

ATTACHMENT 9 – RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

Results of Public Meeting (July 26, 2021) and Correspondence Received

OZS-2021-0011

Monday, July 26, 2021

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: David Barrick, Chief Administrative Officer
Richard Forward, Commissioner Planning and Development Services
Allan Parsons, Director, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Bob Bjerke, Director, Policy Planning, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Jeffrey Humble, Manager, Policy Planning, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Steve Ganesh, Manager, Planning Building and Economic Development
David Vanderberg, Manager, Planning Building and Economic Development
Cynthia Owusu-Gyimah, Manager, Planning Building and Economic Development
Sameer Akhtar, City Solicitor
Yinzhou Xiao, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Carmen Caruso, Central Area Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development

ATTACHMENT 9 – RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

Kelly Henderson, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Himanshu Katyal, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Tejinder Sidhu, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Harsh Padhya, Heritage Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Anand Balram, Development Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Andrew McNeill, Manager, Official Plan and Growth Management, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Andria Oliveira, Project Manager, Transportation Policy, Planning, Building and Economic Development
Peter Fay, City Clerk
Charlotte Gravlev, Deputy City Clerk
Richa Ajitkumar, Acting 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. and adjourned at 10:49 p.m.

Correspondence was received from sixteen members of the public as well as three delegations were made at the meeting.

The following issues were raised by the Public through correspondence received for this application.

Summary of Comments Received

	Staff Response
A. Capacity of Schools	<p>The Conseil Scolaire Viamonde, Peel District School Board (PDSB) and Dufferin Catholic District School Board (DCDSB) have been circulated on this application and none have objected to the proposed development.</p> <p>The Conseil Scolaire Viamonde had no comments.</p> <p>Both the Peel District and Dufferin Catholic District School Board noted that sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area.</p>

ATTACHMENT 9 – RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

	<p>Students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school in another neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Peel District School Board has available school capacity from kindergarten to grade 12 whereas the Dufferin Catholic District School Boards does not have capacity.</p>
<p>B. Increase in traffic of local area</p>	<p>A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted by the applicant that Staff have found acceptable for rezoning purposes. The study analyzes existing and future capacity of the nearby streets based on available transit, active transportation (such as cycling and walking) and vehicular trips.</p> <p>The analysis concluded that the proposed full moves access from the proposal to Beech Street and Church Street will operate at acceptable level with minimum delay. Additionally, the intersection capacity analysis indicated that while queue may occasionally spill back on the left turn at Kennedy Road and Queen Street, there should be no major operational issues.</p>
<p>C. Construction Crew will park at the street</p>	<p>Any parking on-street or at public facilities needs to be in compliance with current city by-laws and policies.</p>
<p>D. Big trucks will use residential streets during construction of the application</p>	<p>Construction vehicle access will be coordinated as a part of the Road Occupancy Permit process.</p> <p>This permit provides temporary construction access and is required for any work done on roads or boulevards on City of Brampton streets. This page provides more details on the permit.</p> <p>Staff will ensure that appropriate construction management techniques (including time of day permitted for construction) are applied to the development.</p>
<p>E. Whether proposed parking spaces and rate satisfactory</p>	<p>The proposal provides parking at a rate of 0.95 spaces per residential unit and 0.20 spaces per unit for visitors. This results in a total of 306 residential spaces and 65 visitor parking spaces.</p> <p>City Staff find this parking rate acceptable.</p> <p>A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was submitted by nexTrans, that in addition to other traffic related items, provided an analysis of the proposed vehicle parking.</p> <p>The TIS has been reviewed by Traffic staff and Staff deem it acceptable for rezoning purposes. Prior to site plan approval, any remaining traffic comments including a swept</p>

ATTACHMENT 9 – RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

	<p>path analysis is to be provided at the time of development application will need to be addressed.</p>
<p>F. Increased Noise from Proposal</p>	<p>Some noise and dust can be expected during construction. The applicant is required to adhere to City By-laws in place regarding noise to minimize disruption to the local community.</p> <p>Additionally, prior to site plan approval and construction, Noise Staff will require a letter from the applicant that provides information on potential noise-emitting sources.</p>
<p>G. Impacts to Property Value</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>H. Concerns regarding loss of mature trees and loss of greenery</p>	<p>An Arborist Report and Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan was provided for this application, that will be further refined and finalized at the site plan stage.</p> <p>The report notes that many of the 146 trees inventoried within the site are in declining health and that they should be removed. No tree removals will be permitted until the Arborist Report and Site Plan approval is provided.</p> <p>The applicant has also provided a Sustainability Assessment that measures the sustainability performance of new development. The application achieves a final sustainability score of 65, which meets the ‘Silver’ level. This score will be further refined at the site plan stage to ensure City’s sustainability requirements are met.</p>
<p>I. Submitted Tree Preservation Plan and Arborist Report has some inconsistencies.</p>	<p>The submitted Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan have been received by Staff and will be refined at the Site Plan stage.</p> <p>Open Space Staff agree that there are inconsistencies in the submitted documents that will need to be addressed in a future revision.</p> <p>No tree removals are permitted until tree compensation payment has been provided and the Arborist Report and Site Plan Application is approved.</p>
<p>J. Notification of proposal was only provided within a 240m radius. It should have been provided to the whole ward.</p>	<p>In accordance with the City’s <u>Official Plan</u>, notice of the Public Meeting are given by prepaid first class mail to all persons assessed in respect of land to which the proposal applies and within 240 metres of the subject property as shown on the last revised assessment roll, and by public notification in the Brampton Guardian. These notification standards exceed the minimum notification requirements of the Planning Act. Notice of any statutory Public Meeting</p>

ATTACHMENT 9 – RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

	<p>will be given at least 20 days prior to the date of the meeting.</p> <p>Additionally, Public Notice signs are posted on all frontages of the application, which provides members of the public an additional opportunity to learn about the proposed changes.</p>
<p>K. Confirmation that the Heritage Home will be relocated at 136 Church Street</p>	<p>A Heritage Impact Assessment has concluded that the property at 136 Church Street East has heritage significance and that home will be retained and relocated to 132 Church Street East. The unique dwelling at 61 Beech Street will be commemorated in a similarly shaped gazebo that will serve to provide shade and seating to residents. City Staff and the Heritage Consultant have worked together and finalized that the building will be relocated to 136 Church Street East.</p> <p>Prior to site plan approval, a Heritage Conservation Plan will be required that demonstrates a plan for moving building safely and putting it on a new foundation, providing conservation guidelines as well as securities for all work. These measures will aid in implementing and enforcing the proposed relocation.</p>
<p>L. Transition and impact to adjacent low-density residential neighbourhood that has a historical heritage character</p>	<p>The proposal has been revised from its initial concept to provide a better transition and increased compatibility with the adjacent neighbourhood. This includes directing density at the corner of Beech and Church Street, away from interior residential streets and removing a townhouse block.</p> <p>The applicant has provided appropriate justification for the increase in height and density based on the applicable Provincial, Regional and local policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning Staff has reviewed the application and the submitted Planning Justification Report and is of the professional opinion that the proposed development is satisfactory based on the applicable provincial, regional and local policies. The applicant has submitted an Urban Design Brief prepared by KFA Architects + Planners Inc. The proposed development conforms to the Transit-Supportive Mid-Rise Development Guidelines through the proposed compact development that incorporates cultural heritage assets and provides a pedestrian related street wall. - A Heritage Impact Assessment has also been submitted by the applicant that assesses the impacts of the proposal that contains four heritage properties. This study noted that the heritage home

ATTACHMENT 9 – RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

	<p>on 136 Church Street is to be preserved. The other three heritage properties did not meet the criteria for designation. However, due to the unique design of 61 Beech Street, the study recommended that the form be commemorated within the proposal. Through these mitigation measures, heritage properties have been integrated within the proposal.</p> <p>Through the implementation of the recommendations in the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment as well as the approved Urban Design Brief, it will be ensured that the built form reflects a contemporary architectural aesthetic that respects the heritage character of the neighbourhood.</p>
<p>M. Loss of Privacy</p>	<p>Design strategies have been applied that strategically minimize shadowing impacts and maintain light, view, and privacy for adjacent low density residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p><i>Design Strategies</i></p> <p>The highest density proposed, the 14-storey apartment, is located at the corner of Beech and Church Street. Gradual stepbacks have been applied above the fourth storey to provide an appropriate streetscape.</p> <p>The building fits mostly within a 45-degree angular plane, measured from the abutting property line, except for some small projections on the 8th floor, 10th to 14th floor and mechanical penthouse. This provides an appropriate transition between the proposed building and existing neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposed three-storey stacked townhouse blocks are setback approximately 7.0m, from the rear, which backs onto the backyards of homes. This helps to maintain privacy and transition of density.</p> <p><i>Shadowing</i></p> <p>A Sun/Shadow Analysis (included within the Urban Design Brief document and Architectural Set) was prepared by KFA architects + planners inc., that showed shadow impacts at 9:30AM, 12:30PM, 3:30PM and 6:30PM for March/September 21 (Spring and Fall Equinoxes) as well as June 21 and December 21 (Summer and Winter solstice).</p> <p>The study has demonstrated that the shadow cast from the proposal onto adjacent properties will be of minimal duration at brief periods in the day (3 hours or less) and that the surrounding areas still have sun exposure. Shadow impacts were the most noticeable on adjacent</p>

ATTACHMENT 9 – RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

	<p>properties during December 21, the shortest day of the year.</p>
<p>N. Infrastructure Capacity to support development proposal</p>	<p>A Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report was prepared for the application by Crozier Consulting Engineers.</p> <p>City and Region of Peel Staff have reviewed the document and satisfied that the site can achieve the proposed grading, storm servicing and stormwater management strategies.</p> <p>The report studies the capacities of the sanitary sewers and water servicing to determine the servicing of the proposed development. The report proposes that the site will be serviced by two water service connections on Church Street and sanitary sewer connection that connects into existing sanitary sewer on Church Street. The Relocated Heritage Home on 132 Church Street will retain its servicing connections because use has not changed.</p>
<p>O. Availability of Green Space</p>	<p>The Brampton Flowertown Secondary Plan provides direction on conceptual land uses anticipated for the area including where Recreational Open Space is to be located. The closest City Parks to the site near the subject site for all members of the public are the Sheridan Parkette, Salisbury Circle Parkette and Duggan Park. The Brampton Cemetery is another example of open space in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposed development also provides indoor and outdoor amenity space for residents of the proposed development. This has been reviewed and accepted by Urban Design and Open Space staff. This proposal is contemplated to be under condominium tenure which makes all amenities offered for this development to be private and only for condominium residents.</p>