential” designation is typically applied to residential lots that have direct access or views to natural environmental areas, and that their lands do not benefit from these environmental features. In addition, the Provincial Planning policies have changed significantly from what was in place when the Secondary Plan and area block plan policies were approved. Today’s planning policies try to ensure that residential development promotes the efficient use of land and support development of healthy, complete communities.

Third, the technical studies submitted in support of the proposed residential density increase, and the comments received from City engineering and traffic, the Region, and the area School Boards all confirm that the additional density can be accommodated by the existing and planned infrastructure for the area. It is also noted that some of the original comments and concerns were based on the applicant’s proposal to change the Service Commercial land use permissions to allow for an apartment development which would add an additional 420 apartment dwelling units to the area. The applicant has since amended their application to delete this request.

Lastly, the request for the City to expedite approvals and construction work on the Community Centre / Community Park is not associated with the applicant’s development application proposal. The timing for these public infrastructure projects will be dictated by the City budget forecasting and needs assessment.

At this time, the current anticipated completion date for this project is 2025/2026, and both budget and timelines will be subject to City Council approval.

2. Shridhar Shah and Shilpa Shah, Brampton residents

Concern was based on the residential development unit increase, from 448 to 1,049 units, which included the proposed apartment development.

Staff Response:

Since the original application was filed and presented at the statutory public meeting, the applicant has since revised their proposal to exclude the proposed apartment development. This means that the new proposed housing development will be increased from 488 to 669 units for a net increase of 181 units which is significantly less

than what was first proposed. As previously noted, the applicant's technical submissions and the comments received from internal and external departments and agencies has confirmed that the proposed density increase can be accommodated.

3. Gloria Shan & Gimar Sandhu, Brampton residents

Similar concerns were reiterated about the premiums that the residents have paid to purchase dwellings within this area and the need to expedite the construction of the area community centre and Community Park.

Staff Response:

Staff contend that there is no information to support the argument that the existing sales value of the neighbouring dwellings will be reduced as a result of the proposed land use changes, and that the ultimate timing of approvals and construction for the City's Community Centre and Community Park or other community uses (ie. Police Station) are not affiliated with this private planning development application.

4.0 Emailed Correspondence, Form Letter #1

Once residents within the adjacent area were made aware of the applicant's development application, a form letter was generated and circulated for residents to submit to City Staff. This email was sent to the City by 53 area residents and is contained in Appendix 14 of the Report and is identified as Letter #1. This correspondence generally noted that they did not support the proposal, and more specifically did not agree with:

- (1) the replacement of the "Executive Residential" housing designation with that of "Low/Medium Density Residential", and,
- (2) the introduction of a "Medium/High Density Residential" block to accommodate four, six storey apartment buildings totaling 420 apartment dwelling units.

Staff Response:

Regarding the first concern, it is noted that the establishment of the "Executive Residential" designation within the Bram West Secondary Plan was intended to implement Provincial policies and those within the 2006 Official Plan which required that 1,000 executive housing units to be provided in this area. The applicant's proposal to delete the "Executive Residential" designation and to replace it with "Low/Medium Density residential" is argued to be more in keeping with current Provincial policy initiatives which is to build complete communities for compact and efficient growth. It was also noted that the subject lands do not offer the unique exposure or proximity of special environmental attributes that are typically associated with upscale executive housing area. In addition, the applicant has advised that an additional 250 executive

housing units will be added to the Vales of Castlemore North Secondary Plan, which is better suited for this type of housing.

The second concern related to the proposed apartment development is considered to be addressed by way of the applicant amending their application to delete this request.

5.0 Emailed Correspondence, form Letter #2

Approximately one week prior to the December 7, 2020 public meeting, a second form letter was prepared and signed by 57 of the area residents and is contained in Appendix 14 of the Report and is identified as Letter #2. It is noted that most of the concerns listed below will be significantly reduced by the applicant's decision to delete the original request for apartment development on the north-west corner of Mississauga Road and Lionhead Golf Club Road which has the effect of reducing the overall net dwelling unit increase by about two-thirds (ie. from 641 to 221 units). The following summarizes the concerns contained within this correspondence.

- a) Recent purchasers feel cheated by Sales Office not informing of proposed changes;

Staff Response:

The applicant filed a pre-consultation development application with the City in 2017 to discuss the opportunity to make changes to the housing type and lotting pattern for the subject lands. Last summer a formal development application was submitted with the City to implement these changes. Residents who have recently purchased in the area are upset that the applicant or their sales office did not advise perspective purchasers about the housing and lotting changes that were being contemplated on the subject lands. Had they been advised of the proposed changes, then they may have not purchased their dwelling. Since these concerns were raised, the applicant has advised that the sales office has been advised of the current land use amendments that are being proposed. Staff is recommending that the applicant amend their Purchase and Sale Agreements and their Detailed Community Information maps to illustrate the revised housing and lotting changes that are being proposed.

- b) Earlier residents purchased based on existing land use permissions;

Staff Response:

The concern was raised that the original purchasers in the area did so based on the understanding of what the approved plan was for the area which included large executive residential lots in the area and which did not include any nearby apartment development. Since these comments were provided, the applicant has decided to withdraw their original request for apartment development which thereby addresses a portion of this concern. It is noted that the proposal to replace the Executive Residential lands with Low/Medium Density residential development, is

proposing the same type of dwellings that exist in the area. In addition, there has been a slight increase to the area park size which is viewed as a positive feature.

- c) Need to share existing resources (park, schools, community centre) with others;

Staff Response:

As noted above, the size of the park will be increased slightly in size (from 0.7 to 0.82 hectares). In addition, the subject lands will be served by a large Community Park and a future Community Centre that should be constructed in the next 4-5 years. The proposed increase in dwelling units has been assessed by City Parks, and the area School Boards and no concerns have been raised about possible parkland shortfalls or student accommodations. As such, Staff is satisfied that the additional housing density being proposed can be accommodated in this area.

- d) Will increase congestion on roads, sidewalks, and parking lots;

Staff Response:

Transportation staff have assessed the proposed 221 unit lotting increase as it pertains to the potential for traffic congestion on the road network or parking shortfalls in the area, and have concluded that the additional housing density can be appropriately accommodated without further changes to the plan.

- e) More development will mean more noise and crime; and,

Staff Response:

This concern seems to be primarily related to the apartment site that was originally being proposed. With the applicant's decision to remove the apartment development from their application, this concern appears to have been addressed.

- f) Request by existing residents for City to expedite Community Centre / Park.

Staff Response:

The residents in the area are concerned that the Community Centre and the Community Park have still not been developed and that this community infrastructure is badly needed by the area residents. The adjacent community centre are too far away and are too crowded. Based on comments received to date, the current anticipated completion date for this project is 2025/2026, and both budget and timelines are subject to Council approval.