

Peel 2051 Draft Policies: Comment and Response Table

Peel 2051 is the Region’s Official Plan Review and Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR), which will help Peel better plan for the future by taking action on new population and employment forecasts to 2051, responding to public and stakeholder feedback, and complying with new Provincial legislation, plans, and policies. Responding to feedback is an integral part of the review process to reflect the needs of the community’s needs. Regional Staff engaged in online consultation with members of the public and stakeholders on draft policies and mapping throughout 2021. The responses below address comments received from stakeholders and the public on proposed draft Regional Official Plan (ROP) policies between November 2020 through July 16, 2021.

| Reference Number | Date | Name | Comment Summary | Response |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Growth Management | | | | |
| OP-17-001 | September 17, 2017 | Malone Given Parsons | Proposed employment conversion for a mixed residential, office, and commercial development of the site located north of Regional Road No. 107 (Queen Street) and west of Regional Road No. 50 in Brampton. (This comment is related to comment reference number OP-19-030.) | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B10. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Non-employment uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning for the Highway 50 Queen Street MTSA (QUE-15) subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.32). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region’s approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-18-011 | June 8, 2018 | Wellings Planning Consultant Inc. | Request for meeting to discuss potential for an employment conversion for 9381 and 9393 McLaughlin Road North. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B10. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region’s approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-18-012 | July 27, 2018 | ██████████ | Informed by City of Mississauga Planning Staff to inquire about the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review in relation to the proposed development of 2120 Dundas Street East. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number M13. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Retail/commercial uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.31). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region’s approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-18-013 | N/A | ██████████ | Provided comments regarding the Regional Official Plan Review Growth Plan | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request |

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | conformity exercise in respect to 3420 Queen Street East in the City of Brampton. Proposed density and land use mix increase along Queen Street East, based on proximity to transit services. | number B13. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Additional retail/commercial uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.31). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-18-014 | N/A | ██████████ ██████████ | Proposed concept map prepared to consider additional commercial uses for the lands located at Bramalea Road and Steeles Avenue East (2111 Steeles Ave E). | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B12. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Additional non-employment uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policies 5.8.31 and 5.8.32 (for the Bramalea GO MTSA; KIT-2). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-18-015 | October 30, 2018 | GSAI | GSAI represents two properties in the Dundas Connects study area at Dundas Street and Mattawa Ave. Inquired if the Region of Peel may provide a more detailed update on the status of the approval of the MCR as GSAI staff are actively working on considering additional non-employment uses these properties with City Staff in an effort to advance development proposals for them. | The properties fronting the north-south arm of Mattawa Avenue are within the area considered separately through the Dundas Connects Master Plan and are supported for conversion. The remaining lands in the proposal for this site to the south of Mattawa Ave. has been filed as conversion request number M14 and is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-18-016 | October 10, 2018 | Krista Walkey (City of Brampton) | The subject lands at 1000 Steeles Ave. are designated Employment (Business Corridor) in the City of Brampton Official Plan and are zoned industrial. There is currently warehousing on the site. The applicants are looking to redevelop the site into an entertainment complex, which would require an employment conversion. | The proposal for this site has been filed as conversion request number B11. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| OP-19-028 | April 25, 2019 | Delta Urban Inc. | Notification of upcoming employment conversion application for 10 Victoria Crescent, 376 Orenda Road, 387 Orenda Road, 391 Orenda Road, and 26 Victoria Crescent in the City of Brampton to allow for residential uses. | The proposal for these sites has been filed as employment conversion request numbers B15 to B19. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Additional non-employment uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policies 5.8.31 and 5.8.32 (for the Bramalea GO MTSA; KIT-2), as applicable. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-19-029 | July 15, 2019 | Plan Logic Consulting Inc. | Request for notice of all future meetings regarding the Regional Official Plan Review in which designation of employment lands is discussed. Support for the Region's recommendation to remove 1000 Dundas Street East from the PSEZs. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number M17. This site is supported for employment conversion through the Regional MCR. The site was also removed from the provincially significant employment zone by the Province. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-19-030 | December 13, 2019 | [REDACTED] | Request to consider integrating a proposed concept plan for Part of Lots 4 and 5, Concession 10 N.D. on the northwest corner of Queen Street and Highway 50 into the Regional Official Plan update. The proposed concept plan permits the residential, commercial, and office mixed-use development of the site. This comment is related to comment reference number OP-17-001. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B10. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Non-employment uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning for the Highway 50 Queen Street MTSA (QUE-15) subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.32). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-19-031 | December 2, 2019 | [REDACTED] | The property is currently zoned industrial by the City of Brampton. The applicant proposes to amend Brampton's Official Plan and Zoning By-law to allow an expanded range of commercial uses on the property based on the Service Commercial category under the current Official Plan, Secondary Plan, and Zoning By-law. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B14. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | The applicant believes that there is a strong need for the conversion, the proposed uses would not adversely affect the overall viability of the employment area or the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan, and that the existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities would accommodate the proposed uses. | the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-20-077n | September 21, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | Inquiry about opportunities to request certain lands to be included within Peel's Future Strategic Employment Area designation and whether these designations will be informed by the SABE study. | Regional staff are accepting requests for consideration of lands to be considered for expansion through the SABE study, including employment lands and future strategic employment lands, which will be informed through various technical studies being undertaken on the Focused Study Area. |
| OP-20-113 | December 14, 2020 | ██████████ | Does not believe that the smaller area in PSEZ 15 that abuts Albion-Vaughan Road in Bolton should be in the PSEZ. Imagines a transformation of the area into a thriving and diverse area within Peel for individuals to live, work and shop. | Comment noted. It is recommended that requests to modify or remove lands from the PSEZ are also submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, as it is the Minister's role to manage the boundaries of PSEZs and make changes to mapping. |
| OP-20-117 | December 3, 2020 | RGC Design Group | Request to consider permitting a place of worship and private school within a designated employment zone on the property on the north side of Countryside Drive, west of Coleraine Drive in Brampton. (Comment related to OP-21-238) | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B24. This site is not currently supported for conversion and continues to be under review through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-20-118 | November 17, 2020 | GSAI | This letter is to request that consideration be made through the Region's MCR process for an employment land conversion on the sites on the south side of Steeles Avenue located between Kennedy Road and Highway 410, to facilitate a mixed-use development including office, retail/commercial, residential, open space, and potential industrial uses. | The proposal for this site has been filed as conversion request number B21. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Additional retail/commercial uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.31). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-20-119 | June 22, 2020 | KLM | The subject lands at the northwest corner of Steeles Avenue and Mississauga Road, and the southwest corner of Steeles Avenue and Financial Drive are currently designated Employment in the City of Brampton Official Plan. KLM requests that the Regional MCR and OP Review convert the subject lands from employment uses to mixed uses and further that the subject lands not be included in the Region of Peel's inventory of employment lands. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B32. This site is not currently supported for conversion but continues to be under review through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth- |

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | management.asp#2021-growth-reports. |
| OP-21-008 | February 5, 2021 | GSAI | Employment land conversion request for the 150 Bovaird Drive West and 10064 Hurontario Street properties in Brampton to accommodate future mixed-use redevelopment. The current and potential transit infrastructure serving the two subject properties make this potential intersection node of Hurontario Street and Bovaird Drive worthy of MTSA status. | The proposal for these sites has been filed as employment conversion request numbers B22 and B23. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Retail/commercial uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.31) as the Hurontario LRT north extension is being explored. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-21-011c | February 18, 2021 | Sylvia Roberts | Population growth in Brampton is driven by international migration and is being accommodated by the rapid growth of rooming houses. | A key component of the development of growth forecasts from the Ministry of Finance, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe includes accounting of immigration trends. Regional staff have incorporated this consideration and are closely considering assumptions for the number of people per unit in Brampton for dwelling types including single detached homes. The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents and increase the supply of affordable housing. Draft policies increase the number of permitted additional residential units ("second units"), encourage shared housing arrangements, establish larger and family-sized (2+ bedroom) as the predominant affordable housing units provided through inclusionary zoning, and encourage local municipalities to review their requirements for multi-tenant houses (e.g. rooming houses) and other similar types of homes to ensure the development of housing that better meets the needs of current and future residents. |
| OP-21-015 | February 22, 2021 | Harper Dell & Associates Inc. | Request for an employment conversion for the property 11 Perdue Court from the current employment designation to residential for a retirement residence to accommodate the aging population. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number C2. These parcels have a prime location in the Tullamore employment area, which is intended to be preserved long-term and become part of a larger employment area as per the Region's draft conceptual settlement area boundary expansion to 2051. As a vacant parcel of key industrial land and considering the proposed uses can be located elsewhere in the Region and Town, the conversion is not supported. The introduction of a sensitive use could limit the ability of surrounding employment lands to achieve their employment potential. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|---|
| OP-21-018 | March 16, 2021 | SGL | Request for a conversion to permit residential uses at 75 Bramalea Road. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B8. This property is on the periphery of the employment area at the transition to residential uses existing to the north. This site is also directly to the north of 69 Bramalea Rd. in Brampton's Secondary Plan 38 which has been supported for conversion. The conversion of this site is being considered in the context of Regional and local work regarding MTSA's and the Bramalea GO Mobility Hub. Considering the site's position at the northern boundary of the employment area, the conversion approved to the south, and the mixed uses intended in the proposal, it is appropriate for this site to be converted as part of a mixed-use transition into the community to the north. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-21-023 | March 25, 2021 | ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ | Plans to build high density condominiums at Queen Street East Corridor and Torbram Road. Has had preliminary discussions with the City of Brampton regarding the possibility of introducing mixed use development to the area. The lands are in proximity to a proposed MTSA but are also within a PSEZ. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B29. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Non-employment uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.32) for the Queen Street Torbram MTSA (QUE-9) and retail/commercial through draft Flexible Policy (5.8.31). |
| OP-21-025 | March 30, 2021 | ██████████ | Ward Land Economics Inc. has been retained for purposes of undertaking and preparing the requisite Employment Lands Study associated with the formal Employment Lands Conversion Request. Specifically interested in ROPA and MCR study initiatives associated with Land Needs Assessments, along with the Forecasts and Land Budget analysis. Comments OP-21-025 and OP-21-035 pertain to the same site. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number C3. This site is not recommended for conversion but is under further review considering additional information was received. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-21-029 | March 31, 2021 | ██████████ | Suggested that reallocating some employment growth in the 2031-2051 timeframe from Community Areas 33a, b, c, and 34a to C37 and 38 would provide the Region with additional employment land that can be developed in the medium timeframe. Inquired what type of employment will be considered in Community Areas B52 and B53. | Regional staff are reviewing the suggestion to relocate employment in Tullamore west, Tullamore, and Tullamore East (C33a, C33b, C33c) and Alloa West (C34a) to West and East of Hurontario (C37, C38). The City of Brampton is in the process of developing a new secondary plan for the Heritage Heights community (areas B52 and B53) and the area is currently proposed to include both light industrial employment and a greater proportion office employment that originally indicated in a 2014 concept plan - for further information please reach out to Brampton staff. |
| OP-21-032 | April 7, 2021 | GSAI | Interested in redeveloping 9400 Goreway Drive to include a mixed-use development incorporating residential, commercial/retail and office uses. An Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Employment Lands | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B27. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Retail/commercial uses may be considered through local |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | | Conversion will be required based on the in-effect land use policies related to the subject property. Request that the subject lands be considered through Peel's MCR process. | comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.31). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-21-034 | April 16, 2021 | Dillon Consulting Limited | Inquiry regarding how Peel's current MCR process functions and if Peel is accepting any new lands for consideration. Peel planning Staff are awaiting an employment conversion on a property not yet disclosed. | There is no formal deadline for when employment conversion requests can be received, but as our Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review is currently underway, we encourage submitting any comments or employment conversion requests as soon as possible. This will ensure there is more time to consider your input, as we prepare for each Peel 2051 milestone. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing submissions, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-21-035 | April 22, 2021 | ██████████ | A formal expression of intent to proceed with an Employment Lands Conversion Request associated with the subject lands, with the submission in support of the conversion to follow in short order for consideration as part of the Peel 2041+ MCR/ROPR process. | Acknowledged. Please see responses to Comment OP-21-025 which pertains to the same site. |
| OP-21-036b | April 28, 2021 | MHBC | Provided the following Growth Management and IZ comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lands identified as PSEZ in Figure 1 should continue to be protected in accordance with Provincial Plan policies. 2. Any proposed Clarkson MTSA policies should be in conformity with the Growth Plan and the City of Mississauga's Compatibility Overview Study. 3. When developing IZ policy for the Clarkson MTSA, Provincial and Regional objectives, including the protection of important employment areas, should be considered. | See response to comment OP-21-036a. |
| OP-21-040 | April 29, 2021 | Environmental Defence | The Land Needs Assessment (LNA) from Hemson in December 10 was incorrectly estimated. The existing urban areas are experiencing low active transportation rates. Environmental Defence will explain how the Region can accommodate growth in the existing built-up areas. The key aspects of Environmental Defence's LNA is to estimate age distribution, estimate housing supply, types, and allocation, and estimate where the housing supply is being allocated in the lower-tier municipalities. | The age structure information is included in the Land Needs Assessment (Step R1). The assessment of housing needs to accommodate forecasted growth is based on the age cohort forecasts. Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf . |
| OP-21-041 | April 29, 2021 | Kathleen Wilson | <p>A hard urban boundary will force modern planning and development and stop the endless sprawl of low paying employment lands and ensure a vital Peel for the future.</p> <p>It is recommended that Peel Region put a pause on their Official Plan Review until such time as the pandemic is resolved and we can look at the real future of employment and keep our prime agriculture and the ORM safe.</p> | <p>Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> <p>The proposed Regional Official Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-042 | April 29, 2021 | Kate Hepworth (Caledon Village Association) | <p>Request that Peel Region put a pause on their Official Plan Review until the pandemic is resolved. The Land Needs Assessment and Intensification Analysis cannot be properly addressed at this time and Peel is losing a significant amount of agricultural land on a daily basis.</p> | <p>The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217. Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. Long term planning is important, and the Region is expected to exceed the 2031 population forecast incorporated in the current Official Plan within the next 5 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> <p>New and updated Regional Official Plan policies emphasize locating growth in</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>existing built-up areas and more compact greenfield development. These directions support better use of transit, active transportation (walking, cycling), reduced vehicle trips and a shift from low density to medium and higher density housing options. These policies will help reduce the requirements for additional urban lands and the loss of farmland, as well as minimize future greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>The Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) focus area includes a number of technical studies including an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). These studies address a number of areas, including protecting the highest quality agricultural areas and to minimizing impacts on the agricultural system and on agricultural operations outside the urban expansion area, as well as climate change adaptation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in new community areas. Details of the studies can be found here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/settlement-area-boundary.asp.</p> |
| OP-21-043 | April 29, 2021 | Jennifer LeForestier (Belfountain Cottage Music) | Recommendation to freeze the Official Plan Review. There also needs to be less transportation emissions to reach emission targets. Also, a fixed urban boundary should be established to mitigate urban sprawl. | <p>The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217. Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. Long term planning is important, and the Region is expected to exceed the 2031 population forecast incorporated in the current Official Plan within the next 5 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf. A key part of addressing emissions includes planning a multi-modal transportation system with increased opportunity for residents and workers to use active transportation and transit across Peel, and intensifying development in MTSAs.</p> <p>Draft policies are included in the transportation section to reduce the environmental impacts of transportation including greenhouse gas emissions, traffic-related and other air pollutants produced by vehicles used by Peel's transportation system. Draft policies encourage and promote the shift to sustainable modes of transportation including, transit, active transportation</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | (walking and cycling) and carpooling. Policy sections addressing sustainable transportation and environmental impacts are being included in the Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment. |
| OP-21-044 | April 29, 2021 | Kathleen Molewski | Recommendation that Council pause the Regional Official Plan Review and MCR due to issues involving the pandemic. Also recommends that a fixed urban boundary be set in order to curb urban sprawl. This would be creating more intensification in urban areas and allow the intensified urban areas to accommodate population growth. | The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217 . Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. Long term planning is important, and the Region is expected to exceed the 2031 population forecast incorporated in the current Official Plan within the next 5 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf . If the housing needs of Peel households is not met, it could lead housing affordability challenges and leap frogging as households seek to meet needs elsewhere. |
| OP-21-045 | April 29, 2021 | Sylvia Roberts | Commented on the population targets for 2041 stating that they were incorrectly estimated. Also commented on housing in Brampton, stating that there needs to be more housing types that yield higher densities | Regional Staff have worked in collaboration with the City of Brampton to explore and refine population forecasts. Growth in the city will include intensification in existing communities and around transit corridors in particular, which provides higher density forms of housing (for example, downtown Brampton, Bramalea City Centre). Draft policies support sustainable, compact, and complete communities by encouraging higher density development. This includes permitting high density residential uses in strategic growth areas, supporting inclusionary zoning in MTSA's, and ensuring that unit sizes in new multi-unit residential buildings reflect housing need. Proposed policies include minimum targets on new housing units being affordable to low- and moderate-income households, being of rental tenure, and in higher-density forms (e.g., apartments). |
| OP-21-047 | April 26, 2021 | Lorraine Green (GASP) | Requested that the Region consider extending the public consultation period for the Regional Official Plan Review until in person input can resume as many Peel residents do not have access to reliable internet and do not have the skills the participate in virtual consultations. Also recommended that a fixed urban boundary be specified to limit sprawl and mitigate climate change. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-048 | April 26, 2021 | Nancy Hurst | Recommended that the Region of Peel establish a zero-boundary expansion. | Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf . |
| OP-21-058 | April 26, 2021 | Karen Alison | Supported pausing the Official Plan Review until the pandemic is over. For this action to be effective, Councils around the Golden Horseshoe will need to pass similar motions. There is also an urgent need to protect existing farmland and mitigate the effects of climate change. Imposing a fixed urban boundary would be a viable solution. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-059 | April 26, 2021 | Rahul Mehta | The comment letter supports pausing the Official Plan Review until the pandemic is resolved. The comment letter also mentions that the Region of Peel must not lock in sprawl until 2051. It is also important to consider forms of development that would have the least significant impact on climate change. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-060 | April 26, 2021 | Michelle Meandro | In support of pausing planning of urban sprawl until contemporary issues surrounding COVID-19 can become resolved. Also in support of preserving Caledon's rural landscape. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-061 | April 26, 2021 | Vicki Tran | In support of pausing the Region of Peel Official Plan until the pandemic is resolved. Continuing with the Official Plan Review could exclude those with poor internet connectivity and those who do not possess the skills to use online participation platforms. There needs to be more thought to better use the space we have rather than continually reducing our farmland/wild spaces. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-062 | April 27, 2021 | Lynda Lukasik (Environmental Halton) | The comment letter calls for two directions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Call for the Provincial government to delay the deadline that Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) municipalities must meet to conform with the requirements of the Provincial Growth Plan for the GGH. 2. Include a 'no boundary expansion' option in the scenarios that Peel Region considers, as it determines where and how its urban areas should grow. | The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217 . Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf . |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|---|
| OP-21-063 | April 27, 2021 | Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing: Steve Clark (MMAH) | Reminder for upper and single-tier municipalities where they must have their Official Plans in conformity with the updated policies in A Place to Grow for July 1, 2022 and that there are no extension deadlines. The Region of Peel must plan to accommodate a population of 2,280,000 and 1,070,000 jobs by 2051. | The Region of Peel is proceeding to complete the MCR process as planned to meet the July 1, 2022 conformity deadline and is utilizing the Growth Plan forecasted growth to 2051. |
| OP-21-064 | April 27, 2021 | Alexandra Srdoc | Recommended that the Region of Peel pause their Official Plan Review until the pandemic is resolved. The letter also recommends preserving farmland and freezing the urban boundary to increase medium to high-density affordable urban development. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-065 | April 27, 2021 | Carol Aziz | Recommended that the Region of Peel pause their Official Plan Review until the pandemic is resolved. The letter also recommends preserving farmland and freezing the urban boundary to increase medium to high-density affordable urban development. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. The proposed Regional Official Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions. |
| OP-21-068 | April 28, 2021 | Eileen Chen | Recommended that the Region of Peel pause their Official Plan Review until the pandemic is resolved. The letter also recommends preserving farmland and freezing the urban boundary to increase medium to high-density affordable urban development. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. The proposed Regional Official Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions. |
| OP-21-070 | April 28, 2021 | Jo-Anne Thompson (Halton Action for Climate Emergency Now) | Recommended that the Region of Peel pause their Official Plan Review, establish a fixed urban boundary to reduce sprawl, and extend the public consultation period because constituents cannot be properly consulted with the lockdown due to COVID. | The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217 . Residents also have had the opportunity to request hard copy materials for review, and Staff continue to be available via phone. Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> <p>The proposed Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-071 | April 29, 2021 | Tammy Atkinson | The letter recommends that the Region of Peel pause their Official Plan Review until the pandemic is resolved. The letter also recommends preserving farmland and freezing the urban boundary to increase medium to high-density affordable urban development. | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> <p>The proposed Regional Official Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-077 | June 14, 2021 | Korsiak Urban Planning | Proposed development of 8383 Mississauga Road, including one 11-storey mixed-use building providing 131 residential units, 896 square metres of ground-floor retail and service commercial uses, and 760 square metres of second-floor office space. The applicant seeks to rezone the property to a site-specific Residential Apartment (R4B-AAAA) Zone to permit the development. | <p>The proposal for this site has been filed as conversion request number B30. This site is not currently supported for conversion and continues to be under review through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports.</p> |
| OP-21-080 | June 17, 2021 | Kathleen Wilson | There needs to be a hard urban boundary to stop the conversion of prime farmland and environmentally sensitive land to support urban sprawl and increasing carbon emissions. | <p>The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217. Residents also have had the opportunity to request hard copy materials for</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>review, and Staff continue to be available via phone. Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> <p>The proposed Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-082 | June 17, 2021 | Phil Pothen (Environmental Defence) | The purpose of this presentation is to provide Peel Region with a detailed plan that ensures housing and workplace demands are accommodated in the existing settlement boundary. Recommended that Peel should inform residents the options of building based on sprawl and building within the existing settlement area. | <p>Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> <p>Draft policies support sustainable, compact, and complete communities by encouraging higher density development. This includes permitting high density residential uses in strategic growth areas, supporting inclusionary zoning in MTSAs, and ensuring that unit sizes in new multi-unit residential buildings reflect housing need. Proposed policies include minimum targets on new housing units being affordable to low- and moderate-income households, being of rental tenure, and in higher-density forms (e.g., apartments).</p> |
| OP-21-083 | June 17, 2021 | Rahul Mehta | Urban sprawl is detrimental to the environment and residents also do not want sprawl. Furthermore, a hard urban boundary can be used to stop sprawl. The Region of Peel also needs to consider COVID in long-term planning. | Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf. The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are being monitored and considered in the Official Plan review - The Employment Strategy Discussion Paper includes information on pandemic employment trends, impacts, and future considerations: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p> <p>The proposed Regional Official Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-084 | June 17, 2021 | Divya Arora (Community Climate Council) | Community Climate Council does not support a SABE because expanding to communities leads to unhealthy communities (e.g., increased GHG emissions). The presentation also mentioned that past Peel consultations had a number of attendees who were not from Peel. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-086 | June 17, 2021 | Kasia Dywanski | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-087 | June 17, 2021 | Helena Galea | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-088 | June 17, 2021 | Elaine Cairns | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-089 | June 17, 2021 | Joshua Santos | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-090 | June 17, 2021 | Andrea Tong | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-091 | June 17, 2021 | Denis MacDougall | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-092 | June 17, 2021 | Libby Yuill | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-093 | June 17, 2021 | Linda Martinello | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-094 | June 17, 2021 | Michelle Mason | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-095 | June 17, 2021 | Jeanne Kannenberg | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-096 | June 17, 2021 | Michael Turco | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-097 | June 17, 2021 | Sharon Hurlburt | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | | and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-098 | June 17, 2021 | Tracy DaCamara | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-099 | June 17, 2021 | Sandra Hager | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-100 | June 17, 2021 | Nick Poutsoungas | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-101 | June 17, 2021 | Marguerite Adamson | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-102 | June 17, 2021 | William Clarke | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-103 | June 17, 2021 | Barb Vassallo | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-104 | June 17, 2021 | Bill van Geest | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-105 | June 17, 2021 | CB Bredschneider | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-106 | June 17, 2021 | Sarah Summers | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in- | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-107 | June 17, 2021 | Marlene Smith | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-108 | June 17, 2021 | Wanda Kwiecien | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-109 | June 17, 2021 | Val Winterhalt | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-110 | June 17, 2021 | Stephen Lum | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-111 | June 17, 2021 | Sagi Denenberg | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-112 | June 17, 2021 | Bernadette Antonutti | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-113 | June 17, 2021 | Kaneera Uthayakumaran | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-114 | June 17, 2021 | Joanne Avison | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|---|---|
| OP-21-115 | June 17, 2021 | Joanne Orsini | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-116 | June 17, 2021 | Maureen Teixeira | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-117 | June 17, 2021 | Janis Gibbs | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-118 | June 17, 2021 | Geoff Day | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-119 | June 17, 2021 | Alex Chamberlain | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-120 | June 17, 2021 | Knut Holmsen | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-121 | June 17, 2021 | Maurice Anderson | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-122 | June 17, 2021 | Cathy Barrett | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-123 | June 17, 2021 | Peter Forte | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-124 | June 17, 2021 | Pat Treacy | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-125 | June 17, 2021 | Hanny Simo | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-126 | June 17, 2021 | Wesley Choy | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-127 | June 17, 2021 | Nancy Hall | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-128 | June 17, 2021 | Glenys O'Connell | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-129 | June 17, 2021 | John Steckley | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-130 | June 17, 2021 | Hamza Navid | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-131 | June 17, 2021 | Astrid Hardjana-Large | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-132 | June 17, 2021 | Howard and Pat Russo | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-133 | June 17, 2021 | Mark Edwards | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-134 | June 17, 2021 | Shona Cannon | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-135 | June 17, 2021 | Peter Dmytrasz | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-136 | June 17, 2021 | Jonathan Bell | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-137 | June 17, 2021 | Alain Ouellet | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-138 | June 17, 2021 | Judy Reid | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-139 | June 17, 2021 | Melanie White | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-140 | June 17, 2021 | Mike Grzyb | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-141 | June 17, 2021 | Mikaeel Ghany | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-142 | June 17, 2021 | Allison Smyth | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-143 | June 17, 2021 | Earl Close | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-144 | June 17, 2021 | Flora Sopjani | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-145 | June 17, 2021 | Robert Nicholson | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-146 | June 17, 2021 | Stacey Wilson | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-147 | June 17, 2021 | William Henderson | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-148 | June 17, 2021 | Melodie Williams | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-149 | June 17, 2021 | Rick Walsh | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in- | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|---|---|
| | | | person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-150 | June 17, 2021 | Marcus Jones | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-151 | June 17, 2021 | Debra Moy | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-152 | June 17, 2021 | Ernest Scholten | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-153 | June 17, 2021 | JanBob Whitmore | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-154 | June 17, 2021 | Dragana Mirkovic | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-155 | June 17, 2021 | Danielle Treacy | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-156 | June 17, 2021 | Philip Dixon | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-157 | June 17, 2021 | Ismat Jahan | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|--|---|
| OP-21-158 | June 17, 2021 | Susan Graham | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-159 | June 17, 2021 | Margo Young | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-160 | June 17, 2021 | Vicki Tran | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-161 | June 17, 2021 | Steve Brothman | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-162 | June 17, 2021 | Sarah Carter | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-163 | June 17, 2021 | Calvin Turland | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-164 | June 17, 2021 | Tanya Grant | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-165 | June 17, 2021 | Mary O'Brien | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-166 | June 17, 2021 | JB Murcar | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-167 | June 17, 2021 | Ernest Pietrobon | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-168 | June 17, 2021 | Jim Laird | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-169 | June 17, 2021 | Ravi Venkatesh | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-170 | June 17, 2021 | Lynn Bennett | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-171 | June 17, 2021 | Erika Agnew | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-172 | June 17, 2021 | Laurel Imeson | Big sprawl must be prevented in Peel Region. | Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> |
| OP-21-173 | June 17, 2021 | Lilly Noble | <p>Urban sprawl and greenhouse gas emissions must be locked in which would mean establishing a hard urban boundary. Farmland must also be protected as well as increasing affordable housing.</p> | <p>The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217. Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> <p>The proposed Regional Official Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-174 | June 17, 2021 | Promi Nahar | <p>The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-175 | June 17, 2021 | Raj Dahari | <p>The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-176 | June 17, 2021 | Grace King | <p>The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | |
| OP-21-177 | June 17, 2021 | Ekroop Birring | The comment urges Peel's Planning Staff to consider planning for future generations and to plan in a way that protects natural heritage features and preserving existing farmland. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-178 | June 17, 2021 | Michelle Meandro | Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-179 | June 17, 2021 | Shraddha Mishra | Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-180 | June 17, 2021 | Jessica Tian | Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-181 | June 17, 2021 | Gabrielle Chang | Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-182 | June 17, 2021 | Diana Janosik-Wronski; David Dorward | A hard urban boundary must be established as the proposed Highway 413 will create development in valuable farmland that needs to be preserved. If the Highway 413 is constructed in Peel, then negative impacts of climate change will ensue. | The Regional Council position is to not support the construction of the GTA West Corridor (Highway 413) in Peel and to request that the Province study alternatives to a highway including transit infrastructure. Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf . New and updated Regional Official Plan policies emphasize locating growth in existing built-up areas and more compact greenfield development. These directions support better use of transit, active transportation (walking, cycling), reduced vehicle trips and a shift from low density to medium and higher density housing options. These policies will help reduce the requirements for additional urban lands and the loss of farmland, as well as minimize future greenhouse gas emissions. The Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) focus area includes a number of technical studies including an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). These |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>studies address a number of areas, including protecting the highest quality agricultural areas and to minimizing impacts on the agricultural system and on agricultural operations outside the urban expansion area, as well as climate change adaptation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in new community areas. Details of the studies can be found here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/settlement-area-boundary.asp.</p> <p>The proposed Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-183 | June 17, 2021 | Lajanthan Prabakaran | Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-184 | June 17, 2021 | Elizabeth Churchill | The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-185 | June 17, 2021 | Alexandra Srdoc | Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-186 | June 17, 2021 | Divya Arora | Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-042. |
| OP-21-187 | June 17, 2021 | Phil Pothen (Environmental Defence) | <p>Peel must accommodate for future growth in the existing neighbourhoods. The comment letter mentions the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neither the Growth Plan nor the LNA Methodology specify what proportion of the population is forecasted in each age group. 2. The household formation rate does not prescribe a specific rate. 3. It is essential to note that the propensities of households in particular age groups to occupy particular forms of housing are highly uncertain, and also driven to a huge degree by the policies that municipal governments | Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>themselves adopt.</p> <p>4. The LNA Methodology and Growth Plan do not place any constraints on the measures that Peel Region can take to ensure that the entirety of demand for single- and semi-detached homes, and for new workplaces is accommodated within existing neighborhoods, and existing built-up and industrial areas.</p> | <p>https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf. At this June 17th Planning and Growth management Committee meeting Regional Staff also provided additional details requested by council regarding housing forms and distribution in Peel in a presentation. Further details on Peel's LNA will continue to be released in Fall 2021.</p> |
| OP-21-188 | June 17, 2021 | Samantha Casey | <p>Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-189 | June 17, 2021 | Johnny Kreppner | <p>The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and to ensure future development is sustainable for the environment.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-190 | June 17, 2021 | Laj Kaur | <p>Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-191 | June 17, 2021 | Raghav Patel | <p>Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-192 | June 17, 2021 | Masha Seems Karim | <p>Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-193 | June 17, 2021 | Yuddha Maharaj | <p>Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-194 | June 17, 2021 | Aayush Gaur | <p>Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-195 | June 17, 2021 | Baani Dhillon | <p>Peel Region must ensure planning takes climate change initiatives into consideration and facilitates environmentally friendly planning that is sustainable for future generations. Growth should be vertical and use existing infrastructure. Urban sprawl and an urban boundary expansion should not occur.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-196 | June 17, 2021 | Sabeen Abbas | <p>Peel must not have an urban boundary expansion as it will destroy 4,200 of farmland. Peel Staff must plan for environmentally friendly communities and must mitigate the effects of urban sprawl.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042.</p> |
| OP-21-197 | June 17, 2021 | Marina Sommer | <p>The comment letter addresses Staff to pause the Official Plan Review process and</p> | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-042</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|---|
| | | | to not proceed with a SABE because residents are not able to be consulted in-person due to pandemic restrictions. Furthermore, the Region should consider Smart Growth alternatives, support mixed-use development, protect farmland, and ensure future development is sustainable for the environment. | |
| OP-21-199 | June 29, 2021 | ██████████ ██████████ (Pound & Stewart Planning Consultants) | The letter is in support of the Region of Peel's modification of its draft Employment Areas schedule as per the Peel 2051 Official Plan Review to include the subject lands at 0 Heart Lake Road, Brampton, Ontario, as Employment Areas. This is in accordance with the City of Brampton Official Plan and the Countryside Villages Secondary Plan. | Regional Staff reviewed the discrepancy with Staff at the City of Brampton and TRCA. Both the Regional Employment Layer and Brampton Official Plan Schedule A will be remaining the same at this time, as previous development application activity on the site did not result in a concluded or approved EIS. A site investigation would be required to complete an assessment of the natural heritage and hazard features and to establish appropriate limits of development in any further application. |
| OP-21-231 | July 8, 2021 | Plan Logic Consulting Inc. | Acknowledged that the Regional Planning and Growth Committee received the Land Needs Assessment Report, which indicates that the Region supports the conversion of 1000 Dundas Street East for non-employment uses. Requested support of the development of both 1000 and 1024 Dundas Street East. for non-employment uses. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number M17, and the property 1024 Dundas Street East has been added for consideration under this request number. This site is supported for employment conversion through the Regional MCR and the Dundas Connects Study recommendations. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-21-235 | April 30, 2021 | ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ | Requests to: 1. Allow delineation and continued inclusion of 2250, 2280, and 2300 Queen Street East, Brampton within the Torbram MTSA; 2. Update mapping to show the subject lands as underutilized employment lands which merit the conversion of employment lands to permit mixed-use development; and 3. Revise Draft Policy 5.7.2.18 to include privately initiated, local Official Plan Amendments within planned and delineated MTSA's. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B29. This site is not currently supported for conversion through the Regional MCR. Additional retail/commercial uses may be considered through local comprehensive planning subject to draft Flexible Policy (5.8.31). For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework and a summary of the Region's approach to reviewing this site, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . The property has not been identified as vacant or underutilized land as the properties do not currently have vacant land on any portion of the site. The policy 5.8.31 (formerly 5.7.2.18) requires a municipally initiated study to ensure that any area being considered for land use flexibility is planned comprehensively with adjacent lands. |
| OP-21-236 | June 13, 2021 | ██████████ | ██████████ Staff continue to review the most recently released Peel 2051 information and note that the subject lands are identified as "Conversion C3" with a notation that states, "under further review" within the LNA Report Update Appendix IV presented at the June 17 PGMC. | Acknowledged. Refer to response to comment OP-21-025 which pertains to the same site. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | | | The attachment reports from BPA Inc. and WLE address the conversion criteria contained within the Growth Plan and pertaining Town of Caledon and Region of Peel documents. Supporting documentation seeks to establish the rationale and justification in support of the requested employment lands conversion. | |
| OP-21-237 | July 13, 2021 | GSAI | GSAI believes that the redevelopment of 8200 Dixie Road for mixed-use residential development along Dixie Road will support Brampton's and Peel's future planning vision and better use the currently underutilized lands. The proposed development intends to contribute to a desirable mix and intensity of uses, therefore contributing to planning objectives of the PPS, Regional Official Plan and Brampton Official Plan. | The proposal for this site has been filed as employment conversion request number B31. This site is not currently supported for conversion but continues to be under review through the Regional MCR. For detailed information on the employment planning and conversion policy framework, please see the Land Needs Assessment Update Report, Appendix IV – Region of Peel Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, to the June 17, 2021 Planning and Growth Management Committee: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp#2021-growth-reports . |
| OP-21-238 | July 30, 2021 | | Intends to submit an Official Plan Amendment, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and a Site Plan application to permit the development of a school and a place of worship on 0 Countryside Line. Believes that the place of worship is an employment generating use that will contribute to the achievement of employment growth targets for the City of Brampton. | Acknowledged. Refer to response to comment OP-20-117 which pertains to the same site, filed as employment conversion request B24. |
| Major Transit Station Areas | | | | |
| OP-20-042 | May 25, 2020 | GSAI | Request that the Region undertake a re-evaluation of the Bolton MTSA in this early Phase 1A of the MTSA Review. | As part of Phase 1B of the study, detailed analysis was being undertaken to determine how stations may be able to meet the growth plan minimum density requirements for MTSA's. For Bolton GO, commentary was included regarding the strategic importance of the station, the historical support for the station, and what is potentially required for it to meet the Growth Plan MTSA requirements. In summer 2021, based on the most recent information available, the Region updated the draft MTSA policy framework which now presents Bolton GO MTSA (HUB-1) as a primary station to be delineated in the Regional Official Plan with a minimum density of 150 people and jobs per hectare. Please refer to the draft June 29, 2021 Regional Official Plan text, Table 5, and Schedule Y7 here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/draft-policies/ |
| OP-20-045 | June 9, 2020 | SGL Planning | Supportive of the inclusion of the 75 Bramalea Road in the MTSA boundary, due to its proximity to the GO Station and its potential for an infill transit-oriented redevelopment. The subject site represents an appropriate location for an employment conversion to better facilitate the creation of a mixed-use neighbourhood. | The property at 75 Bramalea Road continues to be included in the draft MTSA boundary delineation, and the site has also been recorded to have an employment conversion request (B8) which Staff are currently supporting for conversion in the draft employment conversion analysis. |
| OP-20-099 | October 28, 2020 | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the timeline once approved? 2. How will you be working with all level of Government to implement the plan? 3. You mentioned affordable homes but what about now, there are people needing housing now, are there any plans in place? | <p><u>1. What is the timeline once approved?</u></p> <p>1. The Region's proposed Regional Official Plan policies will be adopted by Regional council by end of 2021. Following that, the Province must review and approve our Regional Official Plan Amendment (up to 90 days after Regional Council adoption). That timeline is on our Official Plan review webpage here:</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Do we have to wait until after the policy is approved to have affordable housing? 5. Will there be welcome centres or outreach to individuals seeking mental health support? 6. Will there be housing for our ageing population? 7. Is there some form of health care that is close by to the major nodes proposed? 8. It was mentioned the Region will be working with all levels government to implement these policies once approved, but what about working with the developers as well? 9. Could we not have a water transit which will give Peel a unique opportunity to come up with other sustainable ways to travel? | <p>https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/. Once the Official Plan is approved, the local municipalities have one year to update the local Official Plans to conform to the Regional Official Plans (for example, to plan for MTSA's). Then, development can occur over time which meets the requirements of both plans, but generally we expect the changes across Peel to take shape over the next few decades to 2041 and 2051.</p> <p><u>2. How will you be working with all level of government to implement the plan?</u> 2. Peel has (and will continue to) worked with the Province and local municipalities in planning for MTSA's and Growth Management (and all other Peel 2041+ focus areas). To develop the draft Regional Official Plan policy framework the Region has consulted with the local municipalities, Province, and other agencies such as Metrolinx. Once the Amendment to the Regional Official Plan is adopted, Regional Staff will work with local municipalities in amending their Official Plans to implement the new policy framework.</p> <p><u>3. You mentioned affordable homes but what about now, there are people needing housing now, are there any plans in place?</u> 3. The Region of Peel plans for and provides affordable housing now and will continue to in the future. It is recognized that more affordable housing is needed. To learn about Peel's current and proposed housing initiatives, please visit the Peel 2041+ Housing focus area webpage here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/housing.asp. In addition to Regional Official Plan policies, the Region is implementing the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan, which includes constructing new affordable housing through the Housing Master Plan.</p> <p><u>4. Do we have to wait until after the policy is approved to have these affordable housing?</u> 4. There are affordable housing initiatives underway now as part of the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan, including Second Units Renovation Program, the Affordable Housing Incentives Pilot Program (launching in 2021), and housing development as part of the Housing Master Plan, among other Regional housing programs and services. However, the new policies proposed as part of the housing focus area in Peel 2041+ will need to be approved prior to implementation.</p> <p><u>5. Will there be welcome centres or outreach to individuals seeking mental health support?</u> 5. The Regional Official Plan does not set out funding or where these services are specifically to be located. Information on funding and services for physical and mental health in Peel are available through Peel Public Health and Health Services: https://www.peelregion.ca/public-health/.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------|------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p><u>6. Will there be housing for our ageing population?</u> 6. The Regional Official Plan includes policies regarding planning for the aging population in section 6.3. Section 6.3.2.5 specifically encourages that different demographics including seniors are also considered in providing diverse types of housing. The Region also considers opportunities to develop and support housing for seniors through its programs and housing development.</p> <p><u>7. Is there some form of health care that is close by to the major nodes proposed?</u> 7. The Regional Official Plan will include policies that direct the local municipalities to plan for healthy complete communities that meet all residents' needs, however the Regional Official Plan does not designate specific land uses. While Peel Public Health works with the Province to provide health services through large facilities like hospitals, smaller clinics or doctor's offices may also be provided by private businesses. We recommend that any specific comments about health service needs be provided to Peel Public Health, or the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care.</p> <p><u>8. It was mentioned the Region will be working with all levels government to implement these policies once approved, but what about working with the developers as well?</u> Answer to 8. The Region circulates Regional Official Plan updates like Peel 2041+ to development industry stakeholders as well as the public and government agencies for input, and to keep them informed of future growth in the Region. The local municipalities like Mississauga have a more specific economic development role and work more directly to attract businesses to the city.</p> <p><u>9. Could we not have a water transit which will give Peel a unique opportunity to come up with other sustainable ways to travel?</u> 9. As the Region of Peel does not plan or operate transit service, we would recommend providing your suggestion for alternative transit modes to Mississauga Transit (MiWay), or the Province (Metrolinx).</p> |
| OP-20-111a | November 1, 2020 | ██████████ | Raised concern for the planned 90,000 people in Lakeview along the 1.5-kilometer strip of Lakeshore Road between Lakefront Promenade and Dixie Road. | Under the Provincial MTSA policy requirements, the Lakeshore Bus Rapid Transit Stations must be planned for a minimum (and may go above) 160 people and jobs per hectare. Lakefront Promenade, Haig (Lakeview Waterfront), and Dixie, are identified as LBRT-1, LBRT-2, and LBRT-3, respectively in the draft MTSA Regional Official Plan Amendment with minimum densities of 160 people and jobs per hectare. However, the density requirements apply only within the lands actually delineated as MTSA. The Region has worked closely with local staff to map MTSA delineations based on land use potential. Within the three MTSA delineations (of 134 hectares total) proposed in the Regional Official Plan on the Lakeshore corridor, the minimum |

| | | | | |
|------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | number of people and jobs will be around 21,500. For details on planned development and detailed land uses in the Lakeshore corridor, please contact city of Mississauga Staff for further information. Providing bus rapid transit along Lakeshore Road is an important transit service to connect and serve the community that has been identified by the Province, Region of Peel, and City of Mississauga. |
| OP-20-111b | November 1, 2020 | ██████████ | Suggested Peel reconsider the bus rapid transit system route along the 1.5 kilometer along two crossroads that appear to lead nowhere on Lakeshore Road. | See response to comment OP-20-111a. |
| OP-20-111c | November 1, 2020 | ██████████ | Request to protect the people-friendly environment along Lakeshore Road in Lakeview by maintaining the reasonable height along sidewalks that attract residents to meet, eat and shop. | See response to comment OP-20-111a. |
| OP-21-003a | January 19, 2021 | Plan Logic Consulting Inc. | Request to include the 2505 Dixie Road property as part of the draft employment area - Draft Schedule Y6. The applicant is proposing to develop their property for a 25-storey mixed-use building. | The Regional Official Plan is required to establish a minimum density for each MTSA. This MTSA, DUN-16 will have a minimum density of 160 ppj/ha calculated across the area within the boundary. The City of Mississauga will update their Official Plan to include land uses that can meet or exceed that minimum density across the MTSA. Individual site densities like those proposed at 2505 Dixie Road will need to be considered through local municipal development applications and Official Plan land use designations. Regional Official Plan Draft policy 5.6.19.10 does not limit individual site development. Not all sites within an MTSA will necessarily need to achieve higher density levels in order for the minimum density to be met across the MTSA. |
| OP-21-003b | January 19, 2021 | Plan Logic Consulting Inc. | The Peel MTSA Focus Area Policy Directions Report underestimates the potential opportunity for the redevelopment of the 2505 Dixie Road site for a building containing grade related retail uses and office, as well as residential uses on the upper floors. | Refer to response to Comment OP-21-003a. |
| OP-21-005 | January 26, 2021 | Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd. | Request to include 227 Vodden Street East in the Kennedy MTSA to achieve the minimum density target of 160 people and jobs per hectare. The subject site is currently developed as a neighbourhood retail development, specifically the Centennial Mall. The site is also located within 800 metres of the Kennedy BRT Station which merits inclusion within the Region's MTSA Preliminary Boundary Delineation and final MTSA delineation. | Regional Staff have not recommended inclusion of the property in the Kennedy MTSA (QUE-2). The majority of the site is outside of the 800-metre radius and is north of other low-density properties which remain outside of the MTSA boundary. Individual site developments with densities like those proposed at 227 Vodden Street can be considered outside of MTSA's and will be reviewed through local municipal development applications. |
| OP-21-007 | February 4, 2021 | Humphries Planning Group Inc. | Supported the inclusion of the subject site, 150 Rutledge Road, in the Streetsville GO MTSA boundary as the site is well suited for redevelopment. Request that the Province direct the Region to reclassify the MIL-3 Streetsville GO MTSA as a primary MTSA and assign and a minimum density of 160 people and/or jobs per hectare. | Property identified as 'Planned Station' for future delineation in the proposed Regional Framework. Once further planning work is advanced by Mississauga Staff, it is anticipated lands will be delineated. |
| OP-21-010 | February 9, 2021 | Gahir & Associate Lawyers | Request to include the southeast side of Steeles and Mississauga Road to encourage mixed-use higher density growth at a major transit artery. A retail and office development is currently proposed for this site, but applicant would be interested in pursuing a mixed-use development with medium or high density. | This site directly at the southeast corner of Steeles Avenue and Mississauga Road is within the draft boundary of the HUB-3 MTSA ("Steeles at Mississauga Road"). This MTSA is a "planned" station which is not proposed to be delineated in the Regional Official Plan at this time, and therefore there is no Regional minimum density requirement. Transit-oriented development is encouraged through draft MTSA policies in the interim until the MTSA is |

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | delineated. |
| OP-21-011b | February 18, 2021 | Sylvia Roberts | Peel's MTSA map yields an insufficient amount of land area and should include a third tier of intensification which is centred around frequent bus transit service. | Additional strategic growth areas where intensification is planned are identified on the draft Regional Official Plan Schedule Z2 - Strategic Growth Areas, including regional and local intensification corridors, local nodes/centres, local intensification corridors. Local municipal Official Plans may also identify additional intensification areas and transit corridors beyond higher order transit (like frequent bus). |
| OP-21-017 | March 16, 2021 | ██████ | Additional strategic growth areas where intensification is planned are identified on the draft Regional Official Plan Schedule Z2 - Strategic Growth Areas, including Regional and local intensification corridors, local nodes/centres, local intensification corridors. Local municipal Official Plans may also identify additional intensification areas and transit corridors beyond higher order transit (like frequent bus). | Regional Staff are reviewing the request and will consider if any other stations currently under the "planned station" classification like QUE-5 (Dixie) can be delineated in this Regional Official Plan Amendment. |
| OP-21-036a | April 28, 2021 | ██████ | <p>Provided the following MTSA comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City of Mississauga's Overview Study identifies certain lands in Figure 1 as having the greatest potential for land use compatibility and these lands should correlate with PSEZ lands that overlap with the delineated Clarkson MTSA. 2. The Region should consider a separate policy direction for the Clarkson MTSA in light of the potential land use compatibility issues in introducing sensitive land uses in certain areas of the MTSA. 3. Where there is overlap between the PSEZ and the MTSA, conversions to non-employment uses should be, at a minimum, discouraged to prevent or minimize encroachment of sensitive land uses on existing industries that make up the overall PSEZ 4. Any proposed Clarkson MTSA policies should be consistent with the PPS 2020. | The Region continues to support the PSEZ in the Southdown Employment area and has not proposed any employment land conversions at this time. Overall, the draft Regional Official Plan policies are meant to present a balanced approach to employment land protection and intensification in MTSAs as appropriate. The draft employment policy framework provides for some flexibility for mixed uses post-municipal comprehensive review in the Clarkson GO MTSA (LWGO-2) subject to a detailed local municipal study that meets key criteria for avoiding impact to the surrounding employment land. The Province recently proposed revised land use compatibility guidelines which the Region is monitoring and considering carefully for the avoidance of conflicts between employment and non-employment uses. Inclusionary zoning would only be directly implemented if residential land uses are otherwise proven to be technically appropriate and compatible in the MTSA. |
| OP-21-038 | April 30, 2021 | ████████████████ ████████████████ ████████████████ | <p>Requested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands continue to be included within the Torbram MTSA. 2. The Regional mapping be updated to show the lands as underutilized employment lands, meriting conversion of employment lands to permit mixed-use development 3. Draft Policy 5.7.2.18 be revised to also include privately initiated, local Official Plan Amendments within planned and delineated MTSAs. | The subject lands continue to be identified in the draft boundary of the Torbram MTSA, though the station is not yet delineated in the draft Regional Official Plan Schedule Y7. The lands do not fit the Peel criteria for underutilized in the vacant and underutilized land inventory. Draft Policy 5.7.2.18 (now see policies 5.8.31 and 5.8.32) continues to refer to comprehensive municipally initiated studies. |
| OP-21-050 | July 16, 2021 | GSAI | The Region of Peel's Phase 1A MTSA Review has not fully explored the potential of the Lakeshore MTSA corridor and thus is short sighted in its evaluation of MTSA's #88-90. We would respectfully ask that the Regional study team re-evaluate MTSA's #88-90 in light of the MTSA Analytical Lenses, MTSA criteria, and Emerging Framework considerations. GSAI strongly believes ongoing active development applications, the City's creation of an MOP Major Node in this area, the City's Lakeshore Connecting Communities planning exercise, as well as the abundance of hard and soft services in this general area indicate the MTSA | The Lakeshore Bust Rapid Transit MTSAs have been evaluated in Phase 1B of the MTSA study and recommended to be primary stations, delineated in the Regional Plan in recognition of their development potential, strategic location, and future transit service. Lakefront Promenade, Haig (Lakeview Waterfront), and Dixie, are identified as LBRT-1, LBRT-2, and LBRT-3, respectively in the draft MTSA Regional Official Plan Amendment with minimum densities of 160 people and jobs per hectare. |

| | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | classification/criteria should be revised. | |
| OP-21-206 | July 21, 2021 | GSAI | Concerned with the proposed minimum density target of 300 persons and jobs per hectare for the Fairview, Cooksville, Dundas, North Service and Queensway MTSA. Higher density, compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, and transit-supportive development should be encouraged within the Cooksville MTSA. The minimum density target for the Cooksville MTSA should be maintained as at least 400 residents and jobs combined per hectare. Requested to be involved in the consultation process for the Downtown Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Policy Review initiative should an alternative density target be considered. | The Regional policy framework for MTSA's like those in Downtown Mississauga (see MTSA's HLRT-3 to HLRT-7) prescribes a minimum density only. This will allow for more detailed land use and infrastructure planning to determine if higher densities are appropriate and can be supported. A minimum density of 300 people and jobs per hectare does not preclude higher densities from being planned for. It is recommended that the commenter reach out to city of Mississauga staff to be involved in the local municipal detailed land use process for the Downtown Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Policy areas. |
| Housing | | | | |
| OP-20-103 | December 10, 2020 | BILD | Request to take part in the conversation to devise IZ policies with the Region and local municipalities. Inclusionary zoning will only be effective in bringing the Region and its local municipalities more affordable housing choices if its policies are premised on sound rationale and a true partnership model. The Report prepared by PM Strategies entitled "Inclusionary Zoning - Jurisdictional Scan of Practices" has been shared in hopes that it be of use to the Region to develop mature IZ policies. | Thank you for providing the attached materials. This has been considered by Regional Staff and the local municipalities. The Region met with BILD on April 15 th , 2021 to present and discuss the results of the IZ Market Feasibility Analysis with the support of N. Barry Lyon Consultants Ltd. Further, Regional Staff will be engaging with BILD again in another consultation session on August 26 th , 2021 to discuss the Region's proposed IZ policies and to listen to the industry and receive feedback on the IZ framework. |
| OP-21-056 | June 3, 2021 | BILD | Provided comments regarding the Region of Peel's Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Analysis and Policy Directions Report. Stated that BILD's recommendation is based on a multi-theme strategy, specifically involving the partnership theme which states the need for incentives. Further, IZ can only be effective with incentives from all levels of government. | The Region of Peel retained N. Barry Lyon Consultants Ltd. to undertake a feasibility study on inclusionary zoning in MTSA's based on a model that did not include financial incentives. This study is subject to a third-party peer review and further consultation. Upon finalization of the feasibility study and the peer review, Provincial requirements for implementing inclusionary zoning will be met. Regional Staff are committed to meeting with BILD representatives and consulting further with the public on draft Regional inclusionary zoning policies. Further consultation by local municipalities will be undertaken as part of implementation of inclusionary zoning through Official Plan Amendments and Zoning By-law Amendments. |
| OP-21-067 | April 29, 2021 | BILD | BILD provided an outline of the IZ framework for a municipal partnership with the Region of Peel. The letter acts as supplementation leading up to their presentation at the June 3 PGMC (Item 4.2 on June 3 PGMC Agenda). See OP-21-056 for details. | See response to comment OP-21-056. |
| OP-21-074 | June 2, 2021 | Sylvia Roberts | The high prices of homes, both for ownership and rent, along with the structural supply problems yields housing unaffordability and the Region's Draft IZ policies (per Item 5.1 in the June 3 PGMC Agenda) do not address this issue. | Inclusionary zoning is one tool available to contribute to affordable housing. Draft policies support sustainable, compact, and complete communities by encouraging higher density development. This includes permitting high density residential uses in strategic growth areas, supporting inclusionary zoning in MTSA's, and ensuring that unit sizes in new multi-unit residential buildings reflect housing need. Proposed policies include minimum targets on new housing units being affordable to low- and moderate-income households, being of rental tenure, and in higher-density forms (e.g., apartments). |
| OP-21-076 | June 17, 2021 | Jennifer LeForestier | Based on current MZO guidelines, the Minister of MMAH has made farmland expendable. Furthermore, the Region of Peel should consider establishing a countryside line similar to the Region of Waterloo. This would essentially create a hard urban boundary to protect and preserve farmland. | The Peel 2051 Official Plan Review is ongoing, and a June 3, 2021 Report describes why Regional Staff have not recommended pausing the process, including in person and virtual consultations since 2013, successful attendance at virtual events, and the Provincial conformity deadline of July 1, 2022: |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>https://pub-peelregion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14217 . Residents also have had the opportunity to request hard copy materials for review, and Staff continue to be available via phone.</p> <p>Peel will experience significant growth of approximately 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years. The Region is proceeding with identifying lands for settlement area boundary expansion for a balanced approach between development in new greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide a mix of housing types and employment opportunities in Peel to accommodate the growth. The Land Needs Assessment Report carefully calculates the amount of new greenfield land needed in this balanced approach, and details can be found in a Report to Planning and Growth Management Committee here: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/land-needs-assessment-report-update-appendices.pdf.</p> <p>The proposed Plan identifies an Urban Boundary. Urban expansions are subject to rigorous justification and may only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review except in specified circumstances. The planning requirements include setting intensification targets, an assessment of intensification opportunities, a demonstration that growth cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas and avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas where possible. Waterloo Region's Official Plan similarly identifies a Countryside Line and sets out rigorous policies respecting urban expansions.</p> |
| OP-21-081 | June 17, 2021 | Sylvia Roberts | <p>This presentation dealt with missing middle housing, specifically taking away parking minimums and to include smaller units in the housing stock. There is also a need to build on transportation which can include having more BRT lanes and/or routes and having a Regional transit pass.</p> | <p>The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents and increase the supply of affordable housing. Draft policies increase the number of permitted additional residential units ("second units"), encourage shared housing arrangements, establish larger and family-sized (2+ bedroom) as the predominant affordable housing units provided through inclusionary zoning, and encourage local municipalities to review their requirements for multi-tenant houses (e.g. rooming houses) and other similar types of homes to ensure the development of housing that better meets the needs of current and future residents.</p> <p>The Region of Peel is working with Metrolinx and the local municipal transit agencies to plan for and advance a number of BRT and higher order transit projects in Peel identified in the Metrolinx 2041 Regional Transportation Plan and local municipal transportation plans. While Transit in the Region of Peel is under the jurisdiction of each local municipality transit agency, Metrolinx is working with transit agencies across the GTHA on fare and service integration and PRESTO modernization to facilitate seamless transfers between different transit service providers.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------|---|---|
| OP-21-198 | June 22, 2021 | GSAI | <p>Provided following three comments in the letter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Higher density, compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, and transit-supportive development should be encouraged within the Dundas MTSA. 2. The minimum density target for the Dundas MTSA should be maintained as at least 400 residents and jobs combined per hectare. 3. Given the potential implications to the subject lands should an alternative density target be adopted, we request to be involved in the consultation process for the Downtown Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Policy Review initiative and the Peel 2041+ initiative. | <p>Draft policies support sustainable, compact, and complete communities by encouraging higher density development. This includes permitting high density residential uses in strategic growth areas, supporting inclusionary zoning in MTSAs, and ensuring that unit sizes in new multi-unit residential buildings reflect housing need. Proposed policies include minimum targets on new housing units being affordable to low- and moderate-income households, being of rental tenure, and in higher-density forms (e.g., apartments).</p> <p>The Regional policy framework for MTSAs like Dundas (HLRT-5) prescribes a minimum density only. This will allow for more detailed land use and infrastructure planning to determine if higher densities are appropriate and can be supported. A minimum density of 300 people and jobs per hectare does not preclude higher densities from being planned for. It is recommended that the commenter reach out to city of Mississauga staff to be involved in the local municipal detailed land use process for the Downtown Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Policy areas.</p> |
| OP-21-201 | July 15, 2021 | [REDACTED] | <p>The comment letter suggested that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | <p>The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents and increase the supply of affordable housing and the potential for inclusionary zoning to support this objective. The Region has led feasibility analysis of inclusionary zoning in Protected MTSAs, which is where Provincial regulations permit this policy to be used. Feasibility analysis identified opportunities for inclusionary zoning and suggested that if inclusionary zoning is required at rates higher than what is feasible, development will likely not occur which will further limit the supply of available housing. Inclusionary zoning is one tool available to contribute to affordable housing. There is no mechanism available to require affordable housing in every development, but local and Regional municipal Staff continue to request contributions to the Regional affordable housing targets through developments. Draft policy directions encourage the development of more affordable rental and ownership housing units while not preventing new units, particularly purpose built rental, from being built. Draft policies propose to set a minimum size or percentage and targets for affordable housing in new developments where inclusionary zoning applies, with consideration to the unique characteristics of the area. These policies prioritize on-site affordable housing units and establish larger size (2+ bedroom) units as the predominant affordable units provided through inclusionary zoning.</p> |
| OP-21-202 | July 15, 2021 | [REDACTED] | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford | <p>Refer to response to comment OP-21-201.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>affordable housing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city | |
| OP-21-203 | July 16, 2021, August 8, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-207 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-208 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city.</p> | |
| OP-21-209 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-210 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-211 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | |
| OP-21-212 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-213 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-214 | July 23, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------|--|---|
| OP-21-215 | July 24, 2021 | [REDACTED] | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-216 | July 24, 2021 | [REDACTED] | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-217 | July 26, 2021 | [REDACTED] | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-218 | July 26, 2021 | [REDACTED] | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | |
| OP-21-219 | July 27, 2021 | ██████████ ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-220 | July 27, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-221 | July 27, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>developments set aside as affordable rental housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | |
| OP-21-222 | July 27, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-223 | July 28, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-224 | July 28, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------|--|---|
| | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | |
| OP-21-225 | July 28, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-226 | July 28, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-227 | July 31, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>affordable housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | |
| OP-21-228 | August 1, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-229 | August 3, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |
| OP-21-230 | July 8, 2021 | ██████████ | <p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning | Refer to response to comment OP-21-201. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. | |
| Transportation | | | | |
| OP-20-071l | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | Policy 5.10.5.1.2 states that a major road network should be achieved as shown on Schedule E. Should this policy now reference Schedule Y2? Further, the Strategic Goods Movement Network on Figure Y6 should be referenced in the Official Plan policies and Schedule Y2. | All Schedule references have been updated in the Transportation section. Updated Policy 5.10.7.2.5 to include reference to Figure Y6. Schedule Y2 is referenced in Policy 5.10.5.1.3. |
| OP-20-071m | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | Policy 5.10.5.2.11 states that access to developments should be obtained via municipal roadways and not Regional roads, where feasible. We do not believe this needs to be stated given the Region ultimately controls access to Regional roads. Further, it may present a potential conflict for pits and quarries where direct access to a Regional road is generally preferred where such option exists and is feasible. | The policy notes “where feasible” to speak to circumstances where access to municipal roadways cannot be obtained, then a review along Regional Roads will be undertaken, in accordance with our Controlled Access By-law No. 62-2013. With this policy we are noting that preference is given to municipal roadways to minimize an increase in access points to ensure optimal traffic flow. |
| OP-21-011a | February 18, 2021 | Sylvia Roberts | There is more planned development in Caledon than employment lands. Suggest that Peel plan Regional rapid transit routes to alleviate the risk of car congestion in Caledon and Brampton. Autonomous vehicles risk making traffic here vastly worse, as self-driving cars make it easier to commute significant distances. | To help improve east of mobility across the Region’s network, Peel has adopted the 50% sustainable mode share, focused on providing infrastructure that promotes walking, cycling, carpooling, and transit. The highest increase is seen in Transit. Schedule Y4 Rapid Transit Corridors illustrates the long-term concept of what transit will look like throughout Peel, and along Regional roads. The Schedule is also demonstrative of the growth Peel is both experiencing and can expect and our intentions for addressing the travel demands that stem from it. |
| OP-21-039 | March 18, 2021 | Sylvia Roberts | Provided presentation regarding the Orangeville Brampton Railway and stated that the railway is of significant value to the Region of Peel. The presentation included mapping of the existing railway travelling through Caledon and Brampton and highlighted the key areas within the Region. | Comment noted. |
| OP-21-052 | April 29, 2021 | John Florian | The 413 Highway will take away important farming land in the Caledon area causing the food supply to decrease. The 407 Highway is not being fully utilized and other transit opportunities are not being facilitated. | Peel Region shares these concerns. Throughout the planning process for the GTA West Corridor Peel Region has expressed its concerns to the Province regarding the impacts on the Prime Agricultural Area in Peel. The Region has requested that the Environmental Assessment address impacts on the agricultural land base and on farm operations. Regional Council has passed a resolution expressing its strong opposition in principle to the construction of any transportation corridor traversing the Region of Peel and specifically the currently proposed GTA West Transportation Corridor and Transmission Corridor. |
| Mineral Aggregates | | | | |
| OP-20-015 | March 3, 2020 | | Concerned about the proposed aggregate extraction pit near Charleston Sideroad and the Main Street through Alton. The Town of Erin’s excessive urban growth plans and wastewater treatment plant is a major environmental threat to the community. The West Credit River is going to become majorly polluted. Adding an urban road and roof run-off, plus | The review of the Mineral Aggregate Resources policies will ensure that the Region’s policies are consistent with the updated direction provided by the province in provincial plans and the Provincial Policy Statement. As well, the Region will update its identification of High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas, to reflect the latest data. These policy updates will work towards achieving the balance between resources extraction activity and the |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | stormwater pond drainage will cause Belfountain’s healthy heritage fish hatchery will become a rural casualty. | protection of Peel's communities, natural environment, cultural heritage, and other resources. |
| OP-20-025h | March 15, 2020 | ██████████ | Proposed to use recycled concrete and asphalt instead of using virgin aggregate. Recommended mandating that unnecessary pit lakes be filled, and the land be restored. Caledon does not need more unrehabilitated pits. | The mineral aggregate resources policies are being reviewed and updated to ensure consistency with Provincial policy direction, including policies to address the use of accessory aggregate recycling facilities within operations and comprehensive rehabilitation. |
| OP-20-071n | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | The environmental impact policies in Section 5.10.8 should recognize the importance of close to market aggregate and the potential negative environmental and social impacts of having to haul aggregate further from market. It is not a question of whether or not a load of aggregate will be shipped to market but rather where it is shipped from. Further, Caledon has some of the GGH’s highest quality sand and gravel and bedrock resources which would substantially extend the lifespan of infrastructure and reduce replacement costs. | Comment has been noted and will be considered further through the Aggregate Resources Policy Review. |
| OP-21-053 | May 28, 2021 | ██████████ | ██████████ and its member companies want to be involved in providing background and information on aggregate operations in Peel and discuss the challenges that ██████████ faces in planning for future aggregate supply that is required to meet future growth and infrastructure needs. ██████████ also wants to provide input that they think will help Peel meet its objectives and achieve the conformity and consistency required by the Province. ██████████ highlights a number of aggregates policy topics of interest to the industry that the Region should consider in the Official Plan Review. | The Region will be consulting with stakeholders regarding the proposed changes to the aggregate resources Official Plan policies and mapping. Through the review process, Regional Staff will analyze available information, engage with stakeholders, and provide appropriate policy and mapping responses. |
| OP-21-066 | April 28, 2021 | Jennifer LeForestier | The letter recounts the joint Region of Peel and Town of Caledon Aggregate Official Plan Review should be consistent with the 2020 changes to the PPS. It should also understand the environmental considerations associated with aggregates extraction. | The comments regarding consultation with Indigenous communities, the potential impact of aggregates on surface water, ground water, agriculture and natural heritage, requirements for rehabilitation and the regulation of aggregates operations under the Aggregates Resources Act are noted and will be considered in the Aggregates Policy Review Focus Area. |
| OP-21-204 | May 31, 2021 | ████████████████████ ██████████ | This comment inquired if significant updates and revisions to aggregate policy elements in the Official Plan have already occurred. | A meeting was held with the Belfountain Community Organization/Forks of the Credit Preservation Group on June 16th. Region Staff provided an overview of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review and advised that the Aggregate Resources Policy and Mapping Review and Update was still underway with planned public consultations occurring later in 2021. |
| OP-21-205 | July 5, 2021 | GSAI | The comment noted that Appendix II to the Report presented in June to Regional Planning and Growth Management Committee is based on a 2020 release of updated Provincial aggregate mapping for Peel. However, GSAI the drilling and fieldwork performed in support of a forthcoming aggregate application in the vicinity of Charleston Sideroad and Main Street/Regional Road 136 provides additional information, which may assist the Region and would contribute to more complete and accurate mapping for aggregate resources in this particular location in Peel. The comment provided a map of the quarry including borehole locations and monitoring wells. | Regional Staff will consider the mapping request subject to further consultation with the Province regarding the use of technical information to update the identification of High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas (HPMARA). A meeting with the Province is proposed to confirm the process used to review and update the mapping of selected bedrock resources. Staff will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the policy and mapping development process. |
| OP-21-234 | July 30, 2021 | ██████████ ██████████ | The ██████████ considers Caledon's water resources hold significant value and must be safeguarded. | Regional Staff are undertaking an analysis of municipal best practices as a component the policy review. Other municipal Official Plan policies will be examined to determine if applicable best practices can be applied in Peel." |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>FCPG would also like Peel to incorporate some of the Region of Waterloo's aggregates policies in order to have more detailed aggregates policy.</p> <p>FCPG does not support adaptive management plans (AMPs). Although AMPs are favoured by quarry operators, Town of Caledon Councillors would disagree as it does not provide safeguards for the local community.</p> | |
| Zoning | | | | |
| OP-21-021 | March 10, 2021 | | As part of the current Official Plan review and any associated zoning work, Mr. Wharton would like to request an alignment of any current/future Official Plan designation and the Zoning for the property at 1456 Queen Street West, Alton L7K 0E4. | The subject lands are located within Alton and alignment of the Official Plan designation and the Zoning By-law would be a local municipal matter. Correspondence was submitted to the Region of Peel and the Town of Caledon, and therefore they are aware of the request. |
| Greenlands Systems | | | | |
| OP-20-007 | March 2, 2020 | | <p>The policy review and revisions of the natural heritage systems under the Greenlands Systems Policy Review is important to the area of Belfountain. Development on the outskirts of Belfountain is designated "minor urban centre" despite existing within the Niagara Escarpment and UNESCO biosphere lands. Today, issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Water issues remain tenuous. b) James Dick Pit Extension planned between Winston Churchill and Shaw's reek goes beneath the water table. c) Erin (Wellington) massive development plans require a new wastewater treatment plant which means treated effluent flows into Belfountain via the West Credit River as present methods do not remove endocrine disruptions, etc. | The Peel 2041 Official Plan review is a comprehensive process that includes examining the Natural Environment and Resources sections in the Regional Official Plan. New and amended policies are being proposed. Natural heritage system, mineral aggregate resources and water resources planning policies are being updated. These policies are intended to protect, improve, and restore the natural environment and natural resources. |
| OP-20-020b | March 5, 2020 | | <p>Would like to see each system enhanced and strengthened:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase local food security through agricultural and rural systems • Ensure high level of protection for groundwater and recharge areas • Protect interconnected natural heritage greenlands systems and counteract biodiversity loss in rural and urban areas | Many of the policies that the Region is proposing represent new approaches and best practices that will protect natural heritage and natural resources and support the agricultural system and food security. |
| OP-20-021 | March 5, 2020 | | Strong policies for protecting natural heritage, green spaces, and watersheds are needed. Planning for climate change is also very important. | The Region is proposing to insert new and amend existing policies to protect natural features and areas for the long-term and to protect, improve and restore the quality and quantity of water resources. |
| OP-20-022 | March 5, 2020 | | Proposes trail maps indicating access points with street names. | The Region will continue to work with partners such as the Conservation Authorities and others to implement the Regional Official Plan objective of supporting passive recreational opportunities. |
| OP-20-025g | March 15, 2020 | | Ban chainsaw and bulldoze development, which damages the natural slopes of the land, vegetation and other species and results in flooding, damage to native habitats and subsurface species and fungus that contribute to ecosystem integrity. | The Region is proposing to insert new and amend existing greenlands system policies which are intended to protect and enhance the natural environment. |
| OP-20-034a | April 24, 2020 | | The most striking aspect of this policy review is the transition from a features-based to a system-based Natural Heritage System. With this approach, natural | Thank you for your comment. |

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | heritage protection in Peel falls into place as an integrated whole. Natural landscapes are linked into a network of natural heritage features, areas and corridors that enable safe movement of wildlife and connectivity of land and water features. The focus is to protect, restore and enhance natural heritage features and areas, and the linkages that enable the whole system to be integrated and resilient. The policy clearly recognizes the Greenlands System as providing valuable ecological services essential to the quality of life in Peel. | |
| OP-20-034b | April 24, 2020 | ██████████ | Collaboration among area municipalities and conservation authorities is a strong feature of the Greenlands System Policy. The resulting science-based and data-based approach emphasizes the importance, not just of maintaining, but of restoring and enhancing our natural environment. The policy recognizes that human impact on the natural environment can and should be minimized in both rural and urban areas. With the impacts of climate change and predicted population growth, protection, restoration, and enhancement of our natural environment is crucial for the long-term sustainability of natural heritage in Peel. | Thank you for your comment. The Greenlands System policy framework embodies collaboration among the conservation authorities, the local municipalities, and the Region. |
| OP-20-034c | April 24, 2020 | ██████████ | The Greenlands System Policy is one that engages many stakeholders. Landowners and rural businesses are important partners in protection of natural areas, corridors, and water resources. The Greenlands System and Water Resources System have interrelated policies for protecting sensitive water and groundwater features. The Greenlands System and Agricultural System overlap and are mutually supportive in balancing agricultural uses with protection of natural heritage. Provincial policies and criteria apply but where municipal criteria achieve or exceed the same objective, municipal criteria will apply. All efforts should be made to acquire the necessary funding for a robust Greenlands System throughout Peel. | Thank you for your comment. |
| OP-20-034d | April 24, 2020 | ██████████ | The details of the Greenlands System Policy are thorough and comprehensive, building on Provincial policies and plans, and expanding to include additional components to be integrated into local municipal plans. Its focus is to ensure Natural Areas and Corridors are protected, and to identify Potential Natural Areas and Corridors for protection. It recognizes the environmental value of all wetlands including unevaluated wetlands. It aims to expand protection to cultural woodlands, savannahs, and other woodlands. It recognizes that urban forest is a vital component of a complete, healthy, and sustainable community, and a natural asset to be incorporated into municipal asset management planning. | Thank you for your comment. |
| OP-20-034e | April 24, 2020 | ██████████ | A central aspect of the Greenlands System Policy is its focus on enhancement, restoration, and improvement. It is a policy that recognizes there is much work to be done, in restoring damaged natural environments, in organizing aggressive campaigns against invasive species, in seeking opportunities for greenlands securement, and in engaging all stakeholders in environmental stewardship. It is a policy that provides us with a solid foundation for moving forward sustainably. | Thank you for your comment. |
| OP-20-049b | July 9, 2020 | ██████████ ██████████ | Page 7 - What is the difference between a "greenlands system" and a "natural heritage system"? If there is no difference, then why develop a new term? We already have natural heritage system policies in the PPS, Growth Plan, Greenbelt | The Greenlands System is the term used for the natural heritage system in Peel. It is the term that has been used in planning in Peel for many years and therefore it is recommended that it continue to be used. In some instances, |

| | | | | |
|------------|---------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | Plan, ORMCP and NEP. Also, what does "transitioning from feature-based to system-based NHS" mean for farmers in Peel with natural heritage features on their farms? | the Region's Greenlands System policy framework enables the local municipalities to go beyond the minimum standard provided by the PPS and provides more clarity than the general policy direction provided by the PPS and in some cases Provincial plans. The City of Mississauga's Plan identifies a 'Green System' that includes urban open space, residential woodlands, and urban forest as elements. The Region's policy framework enables a range of implementation options for the local municipalities. A 'Greenlands System' label continues to be relevant for that purpose and does not impose higher standards specific to agriculture than what is required under the PPS or Provincial plans. |
| OP-20-049c | July 9, 2020 | ██████████ ██████████ | What does "transitioning from feature-based to system-based NHS" mean for farmers in Peel with natural heritage features on their farms? | The transition is from an approach that focusses on natural features to an approach concerned with the natural system as a whole, both the features and the linkages among them. As noted in the response to Comment # 182, farmlands can provide linkages while continuing to be farmed and ongoing agricultural activity is compatible with systems approach. The policy direction in the Regional Plan promotes stewardship by farmers and supports the development and implementation of programs to assist farmers who wish to implement natural heritage projects on their properties. The updated framework adding policy direction for natural heritage system planning requirements in development proposals only applies when Planning Act approvals are required. The continuation of normal farm practices does not trigger Planning Act approval requirements. |
| OP-20-049d | July 9, 2020 | ██████████ ██████████ | Page 9 - Maintenance of linkages? The PPS and Growth Plan definitions of a natural heritage system include the phrase, working landscapes [Growth Plan pages 77-78, PPS page 46] which are agricultural lands. They can serve as "linkages and corridors" for wildlife while continuing to be used for farming. | Comment noted. It is recognized that working landscapes can provide linkages while continuing to be farmed. |
| OP-20-051 | July 31, 2020 | ██████████ | <p>The ██████ is a recognized partner of the Region's Greenlands Securement Program and is pleased that Policy 2.2.11.3.8 is included in the Draft Official Plan policies. Support from the Region of Peel for the ██████'s mission has been will continue to be a critical part of the ██████'s success in protecting Niagara Escarpment lands in the Region. However, the ██████ feels that the proposed policies do not go far enough in that support.</p> <p>An important provision of the NEP is the ability for the ██████ to sever land for conservation and Bruce Trail purposes. As drafted, the Region's policies would restrict the ██████'s ability to do this, especially lands designated as part of a prime agricultural area. It is important to note that ████████████████████ supports the continuation of farm leases to keep prime agricultural areas in production. Therefore, ██████ Staff propose a policy that would read, more or less: "new conservation lot proposals for the purposes of securing lands containing sensitive or significant natural features and/or the Bruce Trail by a public agency or an approved Conservation Organization, shall be permitted within all designations of this plan, provided that the new lot is for conservation purposes and no new building lots are created.</p> | <p>A new Section 7.4.3 dealing with lot creation has been added to the draft Official Plan. Policy 7.4.3.4 supports consents to enable the securement of lands for natural heritage conservation purposes by a public authority or a non-government conservation organization subject to certain conditions.</p> <p>Policy 2.2.11.3.7 directs the Town of Caledon to include policies in its Official Plan to minimize lot creation in accordance with the policies of the NEP and where new lots are permitted, maintain, or enhance community character and protect natural heritage features. It is recommended that it be amended by including wording as follows to reference to the ROP creation policies:</p> <p>...in accordance with the policies of the NEP and Section 7.4.3 of this Plan and where new lots are permitted...</p> <p>In addition, it is recommended that the following policies also be modified as follows to address lot creation in the lands subject to the Greenbelt Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan:</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>2.2.13.5.24 Direct the Town of Caledon and the City of Brampton to include policies in their Official Plans to permit lot creation on lands within the Protected Countryside in accordance with Section 4.6 of the Greenbelt Plan and Section 7.4.3 of this Plan.</p> <p>2.2.12.3.3 Direct the Town of Caledon to develop appropriate Official Plan Official Plan policies and a zoning by-law Zoning By-law to implement and refine the requirements of the ORMCP. This includes specifically addressing those requirements that are more appropriately addressed at the area municipal level. Policies are to include but are not limited to those addressing servicing requirements and restrictions, the continuation of existing uses, permitting residential dwellings on existing lots of record buildings or structures on existing lots of record, addressing accessory uses accessory uses and structures, the applicability of the Table in Part III of the ORMCP to existing uses, second dwellings, lots of record, approved uses, lot creation consents, and permitted uses. Lot creation policies shall be in accordance with the policies of the ORMCP and Section 7.4.3 of this Plan.</p> |
| OP-20-071o | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | The opening paragraphs of Section 2.3 states that municipal criteria can be used instead of Provincial criteria to identify natural features if they achieve or exceed the same objective. Question whether this is allowable within the Greenbelt Plan Area. Outside the Greenbelt Plan Area, it is questionable whether this can occur for features such as significant woodlands and wetlands (please refer to the definition of significance in the PPS). | Section 4.6 of the Greenbelt Plan states that “there is nothing in this Plan that limits the ability of decision-makers on planning matters to adopt policies that are more stringent than the requirements of the Plan, unless doing so would conflict with any of the policies or objectives of the Plan.” The PPS and the Provincial plans set out the minimum requirements to ensure municipal conformity with those Provincial documents. The Provincial plans and policies are not meant to prevent municipal planning authorities from going beyond those minimum requirements if such requirements do not conflict with Provincial policies and objectives. No changes are recommended. |
| OP-20-071p | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | According to Section 2.3, Figure Y3 is a conceptual depiction of a Regional scale natural heritage system. Concerns with the inclusion of this figure and policies given the potential for confusion relative to policies relating to the Provincial Natural Heritage System. Further, it appears to identify the majority of the rural area in Caledon including areas that may not warrant environmental protection or designation. | Figure Y3 does not constitute part of the Official Plan. It is included for illustrative and informational purposes and is not referred to in the policies. It is intended to be utilized by the local municipalities in further identifying and interpreting the Greenlands System in implementing the Greenlands System policy framework. The Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System are shown on Schedule X11 and as such are referenced in the Sections of the ROP dealing with those Provincial plans. No change is recommended. |
| OP-20-071q | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | Policy 2.3.2.4 states that valley and stream corridors are now shown on Schedule Y1 (Core Areas). Please explain intent as the remainder of the policy explaining the identification of such features is still included. Please provide a map of the valley and stream corridors that are now shown on Schedule Y1. | The proposed policies maintain the approach set out in the current, approved Peel ROP. The reference to mapped valley and stream corridors shown on Schedule Y1 was to distinguish those valley and stream corridors that met the Core Valley and Stream Corridor mapping methodology developed in the previous five year review of the Regional Plan that was implemented in the Regional Plan through ROPA 21B so that there is a clearer interpretation of the Plan that other valley and stream corridors that are not mapped a Core Areas of the Greenlands System are not interpreted to be Core Areas of the Greenlands System. The inclusion of the text clarifies the basis on which the Core Area valley and stream corridors have been mapped. The Region will provide a map of the Core Valley and Stream Corridors that are a component |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>of the Core Areas of the Greenlands System shown on Schedule Y1. The boundaries have not changed since they were mapped initially through ROPA 21B.</p> <p>Policy 2.3.2.4 indicates that valley and stream corridors meeting one or more of the criteria for Core Area valley and stream corridors in Table 2 are identified as Core Areas and shown on Schedule Y1. As indicated in Policy 2.3.2.10, valley and stream corridors that do not meet the Core Area criteria are identified as Natural Areas and Corridors and shown on Figure Y2.</p> |
| OP-20-071r | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | <p>Policy 2.3.2.29 directs local municipalities to identify, protect, restore, and enhance natural heritage systems in their Official Plans in accordance with Provincial policy and the Greenlands System policies. We request clarification on which natural heritage system the municipalities are being directed to identify. It would not be appropriate for example to have the Town to identify and protect the Conservation Authority Natural Heritage System in recognition of other policies and requirements.</p> | <p>PPS Policies 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 give broad direction to identify and protect natural heritage systems. Similarly, the proposed Regional Policy 2.3.2.29 gives broad direction to the local municipalities to identify natural heritage systems, consistent with the policies of the PPS. The Conservation Authority Natural Heritage System is the product of extensive technical studies and as such should serve as an important resource for the local municipalities in identifying natural heritage systems. Figure Y3 is not a part of the ROP but as stated in the preamble to S. 2.3, is intended to be further interpreted and identified by the local municipalities through their implementation of the Greenlands System policy framework in accordance with Provincial policy. The Regional policies are not intended to strictly prescribe that the municipalities implement the CAs NHS mapping unless they determine the mapping is appropriate to include in accordance with Provincial and Regional policy direction. No change is recommended.</p> |
| OP-20-071s | September 23, 2020 | MHBC | <p>Request to discuss Policy 2.3.2.32 which states the Region will work with landowners to progressively rehabilitate operating pits and quarries to the highest level of ecological integrity practicable. What is this policy based on? What about sites being rehabilitated back to agricultural condition? We also have questions regarding the proposed definition of “rehabilitation” included in the Official Plan.</p> | <p>The policy indicates an interest of the Region to work with agencies and landowners to facilitate rehabilitation of abandoned mineral aggregate extraction areas and progressive rehabilitation of operating pits and quarries in the context of the local Official Plans and the legislative authority that is available to the local municipalities and relevant agencies under the Planning Act, Aggregates Resources Act, and other applicable legislation. The policy now renumbered as Policy 2.14.38 in the draft Regional Official Plan is an existing policy in the current in effect Regional Official Plan (Policy 2.5.2.7). The policy does not preclude the rehabilitation to an agricultural condition where that is required as a condition of approval or is preferred in the case of a site that is not subject to an approval.</p> |
| OP-20-081a | September 23, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | <p>Request to consider free movement of animals by building safe passages for animal crossings to prevent roadkill.</p> | <p>Major road construction that takes place in the Region obtains vetting from the Conservation Authority in that area and one of their focus is to ensure the safe movement of wildlife in road design. Staff are exploring policy direction in the Official Plan that consider wildlife crossings, where appropriate and warranted.</p> |
| OP-20-081b | September 23, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | <p>Concerns about development infringing on the natural habitat in Peel. Although environmental conservation is a focus, many times, development seems to take precedence.</p> | <p>The Greenlands system policies provide the framework required to protect, restore, and enhance the system as a fundamental part of Peel's approach to managing future Growth and development. In addition, there are specific policies proposed in the Greenlands section of the Official Plan prohibiting development in Core Areas with certain exceptions. The proposed policies direct the local municipalities to require proponents of development or site</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | alteration within or on lands adjacent to the Greenlands System Core Areas, Natural areas and Corridors and Potential natural areas and Corridors to prepare an environmental impact assessment and to demonstrate that features and areas will be protected or there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions and that the Core Areas of the Greenlands System will be protected. |
| OP-20-081c | September 23, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | Question about the potential conversion of lands that are currently in the whitebelt into greenbelt lands and whether these lands are considered in the review process. | All lands in Peel are considered in the Official Plan process. With respect to the potential conversion of whitebelt lands into natural cover there are specific Greenlands System policies which promote and support collaboratively with the local municipalities, conservation authorities and other agencies the development and implementation of habitat restoration and enhancement programs where appropriate. Currently, there is no Provincial proposal to expand the Provincial Greenbelt into the whitebelt in Peel. |
| OP-20-081d | September 23, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | There are two adjacent golf courses in Brampton, in the area bounded by Steeles, Kennedy, the 407, and Hurontario. The Peel Village Golf course is mostly floodplain. The area is planned by Brampton for approximately 80,000 more people and needs more parkland. If the City of Brampton wished to turn these into naturalized parks, as the Etobicoke flows through it, how would this fit into the Greenlands system? | Questions regarding site specific development proposals should be directed to the appropriate local municipal planning Staff for comments. The draft Schedule Y1 to the Region's proposed Official Plan identifies valley lands in this area as Core Areas within the Greenlands System. The proposed policies direct the local municipalities to identify, protect, restore, and enhance natural heritage systems in their Official Plans in accordance with Provincial policy and the Greenlands System policy framework of this Plan. Regional Staff will forward this comment to local municipal Staff. |
| OP-20-081e | September 23, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | Question about financial incentives for charitable land trusts to protect natural areas. | Peel's Greenlands Securement Program provides cost share funding to support greenlands securement acquisition of natural areas in Peel based on specific eligibility requirements. The program provides funding to eligible conservation partners that have entered into greenlands securement agreements with Peel including charitable land trusts that have been approved as a conservation partner by Regional Council. |
| OP-20-081g | September 23, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | Request for information on plans for fighting phragmites on road shoulders. | Peel is currently conducting a pilot program to spray 3 specific patches of phragmites in Caledon and evaluate success for their control. One of the objectives is to increase driver safety at an intersection as tall stands of phragmites impact driver sight lines. This is year one of the pilot. Regional Staff recognize that phragmites is an issue along all roads, not only Regional roads. Unfortunately, when private properties abut Regional roads, we have no authority to compel private homeowners to control phragmites. Though Regional Staff may move to treating all Regional ditches the problem will continue to reoccur as the phragmites spreads by underground stolons. To better curb spread of phragmites Staff have also identified the need to wash equipment during ditching operations to prevent the spread to new areas. |
| OP-20-081h | September 23, 2020 | ██████ [informal public consultation] | Question about systems' design thinking at Peel. | The proposed draft changes to the Greenlands System policy framework are based on a natural heritage system approach that provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of natural heritage features and areas and the linkages and corridors that are needed to ensure the system is integrated and resilient. The policy builds on the system approach in Provincial policies and |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | plans including the natural heritage system approaches contained in the Provincial Policy Statement, The Growth Plan, the Greenbelt Plan, Oak ridges Moraine conservation plan, Niagara Escarpment Plan and Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. |
| OP-20-081i | September 23, 2020 | [Informal public consultation] | The conservation authorities provide a report card year-to-year on the condition of the watershed(s). Year-to-year there is decreasing water levels, soil, and air quality. What efforts will be taken to improve these conditions year-to-year? | Peel provides funding to the Conservation Authorities in Peel to provide expertise and implement plans and programs to improve water quality and quantity as well as soil and air quality. |
| OP-20-084a | September 29, 2020 | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] hopes to build mechanisms into the Official Plan to record and reward achievements (conservation and protection of ecosystem services, etc.) by NGO landowners. | The comment is noted and will be considered in Peel's continued review of the ROP. The draft proposed policies provide a comprehensive framework that encourages and promotes greenlands restoration, enhancement and stewardship including by private landowners and non-government organizations. |
| OP-20-084b | September 29, 2020 | [REDACTED] | Request for information on the Region's plans to manage invasive phragmites by Regional roads. | Peel is currently conducting a pilot program to spray 3 specific patches of phragmites in the Town of Caledon and evaluate success for their control. One of the objectives is to increase driver safety at an intersection as tall stands of phragmites impact driver sight lines. This is year one of the pilot. Regional Staff recognize that phragmites is an issue along all roads, not only Regional roads. Unfortunately, when private properties abut Regional roads, we have no authority to compel private homeowners to control phragmites. So, though Staff may move to treating all Regional ditches the problem will continue to reoccur as the phragmites spreads by underground stolons. To better curb spread of phragmites Regional Staff have also identified the need to wash equipment during ditching operations to prevent the spread to new areas. |
| Climate Change | | | | |
| OP-20-020a | March 5, 2020 | [REDACTED] | Glad to see the integrated systems approach with mitigation of climate change at the forefront. Would like to see each system enhanced and strengthened: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce GHG emissions and transition to green transit systems. • Minimum impact development in development nodes and use district energy with a view to zero impact. | The Region has taken an integrated approach to its climate change policies by inserting appropriate policies throughout various section of the plan to embed direction within the appropriate policy context. |
| Agriculture | | | | |
| OP-20-049a | July 9, 2020 | [REDACTED] | Page 6 - What is meant by the term "rural system"? There is no use of this term in the PPS, Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan, ORMCP or NEP. There is the "agricultural system" in these plans. How will a "rural system" be defined? | The Rural System is defined in the draft ROP as consisting of those lands that are outside the Regional Urban Boundary. Thus, it includes rural settlement areas, prime agricultural areas and rural lands, the Palgrave Rural Estate Community, natural heritage and water resources, and other natural resources. The Rural System corresponds to the Rural Areas as described in section 1.1.4 of the PPS. |
| OP-20-049e | July 9, 2020 | [REDACTED] | Page 14 - What is meant by "permissions for agriculture?" Agricultural uses, including erecting ag-related buildings and structures, is a right of being in an agriculturally zoned area. You need a building permit, and to comply with MDS and zoning by-law setbacks from roads and lot lines, but nothing more in terms of "permissions". Also, will Peel be deferring to OMAFRA's guidance on these; | Permissions refer to what is permitted as of right in the Regional and local Official Plans. A building or structure for an agricultural use in an agricultural zone does not require Planning Act approvals if the building or structure complies with zoning and does not require a site plan agreement. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Areas, MDS, etc.? If not, why? | The Region has utilized OMAFRA's Guidelines on Permitted Uses in developing the draft Agricultural System policies. |
| OP-20-049f | July 9, 2020 | | Page 16 - "Existing agricultural operations" is troubling. It was in the 2005 PPS in relation to Natural Heritage policies but was dropped in the 2014 revisions. It should be dropped from this exercise. | Comment noted. The draft policies permit the continuation of agricultural uses within the Greenlands System in accordance with normal farm practices subject to Provincial legislation and policies. See Section 2.3.2.3. |
| OP-20-049g | July 9, 2020 | | Page 17 - What is meant by Planning Act approval not needed for "most changes in agricultural use"? Regional Planners need to carefully read the definition of "agricultural uses" and PPS Policies 2.3.3.1 and 2.3.3.2. | Planning approval is not required for most changes in agricultural use but may be required in some circumstances such as where a proposed agricultural use requires lot creation or where the use would not meet zoning by-law standards such as building setbacks. |
| OP-20-049h | July 9, 2020 | | Page 18 - What are "high impact agricultural uses"? PPS Policies 2.3.3.1 and 2.3.3.2 speak to "all types, sizes and intensities of agricultural uses being "promoted and protected". This could be interpreted as anti-certain aspects of agriculture. [redacted]s aware that Caledon has lands subject to the Growth Plan, Greenbelt Place, ORMCP and NEP. Secondary farm help houses are a recognized agricultural use under the Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan and ORMCP. Only the NEP discriminates against farm help housing. Again, see the definition of "agricultural uses". | The Caledon Official Plan defines "High Impact Agricultural Uses" to mean the use of the land, buildings, or structures for agricultural uses that because of the intensity or nature of the use have greater potential to impact surrounding uses, the natural environment or servicing. High impact agricultural uses include such uses as large- and mixed animal hospitals; large-scale public equestrian centres; fish farms or aquaculture operations; commercial greenhouses; fur-bearing animal farms; and mushroom farms. |
| OP-20-049i | July 9, 2020 | | Page 19 - How does the Caledon Official Plan define "major expansions"? I.e., Some of the "Provincial plans" define "major development" as over 5382 sq. ft. of floor area (500 sq. metres). The [redacted] objected to this for agricultural buildings. | The Caledon Official Plan defines "major expansion", with respect to existing development and uses within Environmental Policy Areas, as including related facilities, operations, and programs, shall mean an enlargement or change in use which is major in proportion to the size, scale or intensity of the development or uses which existed at the date of adoption of Official Plan Amendment 124. |
| OP-20-049j | July 9, 2020 | | Page 20 - [redacted] believes that the last bullet point on this page is wrong. No buildings are permitted in the 30-metre vegetation protection zone adjacent to key natural heritage features. Farmers are exempt from maintaining the 30-metre vegetation protection zone in "natural, self-sustaining vegetation" if the 30-metre buffer is used for "agricultural purposes" i.e., cropped, pastured, etc. In specialty crop areas of the Greenbelt, the 30-metre buffer is reduced to a 15-metre buffer. | The last bullet repeats Policy 4.2.4.4 b) of the Growth Plan. The requirement for a 30 m vegetation protection zone means that agricultural buildings and structures are not permitted within 30 m of a key feature. |
| Water Resources | | | | |
| OP-21-200 | June 25, 2021 | | The comment letter asks that Peel's Municipal Comprehensive Review should take a high-level path to protect the Region's terrestrial and aquatic integrity and not merely position itself to satisfy the requirements of the Growth Plan. It also asks to protect and restore water quality and quantity through the Provincial Policy Statement and to ensure that local Land Need Assessments require a watershed or sub-watershed plan to be considered complete, ready for public comment, and to be presented for ratification by Council. | Comprehensive policy updates for climate change, water resource system and natural heritage system planning are included in Peel 2041+.The Region is addressing the planning for the new settlement area through a Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) Study that includes twelve technical studies to inform where and how new settlement areas are planned. One of the technical studies is the Environmental Screening and Scoped Subwatershed Study. The Scoped Subwatershed Study component includes a characterization of water resource and natural heritage system features and areas, an impact assessment with detailed studies of surface water and ground water impacts, and an implementation plan of measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts. Headwater areas affected in the SABE study area are being |

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------------|------------|--|--|
| | | | | comprehensively considered within the Scoped Subwatershed Study. |
| OP-21-232 | July 20, 2021 | ██████████ | This comment inquires why a pond in Brock Pit in Northeast Caledon has been removed in the Draft Schedule X12- Rural Systems. The comment further mentions that other ponds and quarry lakes are included in Schedule X12. | <p>The waterbody located on the Brock Pit site, it is mapped as a “waterbody” on the latest version of draft Schedule X1 – Water Resource System Features and Areas which can be found at the following link: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/pdf/maps/schedules/schedule-x1.pdf.</p> <p>Water Resource System features and areas shown on Schedule X1 are not comprehensively mapped on other schedules and figures in the Regional Official Plan that are intended to show information related to the purpose for which they have been created. The image provided in the inquiry is an earlier version of Schedule X12 which is intended to show the areas included in the Rural System and its components including the Palgrave Estates Residential Community. The Water Resource System policies and mapping apply throughout the Region’s Rural System and Urban System in accordance with policy text in the Regional Plan.</p> <p>The mapping of Water Resource Systems in Official Plans, including surface water features, is a requirement of the Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan. It is important to note that draft schedules and figures shown on the project website may be subject to further review and revision as the Region completes the Regional Official Plan Review.</p> |
| Other | | | | |
| OP-20-025c | March 15, 2020 | ██████████ | Expressed concerns with excess light pollution from both commercial and private properties damage breeding cycles of plants, insects, and wildlife and will affect bird migration. Gutter lights and other extreme sources of light should be banned or restricted. Dark sky lighting across Peel should be implemented. | Local municipalities have the legislative authority to approve site and building design. The Planning Act gives local municipalities the ability to address matters through site plan approval and urban design policies that can include lighting and other exterior design features. Local municipalities are best suited to address these matters. This comment will be sent to the local municipalities. The Region is not intending on requesting designation or preservation by the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada or International Dark-Sky Association, and the Region is not intending on implementing a dark sky preserve area at this time. |
| OP-20-095a | October 28, 2020 | ██████████ | Suggested Staff provide key consultation materials in different languages or shorter summaries of complex information. | Regional Staff will explore options to share information in other languages. |