

Results of the Public Meeting (November 16, 2020)
OZS-2019-0014

Monday, November 16, 2020

Members Present: Regional Councillor M. Medeiros - Wards 3 and 4
Regional Councillor P. Fortini - Wards 7 and 8
Regional Councillor R. Santos - Wards 1 and 5
Regional Councillor P. Vicente - Wards 1 and 5
City Councillor D. Whillans - Wards 2 and 6
Regional Councillor M. Palleschi - 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 Regional
Councillor G. Dhillon - Wards 9 and 10

Staff Present: D. Barrick, Chief Administrative Officer
R. Forward, Commissioner Planning and Development Services
A. Parsons, Director, Planning, Building and Economic Development
B. Bjerke, Director, Policy Planning, Planning, Building and Economic Development
J. Humble, Manager, Planning, Building and Economic Development
S. Ganesh, Manager, Planning, Building and Economic Development
D. VanderBerg, Manager, Planning, Building and Economic Development
M. Gervais, Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
C. Caruso, Central Area Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
S. Dykstra, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
K. Freeman, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development

K. Henderson, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
H. Katyal, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
J. Lee, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
M. Michniak, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
S. Akhtar, City Solicitor
P. Fay, City Clerk
C. Gravlev, Deputy City Clerk
S. Danton, Legislative Coordinator

Note: In consideration of the current COVID-19 public health orders prohibiting large public gatherings of people and requirements for physical distancing between persons, in-person attendance at this Planning and Development Committee meeting was limited and physical distancing was maintained in Council Chambers at all times during the meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., recessed at 9:10 p.m., reconvened at 9:20 p.m., and adjourned at 10:39 p.m.

As this meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was conducted with electronic participation by Members of Council, the meeting started with the City Clerk calling the roll for attendance at the meeting, as follows:

Members present during roll call: Councillor Santos, Councillor Vicente, Councillor Whillans, Councillor Palleschi, Councillor Bowman, Councillor Medeiros, Councillor Fortini, Councillor Singh, Councillor Dhillon

Members absent during roll call: nil

Results of the Public Meeting

Himanshu Katyal, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development, presented an overview of the application that included location of the subject lands, area context, design details, current land use designations, preliminary issues, technical considerations, concept plan, next steps and contact information.

Jason Afonso, Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., presented the key design features including building materials and landscaping, and noted the policy framework guiding the application.

Items 6.2 and 11.2 were brought forward at this time.

Following the presentations, the following members of the public addressed Committee and expressed their views, suggestions, concerns and questions with respect to the subject application:

1. Hoang Nguyen, Brampton resident
2. Rajeev Saini, Brampton resident
3. Jotvinder Sodhi, Brampton resident
4. Balihar Singh, Brampton resident
5. Sanket Radadia, Brampton resident

In response to questions of clarification from Committee, staff noted the following:

- the proposal includes upscale and high quality design features and building materials to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area
- the current land use designations allow for a variety of residential dwellings; an amendment to the Official Plan is required to permit the proposed apartment building
- the policies of the applicable legislation apply at the time the application is submitted
- the review of the application includes circulation to the Region of Peel
- a total of three petitions of objection have been received since March
- further enquiries will be provided to the area councillors directly so they may convey the information to interested residents

Five members of the public and the applicant had a delegation for this meeting. Twenty-one written correspondences were also submitted regarding this application.

Issue: Density and Built Form Compatibility

Proposed apartment building and townhouses are not appropriate for the area. The homes in this area were intended for low density residential only. The local area can't accommodate this density.

Concerns were noted by members of the public regarding the status of the neighbourhood and that the proposal is not consistent with the standards associated with Executive Housing (ie. minimum lot frontage for single detached homes in this Secondary Plan area is 15 metres frontage).

Response:

After the Councillor Meeting in September 2020 and Public Meeting in November 2020, proposal was revised to eliminate the apartment building. Total number of units were also reduced from 204 to 107 units. The site layout, particularly west of the Public Street was reoriented to have more compact townhouse blocks and walkways surrounding the blocks to encourage walkability.

An Urban Design Brief was submitted by the applicant that demonstrates how the application meets the principles set out in the City's Development Design Guidelines.

This was reviewed and accepted by Urban Design Staff in coordination with other departments that provided comments.

The proposed built form will maintain the superior quality housing that reflects the community's planned upscale, executive character. The proposed homes will have high standard of architectural design quality and will have a classical-inspired 'Georgian' architectural character. This architectural character will also provide a cohesiveness amongst the different housing types proposed (detached, standard townhouses and back to back townhouses). The proposal also has Natural Heritage Systems on both sides of the site as well as a future park to the south. The proximity to these features is another key component of the upscale design of this development.

The applicant has provided appropriate justification for the density and additional dwelling types other than detached homes contemplated in their proposal. This is based on the applicable Provincial, Regional, and local policies. This includes the Provincial Policy Statement which supports the efficient use of land and resources through intensification, as well as the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe which promotes redevelopment and intensification in close proximity to transit-supportive areas. The subject site is located along Mayfield Road. This is identified as a Major Road (Region Official Plan) as well as Major Arterial (Regional) corridor and Secondary Transit Corridor in the City of Brampton Official Plan. Mayfield Road forms part of the transportation system in Peel and is also envisioned to be part of the bus transit network. This provides a further basis for how the proposed density and dwelling types contemplated in the application form a complete community that is served by existing transit and optimizes existing infrastructure.

Issue: Increased Traffic

There are concerns about increased traffic along Mayfield Road and McVean Drive. Also concerns about side roads being used and safety of children.

Response:

A Transportation Impact Study has been submitted by the applicant. This study has been reviewed and approved by Traffic Staff and found to be satisfactory to support the proposed development.

The study analyzed existing and future traffic impacts for the following years: existing conditions in 2019, 2023 and 2028. The report noted that the proposed development will have a minor transportation impact on the Study Area.

The proposed access location of the street was also reviewed to assess the sightline and intersection spacing. The study determined that the proposed access location to Mayfield Road is appropriate based on a sightline perspective as well as the intersection spacing.

Issue: Impact to environment

A comment was received regarding negative impacts to the environment as a result of this proposed development.

Response:

An Environmental Impact Study and Tree Evaluation Report were prepared by the applicant. Environmental planning and Parks Planning staff in coordination with the Toronto Region Conservation Authority have reviewed these and find them to be satisfactory.

The Environmental Impact Study was prepared to study the impact of the proposed development on the natural heritage features in the site. The report identified six natural heritage features and provided recommendations to protect these features post development.

The Tree Evaluation Report was prepared to confirm inventory of trees located on the site, any opportunities for the protection of these trees and the compensation for tree removals. The report confirmed that all 139 trees were to be removed on the site and 216 replacement trees will be required as compensation and to be planted on the site.

Issue: Planned development in Vales of Humber Block Plan have not been materialized yet

Comment was provided regarding that when the home was purchased, the block plan was shared which shows blocks for a place of worship, elementary school and trails. All of these have not been done yet.

Response:

The block plan is a conceptual representation of the intended vision and character of the development in the applicable block plan area. Final designs for block plan elements including pathways, gateway features and other elements are confirmed through the development approval process.

Construction of the trails is currently undetermined as not all relevant properties have gone through the development process. Once all applications have been submitted and the City has acquired the lands for the trail, the trails can be completed.

There is one place of worship and two elementary schools identified in the Vales of Humber Block Plan. Of the blocks identified, one site has already been developed. There is an existing elementary school located at 100 Martin Byrne Drive. The other Elementary School and Place of Worship site are currently vacant and further details are provided below.

The Place of Worship block is located at 150 Martin Byrne Drive and the other Elementary School block is located at 0 McVean Drive (Carl Finlay Drive and McVean Drive).

There was a Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision application (C09E16.008) approved for the Elementary School Block located at 0 McVean Drive. This application proposed an elementary school (at the Elementary School block), 17 single detached residential lots and 17 single detached residential part blocks. The associated draft plan of subdivision was registered in November 2016.

For the place of worship designated site, there is no current application or previous approvals to facilitate a Place of Worship yet. A pre-con application was submitted in March 2018 which has since been closed. Once an application is put forward and approved, development of a Place of Worship can proceed.

For further clarification, the Parks Planning and Development Division can be contacted at 905-874-2331.

Issue: Design elements discussed in the Vales of Humber Community Design Guidelines are not being applied

Response:

Residential draft plan of subdivisions are subject to architectural control. Builders and developers are required to comply with the Architectural Design Review and Compliance Document and the approved Community Design Guidelines or Urban Design Brief.

Issue: Property Values

Concerns regarding impacts to the property value of homes as a result of this proposed development were noted.

Response:

Planning staff cannot comment on the future potential valuation of land. This application is reviewed on the merits of criteria set out in the "Planning Act" and City, Regional and Provincial policies regarding land use planning.

Issue: Capacity of Schools

Schools do not have capacity to support enrollment of future students of this proposed development.

Response:

Both school boards (Peel District School Board and Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board) are in receipt of the proposed development and provided their conditions of draft approval for the subdivision.

Two schools in the Peel District School Board were located within the attendance area, both are not at capacity yet. In the Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board, two schools were located in the catchment area of which one secondary school was at capacity.

Both school boards requested conditions to be added in the development and engineering agreements noting that sufficient accommodation might not be available for all anticipated schools, that some students may need to be bussed and details regarding where children will meet the school bus. These conditions are provided in the Conditions of Draft Approval (Appendix 16).

Issue: Scheduling of Original Public Meeting was during the onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic

The public meeting for this application was initially scheduled for April 6, 2020. Notification was provided to property owners within 240m of the subject lands on March 6, 2020 as per Planning Act requirements and notice of the public meeting was published in the Brampton Guardian.

During this time, comments were received from members of the public regarding why a meeting was happening during the beginning of the COVID-19 Pandemic and whether it could be moved to a further date.

Response:

This meeting was later cancelled with the notification also published in the Brampton Guardian as well as mailed notices being sent to property owners within 240m of the subject lands.

Issue: Clarification regarding Planning Process

Member of the public sought clarity on why the application was still moving forward to a public meeting after there was already a Councillors meeting held in September 2020.

Response:

The virtual councillor meeting was held in September 2020 and a Statutory Public Meeting was organized in November 2020.

The Statutory Public meeting varies from other types of meetings as it follows a set procedure determined by the Planning Act and City of Brampton with regard to when

Appendix 11

the notification needs to be provided by, who is notified and what specific notices need to be sent.

The Planning Act requires that a Statutory Public Meeting is held to consider any applications for amendments to the Official Plan, Zoning By-law and Plans of Subdivision. The purpose of this meeting is to consider the staff report and provide information to the public.