

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
Region of Peel	<p>We recommend that Brampton staff consider adding a policy that is similar to Mississauga's Development Servicing policy 5.7.9.1 contained in their OPA.</p> <p>Clarify that the intent of the MTSA Block Concept Plan does not imply the use of a Community Block Plan framework for MTSAs. The City might consider the use of a different term to avoid confusion with Block Planning, such as Precinct Plans.</p> <p>An exemption from the MTSA Block Concept Plan would trigger an exemption from having to submit a Growth Management Strategy (GMS). Amend Section 3.2.6.1 to require both City and Regional satisfaction.</p> <p>Given the significance of the Region's role in ensuring appropriate phasing, we suggest revising 3.2.6.3 to include the Region of Peel.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The proposed MTSA Block Concept Plan does not imply the use of a Community Block Plan framework for MTSAs. The requirement for a MTSA Block Concept Plan has been replaced with the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of Brampton's 2006 Official Plan.</p> <p>A Growth Management Strategy is required for applications and Tertiary Plans submitted within a "Primary" MTSA prior to Brampton completing its MTSA Study. The Strategy will form part of the Planning Justification Report and shall be prepared in accordance with the City's Planning Justification Report Terms of Reference and be to the general satisfaction of the City and the Region of Peel prior to deeming the application complete.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.7 of the OPA has been amended to include the recommended Development Servicing policy.</p> <p>The reference to MTSA Block Concept Plan has been changed to Tertiary Plan in all applicable policies.</p> <p>Section 3.2.6.1 has been amended to state that the Tertiary Plan shall be prepared in accordance with Section 5.35 of the Official Plan. Section 5.35.5 already states that the Tertiary Plan shall be prepared to "other reviewing agencies satisfaction".</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	Suggest a policy that directs the City of Brampton to prepare a Terms of Reference for the Growth Management Strategy document in consultation with the Region.	It is the intent that the Strategy will form a section of the Planning Justification Report. The Planning Justification Report Terms of Reference will be amended to include the requirements of the Strategy and will be provided to the Region for their review.	Section 3.2.7.1 has been amended to add the words <i>"The Strategy shall be prepared in accordance with the City's Planning Justification Report Terms of Reference and be to the general satisfaction of the City and the Region of Peel prior to deeming the application complete."</i>
	Update the language as per the Region of Peel Official Plan (RPOP) MTSA policies pertaining to Planned MTSA's.	Agree	The definition of Planned MTSA's in the OPA has been amended to conform with the RPOP.
	Ensure all MTSA definitions, references to MTSA's and delineated boundaries are in accordance with the RPOP.	Agree	All definitions, references and have been amended in accordance the RPOP.
	The terms "minimum densities" and "minimum population and employment targets" are being used in this policy. It is not clear if the terms mean the same or refer to two different targets. Table 1 includes only minimum density targets. Some clarification or revision is needed.	Agree. Table 1 is intended to only include the minimum number of residents and jobs combined per hectare for the Primary MTSA's.	In Section 3.2.4.1 the term <i>"minimum densities"</i> has been revised to <i>"minimum number of residents and jobs combined per hectare."</i>
	Add the word "Primary" to Section 3.2.5.2	Agree	The word "Primary" was added to Section 3.2.5.2.
	In Section 3.2.5.2 include criteria as per RPOP 5.6.19.10.	Agree	Section 3.2.5.2 a) has been amended to state, <i>"the criteria in accordance with Section 5.6.19.10 of the Region of Peel's Official Plan."</i>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>The Minister provided a letter that discussed maximum height policies within MTSAs. However, consultation with the Ministry is ongoing and Region staff will provide information and clarification regarding this matter as it becomes available.</p> <p>Section 3.2.5.2 i) Protection of Employment Areas: does not address flexible employment policies within MTSAs (RPOP 5.6.36), clarification/confirmation needed on whether this will be addressed in future OP updates.</p> <p>Clarify in Section 3.2.7.6 that land use compatibility shall be in accordance with requirements of the PPS and provincial guidelines, standards and procedures.</p> <p>Clarify how Section 3.2.7.7 does not contradict achieving MTSA density targets. Possibly change from short-term to long-term.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>The future Official Plan and Secondary Plan Amendments will address flexible land use permissions.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>The policy has been amended to ensure that building additions, and/or alterations may be permitted for non-residential uses where it can be demonstrated that they do not impact the MTSA objectives. To ensure this, the Zoning By-law amendment that will pre-zone the “Primary” MTSAs will</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required at this point.</p> <p>Section 3.2.7.7 has been amended to include “<i>in accordance with requirements of the PPS and provincial guidelines, standards and procedures.</i>”</p> <p>The words “<i>preclude the long-term redevelopment</i>” has been deleted from new Section 3.2.7.8 and replaced with “<i>impact the MTSA objectives</i>”.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Add the following to Section 3.2.8.3, “that may be delineated by the Region of Peel in the future will require a City-initiated Official Plan Amendment to be designated on Schedule 1b.”</p>	<p>include the necessary provisions to implement this policy.</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>A new Section 3.2.9 (New MTSAs) has been added with the wording “3.2.9.1 New MTSAs that may be delineated by the Region of Peel in the future will require a City-initiated Official Plan Amendment to be designated on Schedule 1b.”</p>
	<p>Recommend adding a reference in 3.2.4 to the potential for Inclusionary Zoning requirements in Primary Major Transit Station Areas.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>A new Section 3.2.5.3 has been added stating, “Inclusionary zoning may apply to specific Primary MTSAs to increase housing affordability.”</p>
	<p>In Section 3.2.6.6 e) can there be a statement added requiring how the development will provide an appropriate proportion of family sized units to meet local need. Perhaps also reference exploring opportunities for purpose-built rental, and where not possible, affordable rental.</p>	<p>This intent is covered in the MTSA objectives Section 3.2.5.1 where it states, “Provide a range and mix of housing options, unit sizes and tenure, including affordable housing, to attract a broad range of demographics and to meet local need.”</p> <p>There is also a requirement in Section 3.2.6.6 d) that the Planning Justification Report explain how the development proposal generally satisfies the Region of Peel’s Housing Strategy and Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan 2018-2028.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	In Section 3.2.6.6. f) suggest providing some sort of price points to indicate what households will be able to afford these units.	This will not be included as part of this OPA. We will consider adding this in the Secondary Plan MTSA policies.	No action required.
	Can language be added around universal accessibility of units?	This will not be included as part of this OPA. We will consider adding this in the Secondary Plan MTSA policies.	No action required.
	To ensure the stormwater management is addressed comprehensively from a systems perspective, we recommend that the word “facilities” be deleted in Section 3.2.7.1.	The list of items to be addressed in the Growth Management Strategy has been deleted from the OPA.	The list of items to be addressed in the Growth Management Strategy has been deleted from the OPA.
	Secondary MTSA's are referenced in the definitions section but are not addressed in the classification or policies.	At this time we are only proposing to add a definition of Secondary MTSA's into the current Official Plan as Brampton does not have any delineated Secondary MTSA's in accordance with RROP Schedule E-5. We don't deem it necessary to include any Secondary MTSA policies as part of this OPA.	To clarify, Section 3.2.8.1 has been amended to state: <i>“Planned” MTSA's require further study to determine appropriate land use considerations before they are delineated by the Region of Peel. The delineation and establishment of minimum population and employment targets for “Planned” MTSA's that will be delineated as either “Primary” or “Secondary” by the Region of Peel will require an amendment to the Region’s Official Plan, Brampton’s Official Plan and any applicable Secondary Plans.”</i>
	The protection, preservation and enhancement of the natural heritage system should be included in Section 3.2.5.2.	Agree.	The protection, preservation and enhancement of the natural heritage system has been added as 3.2.5.2.h).

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	Should consideration of servicing capacity to facilitate further development within the MTSA be included if servicing capacity is limited and the City deems it desirable that capacity be reserved for other strategic objectives, services or needs?	This will not be included as part of this OPA. We will consider adding this in the Secondary Plan MTSA policies.	No action required.
Embree Properties Limited	To allow greater intensification on sites without cultural heritage resources. Greater density should be directed to sites adjacent to arterial roads.	Comments will be considered when the detailed Secondary Plan policies are prepared for each “Primary” MTSA.	No action required.
Zelinka Priamo Ltd. c/o Choice Properties REIT and c/o Canadian Tire Corporation	Vision for MTSAs should acknowledge employment uses. MTSA objectives shall not apply to “all development”. Clarification on maximum building heights in MTSAs.	Agree In general, objectives are to be met for the overall MTSA, however, staff recognizes that some properties may not redevelop with transit oriented uses, and will be designated accordingly in the specific secondary plan. Discussions are on-going between the Province and the Region as to whether local municipalities can establish maximum building heights in Protected MTSAs in the context of the Minister’s letter dated February 9, 2023 to the Regional Chair.	<i>“Employment uses”</i> have been added to the introductory paragraph in Section 3.2.4. Section 3.2.5.1 has been revised to state, <i>“Lands within Primary MTSAs shall be developed in accordance with the applicable Secondary Plan designation to generally to meet the following objectives:...”</i> The proposed OPA includes Section 3.2.5.2 b) that states, <i>“The minimum, and if appropriate, maximum building heights.”</i>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
		In Section 3.2.5.2, the draft OPA includes language about the policies that will be implemented through future amendments to the applicable Secondary Plan for each “Primary” station that will address, among other matters, the minimum, and if appropriate, maximum building heights. If it is determined by the Province that maximum building heights can not be established by the local municipalities, then the subsequent OPAs that will be forwarded to Council for adoption in November 2023 will not include maximum building heights.	
	Will MTSA Block Concept Plans be required for as-of-right development and/or infill development prior to comprehensive redevelopment?	The requirement for a MTSA Block Concept Plan has been replaced with the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of Brampton’s 2006 Official Plan. According to Section 5.35.1, a Tertiary Plan may be required as part of a complete application for most development applications.	Policy 3.2.6.1 has been amended to reflect the requirement of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of the Official Plan.
	Clarify what “approval” of a Block Concept Plan means?	Any required Tertiary Plan will conform to the requirements outlined in Section 5.35 of the Official Plan.	The “approval” language has been deleted from the proposed OPA.

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	OPA should include opportunities to amend an approved Block Concept Plan.	Agree	A new Section 3.2.6.5 has been added that states, <i>“If a Tertiary Plan has been approved in accordance with Section 5.35 of this Plan, amendments to the Tertiary Plan can be requested by an applicant through the submission of a Pre-consultation Application. The requested amendments will be evaluated to ensure that they do not impact the “Primary” MTSA outlined in Section 3.2.5.1. If deemed acceptable by the Director, Development Services the amended Tertiary Plan shall be approved by Council in conjunction with the development application.”</i>
	For proposed as-of-right development is a Planning Justification Report required?	A Planning Justification Report that includes a Growth Management Strategy is required to be submitted in conjunction with a development application. If the property has as-of-right zoning permissions, there is still a requirement to understand how infrastructure and services are delivered in a manner that supports complete communities, including open space, accessible public amenities and active transportation infrastructure.	Clarification has been added to Section 3.2.7.1 that requires the submission of Planning Justification Report, which includes a Growth Management Strategy section for development applications and Tertiary Plans.
	Add “where residential is proposed” to the policy that requires the submission of a Planning Justification Report.	The Planning Justification Report will be required for residential and mixed-use development proposals.	Section 3.2.6.5 has been amended to state, <i>“The Planning Justification Report submitted in conjunction with a residential or mixed-use</i>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Add compatibility criteria to the list of components of a required Planning Justification Report.</p> <p>Flexibility shall be provided to provide for infill development for non-residential uses prior to comprehensive redevelopment at an appropriate and feasible time to allow for increased densities on individual sites.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>The flexibility for infill development for non-residential uses prior to comprehensive redevelopment will be reviewed in more detail as the Brampton MTSA Study is being completed. If deemed appropriate, the necessary policies will be included in the applicable Secondary Plan policies that will be forwarded to Council for adoption by November 22, 2023.</p>	<p><i>development application shall include the following:....”</i></p> <p>Section 3.2.6.5 has been amended to add subsection “f) Demonstrate how land use compatibility has been assessed and addressed in accordance with applicable Provincial guidelines, standards and procedures and policies of this Plan.”</p> <p>No action required.</p>
D.J.K. Land Use Planning c/o Fifth Avenue Group	Ambiguous language related to abutting land uses that could restrict achieving the desired intensification goals given Council’s direction for unlimited height and density.	The intent is to have general MTSA policies in the Official Plan and to have more specific MTSA policies at the Secondary Plan level once the MTSA Study is completed. The Secondary Plan policies will also be informed by the City’s Tall Building Guidelines	Section 3.2.5.1 b) has been amended to state, <i>“Concentrate the highest intensity within close proximity to the transit station or stop, and transitioning to a lower intensity built form for properties that do not have frontage along existing or planned high order transit corridors, to achieve an appropriate transition to established low density residential areas.”</i>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
		<p>Council's direction to permit unlimited height and density within a portion of the Urban Growth Centre is based on implementing a Holding provision that will require the completion of a number of technical studies to the satisfaction of the City prior to the lifting of a Holding Provision. Some of these studies will include shadow impacts and illustrating an appropriate transition of built-form to existing areas.</p> <p>The determination of the "appropriate transition" will be reviewed on a site-specific basis.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.5.2 b) has been amended to state, <i>"appropriate transitions in height and density to adjacent established low density residential uses."</i></p>
<p>Malone Give Parsons c/o TACC Holborn</p>	<p>Is the requirement for a block concept plan a permanent requirement and will these policies be carried forward into the long-term policies for Primary MTSA's?</p> <p>Areas with advanced MTSA studies should be exempt from the MTSA Block Concept Plan requirement.</p>	<p>The requirement for a MTSA Block Concept Plan has been replaced with the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of Brampton's 2006 Official Plan. According to Section 5.35.1, a Tertiary Plan may be required as part of a complete application for most development applications.</p> <p>There may still be instances where a Tertiary Plan is deemed appropriate to be submitted in conjunction with a development application that is submitted within a Primary MTSA once Brampton's</p>	<p>No action at this time.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>The lands owned by TACC Holborn within The Gore MTSA have already undergone extensive block-wide analysis through the review of the development applications. In addition, the majority of the lands are approved and are under construction.</p>	<p>MTSA Study is completed and the long-term policies are adopted. This will be reviewed in more detail once the long-term policies are being drafted.</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>To acknowledge where extensive planning has already occurred, a new Section 3.2.6.2. has been added stating, <i>“A Tertiary Plan may not be required for development applications located within either a draft approved Plan of Subdivision or an approved Block area.”</i></p>
<p>Gagnon Walker Domes (4 pieces of Correspondence) c/o Lark Investments c/o Starbank Development Corporation c/o Claireville Holdings Limited</p>	<p>Include progressive language, such as ‘encourage’ and ‘strive to provide’ in all policies.</p> <p>The reference to ‘non-motorized’ travel in the introductory paragraph contradicts the reference to transit services which are motorized modes of travel.</p> <p>Do the MTSA objectives apply across the whole MTSA or within each development application within an identified MTSA? Recommend to amend wording so that the objectives are achieved across the whole of the MTSA.</p> <p>Section 3.2.5.2 – clarification with respect to the word “study”.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Generally, each development shall strive to meet all of the MTSA objectives. It is acknowledged that some development proposals will not meet all of the objectives.</p> <p>The reference to “study” in this Section is to the MTSA Study that the City is undertaking.</p>	<p>The words “are encouraged to” have been added to the introductory paragraph in Section 3.2.4 with respect to affordable housing.</p> <p>The sentence “non-motorized travel will be the preferred option within MTSAs” has been deleted from the introductory paragraph in Section 3.2.4.</p> <p>Section 3.2.5.1 has been amended to state, <i>“Lands within Primary MTSAs shall be developed in accordance with the applicable Secondary Plan designation to generally meet the following objectives:”</i></p> <p>Section 3.2.5.2 has been amended to add “MTSA” in front of “planning study”.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Clarification on imposing maximum building heights in MTSAs in areas of the City where Council has directed unlimited height and density.</p> <p>Is the MTSA Block Concept Plan the same as a Tertiary Plan?</p>	<p>Discussions are on-going between the Province and the Region as to whether local municipalities can establish maximum building heights in Protected MTSAs in the context of the Minister's letter dated February 9, 2023 to the Regional Chair.</p> <p>In Section 3.2.5.2, the draft OPA includes language about the policies that will be implemented through future amendments to the applicable Secondary Plan for each "Primary" station that will address, among other matters, the minimum, and if appropriate, maximum building heights. If it is determined by the Province that maximum building heights can not be established by the local municipalities, then the subsequent OPAs that will be forwarded to Council for adoption in November 2023 will not include maximum building heights.</p> <p>The requirement for a MTSA Block Concept Plan has been replaced with the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of Brampton's 2006 Official Plan. According to Section 5.35.</p>	<p>The proposed OPA includes Section 3.2.5.2 b) that states, <i>"The minimum, and if appropriate, maximum building heights."</i></p> <p>Policy 3.2.6.1 has been amended to reflect the requirement of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of the Official Plan.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Delete Section 3.2.6.4 that encourages landowners within a Block Concept Plan area to work together to prepare a Plan.</p> <p>Delete Section 3.2.6.5 g) that requires the phasing of a development. If all lands can proceed, phasing should not be forced.</p> <p>Does reference to phasing in Section 3.2.6.5 g) apply within each site-specific development or across the whole of the MTSA?</p>	<p>1, a Tertiary Plan may be required as part of a complete application for most development applications. The Tertiary Plan shall be prepared in accordance with Section 5.35 of Brampton's Official Plan.</p> <p>This section has been deleted.</p> <p>Development will be phased to ensure appropriate infrastructure, community services and facilities are available to service development. Section 3.2.6.5 g) has been deleted and incorporated into Section 3.2.7.1 and 3.2.7.2. Phasing of a development may be dependent upon services, facilities and infrastructure outside of the boundaries of a specific development proposal.</p>	<p>A new Section 3.2.6.3 has been added that states, <i>"To ensure co-ordination between applications in the same Tertiary Plan area, applicants will be advised through the Pre-consultation Application process if there are other development applications submitted within the same Tertiary Plan area. All applications within the same Tertiary Plan area will be required to submit one joint Tertiary Plan."</i></p> <p>Section 3.2.7.1 and 3.2.7.2 include the applicable phasing policies.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Confirm who prepares the Growth Management Strategy and the mechanism to ensure coordination of the Strategy amongst other applicants within the same Block Concept Plan area.</p> <p>Section 3.2.7.3 – use less prescriptive language with respect to consolidation of parcels.</p> <p>Sections 3.2.4 through 3.2.7 should clarify that these apply on to “Primary” MTSAs.</p> <p>The OPA to introduce interim MTSA policies is premature given the MTSA study and public engagement is ongoing.</p>	<p>The applicant is required to submit a Growth Management Strategy for their application and any required Tertiary Plan.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>The purpose of the Official Plan Amendment is to add interim policies <u>while</u> the MTSA Study is ongoing to better guide development and land use decisions in MTSAs before the final MTSA is adopted in November 2023.</p>	<p><i>Section 3.2.7 – Implementation for “Primary” MTSAs has been amended to reflect the requirement of a Tertiary Plan.</i></p> <p>This section has been amended to state, “Where the planned scale or configuration of development is not feasible on an individual property, property consolidation should be explored in order to facilitate integrated development within the MTSA. Where property consolidation is not feasible, development permissions may be limited.”</p> <p>The word “Primary” has been added to the applicable section headers.</p> <p>No action required.</p>
<p>SGL Planning & Design Inc. c/o Mac Mor of Canada Ltd. and c/o 2706287 Ontario Inc.</p>	<p>Will the Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan Area 9 be updated as part of the MTSA OPA be adopted later this year?</p>	<p>Yes, a new land use schedule and applicable MTSA policies will be added to the Bramalea Mobility Hub Secondary Plan as part of the OPA that will be forwarded to Council for adoption in November 2023.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	MTSA objectives shall not apply to “all development”.	In general, objectives are to be met for the overall MTSA, however, staff recognizes that some properties may not redevelop with transit oriented uses, and will be designated accordingly in the specific secondary plan	Section 3.2.5.1 has been revised to state, <i>“Lands within Primary MTSA shall be developed in accordance with the Secondary Plan designation to generally meet the following objectives.”</i>
	The two objectives surrounding cultural heritage and street network should be separated in Section 3.2.5.2 f).	Agree	Section 3.2.5.2 has been amended to have two separate policies pertaining to cultural heritage and the street network.
	The use of a Block Concept Plan is not an appropriate tool to be utilized in intensification areas.	The current Official Plan includes Tertiary Plan policies (Section 5.35.2 g)) that allows the City to require the applicant to prepare a Tertiary Plan as part of a complete development application where a new higher order transit station is proposed or the site is adjacent to an existing higher order transit station. A tertiary plan is a useful tool to understand the comprehensive development of lands located within a “Primary” MTSA.	<i>Section 3.2.7 – Implementation for “Primary” MTSA has been amended to reflect the requirement of a Tertiary Plan.</i>
	What legal status is intended to be given through the “approval” of a Block Concept Plan? Is a Block Concept Plan a binding statutory document?	The requirement for a MTSA Block Concept Plan has been replaced with the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section	Section 3.2.6 has been revised to include the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of the Official Plan.

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
		<p>5.35 of Brampton's 2006 Official Plan.</p> <p>The current Official Plan includes Tertiary Plan policies (Section 5.35.2 g)) that allows the City to require the applicant to prepare a Tertiary Plan as part of a complete development application where a new higher order transit station is proposed or the site is adjacent to an existing higher order transit station.</p> <p>Section 5.35.3 of the Official Plan states, <i>"Subject to any applicable Secondary Plan policies to the contrary, Staff are authorized to endorse Tertiary Plans for inclusion as non-statutory appendices to the applicable Secondary Plan prior to the approval of development applications."</i></p>	
	It is unclear as what criteria will be applied during the Pre-Consultation Application stage to determine if a Block Concept Plan is required.	The criteria in Section 5.35 – Tertiary Plans of the Official Plan will be applied.	Section 3.2.6 has been revised to include the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of the Official Plan.
	The requirement for one landowner to prepare a Block Concept Plan for lands not within its ownership is unduly onerous.	The City's current Tertiary Plan Official Plan policies (Section 5.35) require a landowner to conceptually show a	No action required.

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Clarify that only one Planning Justification Report is required to be submitted.</p> <p>Section 3.2.6.6 c) states applications should conform to policy document and guidelines/strategies. There is no statutory requirement for applications to conform to guidelines/strategies.</p> <p>Section 3.2.6.6 d) states that a breakdown of unit mixes and tenures shall be provided. This is impossible to calculate on other properties in the Block Concept Plan Area.</p>	<p>comprehensive development scenario on lands not within its ownership.</p> <p>Only one Planning Justification Report is required to be submitted with a formal development application.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>The intent of this policy is to only require this information for the subject development proposal and not for the entire Tertiary Plan area.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.6.7 has been amended to delete the words <i>“and the accompanying Planning Justification Report may include”</i>.</p> <p>Section 3.2.6.8 has been amended to state, <i>“The Planning Justification Report submitted in conjunction with a residential or mixed-use development application shall include the following:...”</i></p> <p>New Section 3.2.6.8 c) has been revised to state, <i>“Demonstrate conformity and consistency with the housing policies and objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and the Region of Peel’s 2051 Official Plan;”</i></p> <p>A new sub clause 3.2.6.8 d) has been added that states, <i>“Explain how the development proposal generally satisfies the Region of Peel’s Housing Strategy, Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan 2018-2028 and Housing Brampton”</i>.</p> <p>No action required.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>What is required in the preparation of an Affordable Housing Strategy?</p> <p>The requirement for a Growth Management Strategy is onerous and doesn't work well in a built-up environment. It is not appropriate for the policy to impose the responsibility on an applicant to assess the timing and delivery of the list of infrastructure across lands it does not own and where redevelopment may occur decades from now.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Affordable Housing Strategy is to provide an assessment on how the development proposals achieves the targets set out in Housing Brampton.</p> <p>The policy requirement for a Growth Management Strategy to be submitted for development applications and Tertiary Plans located in Primary MTSA's will remain in the proposed OPA.</p> <p>The Region's 2051 Official Plan MTSA policies require local municipalities to ensure infrastructure and services are delivered in a manner that supports complete communities, including open space, accessible public amenities and active transportation infrastructure as part of their comprehensive MTSA planning. To date, Brampton has not completed its MTSA comprehensive planning, therefore, any application submitted before that is completed shall submit a Growth Management Strategy to address the adequacy and delivery of</p>	<p>Section 3.2.6.6 e) has been deleted and section 3.2.6.6 d) has been amended to state, <i>"Explain how the development proposal achieves the goals, objectives and targets of the Region of Peel's Housing Strategy, Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan 2018-2028 and Housing Brampton."</i></p> <p>Section 3.2.7 of the OPA has been modified to include phasing and servicing strategy policies requested by the Region of Peel.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Section 3.2.7.2 – the policy should clarify that if an applicant provides space for a public facility, it will be accepted as an in-kind contribution towards their Community Benefit Charge payment, if applicable.</p> <p>Section 3.2.7.5 - recommend the removal of prioritizing land fronting onto higher order transit with respect to the phasing of development across land ownerships.</p>	<p>infrastructure, facilities and services to the satisfaction of both the Region and the City of Brampton.</p> <p>The acceptance of a public facility as an in-kind contribution toward a Community Benefit Charge depends on what kind of public space and how much it is benefiting the community. This will be determined with each site-specific development proposal.</p> <p>This policy is important to ensure that any development in a MTSA strives to meet the delivery of transit-oriented communities. This policy will remain with some minor wording amendments.</p>	<p>No action at this time.</p> <p>New Section 3.2.7.6 has been revised to state, <i>“For phased development proposals that have frontage along a high order transit corridor, the first phase of development is encouraged to include the lands fronting the transit corridor in order to create a safe, pedestrian-friendly environment and to provide the necessary multi-modal access connections to the station or stop. Section 3.2.7.6 does not apply to lands designated “Regional Retail” on Schedule A – General Land Use Designations.”</i></p>
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. c/o CPVC 100 West Nominee Inc.	Our client would like to retain the industrial permissions at 100 West Drive, while integrating policies to permit medium-high density residential development in the future and this should be reflected in any policy updates to the parent Official Plan, Secondary Plan and amendments to the Zoning By-law.	Staff will review these comments in more detail as part of the MTSA Study and the Official Plan review process. The proposed OPA does not include any amendments to existing land use permissions.	No action required at this time.

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>We are in support of policies that reduce or mitigate interface and compatibility issues.</p> <p>We are in support of no maximum building height policies as per the Minister Clark's letter to the Peel Regional Chair.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed OPA includes land use compatibility policies.</p> <p>Discussions are on-going between the Province and the Region as to whether local municipalities can establish maximum building heights in Protected MTSAs in the context of the Minister's letter dated February 9, 2023 to the Regional Chair.</p> <p>In Section 3.2.5.2, the draft OPA includes language about the policies that will be implemented through future amendments to the applicable Secondary Plan for each "Primary" station that will address, among other matters, the minimum, and if appropriate, maximum building heights. If it is determined by the Province that maximum building heights can not be established by the local municipalities, then the subsequent OPAs that will be forwarded to Council for adoption in November 2023 will not include maximum building heights.</p>	<p>No action required at this time.</p> <p>The proposed OPA includes Section 3.2.5.2 b) that states, <i>"The minimum, and if appropriate, maximum building heights."</i></p>
MHBC c/o Morguard Corporation –	Additional policy language needs to be inserted to Policy 3.2.5.2 e) to ensure that existing buildings can be modified and	The policies included in the proposed OPA are intended to apply to all MTSAs in Brampton	No action required at this time.

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
Bramalea City Centre	expanded and new commercial buildings constructed so as not to hinder their long term viability, recognizing that they provide an important commercial function within their communities.	and not to specific properties. The purpose of Section 3.2.5.2 is to provide direction on the type of policies that shall be included when preparing the specific Secondary Plan policies for each “Primary” MTSA. The policies contained in Section 3.2.5.2, such as sub-clause c) <i>“Appropriately managing expansions and redevelopment of existing land uses while they transition to meet the MTSA objectives of this Plan”</i> will be refined as part of the applicable Secondary Plan Amendments that will be adopted by Council by November 22, 2023.	
	Proposals that are generally consistent with the existing regulatory framework should not require a MTSA Block Concept Plan given that the comprehensive requirements for Block Plans, as set out in this section, are more appropriate for an MTSA-wide study. We request that policy 3.2.6.2 be amended to clarify that a MTSA Block Concept Plan may only be required as part of a large scale development proposal.	The requirement for a MTSA Block Concept Plan has been replaced with the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of Brampton’s 2006 Official Plan. According to Section 5.35.1, a Tertiary Plan may be required as part of a complete application for most development applications and not only for large scale development proposals. Section 5.35.2 g) allows the City to require the applicant to prepare a Tertiary Plan as part of a complete development application where a	Section 3.2.6 has been revised to include the submission of a Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of the Official Plan. No other action at this time.
	Proposals requiring only site plan control, minor variance or minor Zoning By-law Amendment should not be subject to a		

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>MTSA Block Concept Plan or Planning Justification Report that requires <i>“phasing of development including all relevant information required to evaluate the phasing plan.”</i></p>	<p>new higher order transit station is proposed or the site is adjacent to an existing higher order transit station.</p> <p>No amendments are being made to the current Tertiary Plan Official Plan policies to exclude site plan applications, minor variances or minor Zoning By-law Amendment applications from submitting a Tertiary Plan. The submission of a Tertiary Plan may not be required and this is reflected in the policy language in Section 3.2.6.1 of the proposed OPA where it states, <i>“A Tertiary Plan in accordance with Section 5.35 of this Plan may be required for an application submitted within a “Primary” MTSA.”</i></p> <p>The Region’s 2051 Official Plan MTSA policies require local municipalities to ensure infrastructure and services are delivered in a manner that supports complete communities, including open space, accessible public amenities and active transportation infrastructure as part of their comprehensive MTSA planning. The requirement for a</p>	

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Policy 3.2.6.6 b) requires that the supporting PJR provide confirmation that <i>“public service facilities are conveniently located and are adequately sized to accommodate the projected population within the Block Concept Plan”</i>. As with phasing, this level of detail should be provided through a comprehensive study and policy framework for the entire MTSA, not for a single block plan supporting a development proposal. We request that Policies Policy 3.2.6.5 g) and 3.2.6.6 b) be removed as their requirements are more appropriately addressed through an MTSA wide study.</p> <p>The City should be responsible for preparing a Growth Management Strategy</p>	<p>Growth Management Strategy is an interim policy while Brampton completes its MTSA Study. Development applications submitted in advance of Brampton’s MTSA Study being completed may require the submission of a Growth Management Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed policy language that requires applicants to provide confirmation in the Planning Justification Report for all residential and mixed-use developments that there is appropriate infrastructure and public service and community facilities to accommodate growth is consistent with both the PPS and Growth Plan. The provincial direction in both these documents is that the necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs to sustain healthy, liveable and safe communities. It is the responsibility of the applicant within a “Primary” MTSA to demonstrate this.</p> <p>Through Brampton’s MTSA Study the adequacy of services and</p>	<p>Policy 3.2.6.5 b) in the draft OPA has been revised to state, <i>“Confirmation that appropriate infrastructure and municipal servicing infrastructure along with community services and facilities are available to service the proposed development.”</i></p> <p>No action required.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>as part of the detailed comprehensive planning MTSA study or for large scale proposals that precede the completion of Brampton's MTSA study.</p> <p>Policy 3.2.7.2 needs to be clarified that contributions of public service facilities may only be required subsequent to the completion of the City's comprehensive planning process and amendments to the Secondary Plan that identify public service facility needs. Contributions should be in accordance with the relevant regulatory regimes, including the Development Charges By-law, Community Benefits Charges By-law and Parkland Dedication By-law.</p>	<p>infrastructure will be determined. In the meantime, any application submitted in advance of Brampton's MTSA Study being completed, will be responsible for preparing a Growth Management Strategy for development applications and Tertiary Plans submitted within a "Primary" MTSA. This includes demonstrating that the necessary public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs to sustain healthy, liveable and safe communities.</p> <p>Agree, contributions of public service facilities should be in accordance with the relevant regulatory regimes, including the Development Charges By-law, Community Benefits Charges By-law and Parkland Dedication By-law.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.7.3 has been amended to include <i>"Such contributions will be in accordance with the in-effect regulatory regimes, including the Development Charges By-law, the Community Benefit Charges By-law and the Parkland Dedication By-law."</i></p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	<p>Clarification of the intent of Policy 3.2.7.3. Who will determine “feasibility” of development and on what criteria will this be assessed?</p> <p>Policy 3.2.7.5 - It is important to recognize that large sites like BCC may have development occurring away from the higher order transit corridor in initial phasing given the need to balance existing commercial operations with redevelopment opportunities as such sites transition over the long term into intensified, mixed-use areas.</p> <p>Additional policy language needs to be inserted to ensure that large scale commercial operations like BCC are able to modify existing buildings and construct new commercial buildings so as not to hinder their operations and the important commercial functions they serve for the</p>	<p>The intent of Policy 3.2.7.3 (now 3.2.7.5 in the proposed OPA) is to ensure that any proposed development within “Primary” MTSA meets the built form objectives and doesn’t impact the ability to meet the minimum density targets prescribed for each MTSA.</p> <p>This policy is important to ensure that any development in a MTSA strives to meet the delivery of transit-oriented communities. This policy will remain with some minor wording amendments. Understanding that some existing regional retail sites will transition over the long term, wording has been added to the proposed OPA to exclude lands that are designated “Regional Retail” on Schedule A – General Land Use Designations from the requirements in Section 3.2.7.7.</p> <p>The policies included in the proposed OPA are intended to apply to all MTSA in Brampton and not to specific properties. It is not appropriate to add language to Policy 3.2.7.8 to permit the development of new low rise</p>	<p>Section 3.2.7.5 of the proposed OPA has been revised to state, “<i>Where the planned scale or configuration of development on an individual property does not meet the intent of the MTSA objectives of this plan, property consolidation should be explored to facilitate integrated development. Where property consolidation is not feasible, development permissions may be limited.</i>”</p> <p>Section 3.2.7.7 in the proposed OPA has been revised to state, “<i>For those development proposals that have frontage along a high order transit corridor, the first phase of development is encouraged to include the lands fronting the transit corridor in order to create a safe, pedestrian-friendly environment and to provide the necessary multi-modal access connections to the station or stop. Section 3.2.7.6 does not apply to lands designated “Regional Retail” on Schedule A – General Land Use Designations.</i>”</p> <p>No action required at this time.</p>

Appendix 5 – Response to Correspondence Received

Commenter	Comment Summary	Brampton Response	Brampton Action
	community. We appreciate the inclusion of permissions to modify and expand existing buildings. However, language should also be included to permit development of new low rise commercial buildings.	commercial buildings as this does not align with the overall MTSA objectives. It is acknowledged that there may be site-specific instances where new low rise commercial buildings may be appropriate within a “Primary” MTSA, however, it will be through the future Secondary Plan Amendments where those policy permissions will be determined.	