



Principals

Michael Gagnon
Lena Gagnon
Andrew Walker
Richard Domes

April 24, 2023

GWD File PN 01.242.00
MTSA

The Corporation of the City of Brampton
2 Wellington Street West
Brampton, Ontario
L6Y 4R2

Attention: Mayor and Members of Council
Peter Fay, City Clerk
Steve Ganesh, Commissioner, Planning, Building and Growth Management
Michelle Gervais, Policy Planner, City Planning and Design
Claudia LaRota, Supervisor/Principal Planner, City Planning and Design

Subject: Public Input – April 24, 2023 Planning & Development Committee
Item 7.2 - City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment
Major Transit Station Areas (City-Wide)
Lark Investments Inc.

Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. (GWD) and Delta Urban Inc. (Delta Urban) acts as Planning Consultant to Lark Investments Inc. (Client); the Registered Owner of 10 and 26 Victoria Crescent, 376, 383, 387 and 391 Orenda Road and 24 Bramalea Road, in the City of Brampton (hereinafter referred to as the "subject site"). The subject site is located in the Bramalea GO 'Primary' MTSA.

We have been monitoring and actively engaged in the City's MTSA Planning Study process, and we previously provided comments on the draft City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment – Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA) on February 13, 2023.

Our Client has also been actively participating in the Brampton Plan (City of Brampton New Official Plan) process, including correspondence dated June 3, 2022 prepared by Delta Urban.

City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment - MTSA

On behalf of Lark Investments Inc., we have reviewed the City of Brampton Staff Recommendation Report dated March 8, 2023, along with the accompanying revised Draft Official Plan Amendment (OPA). We note that revisions to the Draft Official Plan Amendment have incorporated most of our previous comments. Following our detailed review of the revised Draft Official Plan Amendment, we offer the following additional comments, observations and recommendations.

GAGNON WALKER DOMES LTD.

7685 Hurontario Street, Suite 501 • Brampton ON Canada L6W 0B4 • P: 905-796-5790
www.gwdplanners.com • Toll Free: 1-855-771-7266

**CONFIDENTIALITY
CAUTION**

This document is Consultant-Client privileged and contains confidential information intended only for person(s) named above. Any distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this document in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original to us by mail without making a copy.



1. **Policy 3.2.4.1** of the draft revised OPA includes directs that “...a minimum number of residents and jobs will be applied.” The next sentence then references “The minimum number of residents and jobs combined per hectare...outlined in Table 1...” In the first sentence, this would represent a total number of residents and jobs, while the second sentence and Table 1 are density targets that are calculated across the whole of the MTSA. We recommend that the first sentence be amended to read: ‘... a minimum density target of residents and jobs per hectare will be applied.’
2. **Policy 3.2.5.1** – While the revisions to policy to indicate lands within “Primary” MTSA’s and the reference to being developed in accordance with the applicable Secondary Plan designation to generally meet the listed objectives partially addresses our earlier comments, it is still not clear if the objectives of this policy are meant to be met across the whole of the MTSA, or within each development application within a “Primary” MTSA. We recommend that language be added to the policy lead-in paragraph that the objectives are to be achieved across the whole of the MTSA.
3. **Policy 3.2.5.1 b)** – The objective for transitioning to lower density established neighbourhoods is supportable, however, the reference to ‘*properties that do not have frontage along existing or planned higher order transit corridors*’ should be removed. There are areas in the “Primary” MTSA’s, including the subject site, where there are properties that do not have frontage along existing or planned higher transit corridors that do not necessarily require transition to lower heights. The policy should simply remove this part, and simply direct transitioning from the location of the highest built form to the existing lower density areas to achieve the appropriate transitions.
4. **Policy 3.2.5.2 b) and c), and Policies 3.2.5.4 and 3.2.5.5** – While the revised Draft OPA replaced “if required” to “and if appropriate” with regard to maximum building heights and maximum FSI, we continue to recommend that the policy be amended to only reference the minimum heights. The letter dated February 9, 2023 to the Region of Peel which clarifies that through the modifications and approval of the Region of Peel Official Plan in November 2022, the local municipalities are not permitted to assign maximum building heights in MTSA’s.
5. **Policy 3.2.5.3** – Is a new policy that has been added to this version of the draft OPA. The policy is vague and not clear when Inclusionary Zoning may apply, as it states that it may apply to ‘specific “Primary” MTSA’s’, but does not specify which ones. Further, it does not include criteria to decide when, if and where it would apply. Inclusionary Zoning is one (1) of many tools available to be utilized to address housing concerns, which is already being addressed through the housing compatibility component of the Planning Justification Report. We recommend that this policy be deleted in its entirety.
6. **Policies 3.2.6, 3.2.6.1 and 3.2.6.2** – In the opening paragraph of Policy 3.2.6, it notes that Tertiary Plans be prepared if the site is adjacent to a new higher order



transit station that is proposed or that the site is adjacent to an existing higher order transit station, but then appears to expand this requirement to all areas of a “Primary” MTSA in Policy 3.2.6.1. These statements appear to contradict themselves. Further, given the language of Policy 3.2.6.1, is Policy 3.2.6.2 necessary; we recommend deletion of Policy 3.2.6.2 given the wording of Policy 3.2.6.1.

7. **Policy 3.2.6.3** – While the revised Draft OPA partially addresses our previous comments, we remain concerned as this policy still assumes that all applications are proceeding at the same time. The requirement for the submission of one joint Tertiary Plan does not recognize that different landowners may be at different stages of the development application process for their sites. We are concerned with this policy language as it has the potential to hold up applications that otherwise might be able to proceed. We recommend that the last sentence be deleted in its entirety. This is further supported by the inclusion of Policy 3.2.6.4 which speaks to the process whereby an already approved Tertiary Plan may be modified in the instance where different landowners are on different development timelines.
8. **Policies 3.2.7.1 and 3.2.7.2** – These policies speak to the responsibility of the applicant to prepare a Growth Management Strategy to assess the timing and delivery of servicing infrastructure. The policy does not reflect that in most cases this requires assessing or recommending/implementing servicing upgrades across lands that are not in the applicants control, or timing of improvements that are not in the applicants control (i.e. City and Regional Capital Works Program changes, etc.).

Further, the policy requires that the Growth Management Study be included as a section in the Planning Justification Report, meet the established terms of reference, and be to the satisfaction of the City and Region, prior to deeming the application complete. It is inappropriate to require the strategy to be to the satisfaction of the municipalities prior to deeming the application complete. The policy should only require that the strategy be deemed to have met the requirements of the terms of reference prior to deeming it complete, and thereafter, through the processing of the application and the technical review will the strategy ultimately be approved to the satisfaction of the municipalities.

Closing Remarks

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment – Major Transit Station Areas. Our Client reserves the right to provide further comments as necessary prior to Council approval of the Official Plan Amendment.

Kindly accept this letter as our formal request to be notified of all future Open Houses, Public Meetings, Planning Committee and Council meetings to be held in connection with the City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment – Major Transit Station Areas. Lastly, we request notification of the passage of any and all By-laws and/or Notices on this matter.



Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Andrew Walker, B.E.S., M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Partner, Principal Planner

Michael Gagnon, B.E.S., M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Partner, Managing Principal Planner

cc: **Lark Investments Inc.**
Mustafa Ghassan, Delta Urban Inc.
Anthony Sirianni, Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.
Harjap Singh, Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.