

From: Eniber Cabrera <Eniber.Cabrera@mississauga.ca>

Sent: November 30, 2021 3:13 PM

To: Kataure, Virpal <virpal.kataure@peelregion.ca>; ZZG-Planpeel <zzg-planpeel@peelregion.ca>

Cc: Jason Bevan <Jason.Bevan@mississauga.ca>; Katherine Morton <Katherine.Morton@mississauga.ca>; Buonpensiero, Tara <tara.buonpensiero@peelregion.ca>

Subject: City of Mississauga Comments on proposed ROPA and MCR - Statutory Consultation

Good Afternoon Virpal,

Thank you for providing City of Mississauga staff with an opportunity to comment on the proposed Peel Region Official Plan Amendment and Municipal Comprehensive Review as part of the Peel 2051 statutory consultation process.

Please find attached a memorandum and the comment table including the City's comments on the previous June 2021 draft ROPA and follow-up comments on the current October 2021 submission.

Let us know if you have questions or need clarifications. Regards,

Eniber



Eniber Cabrera, MA, RPP, LEED AP

Planner, City Planning Strategies

T 905-615-3200 ext.5305

eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca

[City of Mississauga](#) | Planning and Building Department,
City Planning Strategies Division

Please consider the environment before printing.

City of Mississauga
Memorandum



Date: 2021/11/30

File: LA.09.REG
(Region of Peel)

To: Virpal Kataure, Principal Planner
Regional Planning & Growth Management Division

From: Eniber Cabrera, Planner, City Planning Strategies

Subject: **Comments on Proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment and
Municipal Comprehensive Review**

Thank you for providing the City of Mississauga with the opportunity to review the proposed Region's 2051 Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) and Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). City staff understand that the October 2021 draft ROPA includes most of the draft policies previously reviewed by City staff this past June 2021.

The attached table includes the comments provided on the July 2021 circulation and the Region's response. The Region's responses contain valuable clarifications and indicated where previous comments are still being addressed. City staff has included further comments and/or indicated where Mississauga's comments are still outstanding and may require further discussions.

City staff acknowledges there are several areas where the City and the Region will continue to collaborate and address key comments from the Province. Consequently, Mississauga staff expects additional policy changes. The City looks forward to continuing to work with Peel Region staff and finalize the policies in the ROPA, particularly those related to Major Transit Station Areas, urban structure/ strategic growth areas, employment areas conversions, and housing/inclusionary zoning.

For the housing comments, City staff would like to request a meeting with the Region to discuss the direction of the additional residential unit and inclusionary zoning policies since this would affect local implementation as well as policy interpretation to aid the City on the conformity requirement.

If you have any questions, please contact me at Eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca or at (905) 615-3200 ext. 5305.

Regards,

Eniber Cabrera, Planner, City Planning Strategies

attach

cc. Jason Bevan, Director, City Planning Strategies
Katherine Morton, Manager, Planning Strategies and Data

*K:\PLAN\POLICY\GROUP\Projects\Region\2021 Peel Region\Peel 2041 Consultation\October2021 -
Statutory Consultation\Memo-CityMississaugaComments-November30-2021.docx*

Region of Peel Draft Region Official Plan Consolidation - Tracked Changes Updated by Mississauga, November 26, 2021
City of Mississauga Comments

Comme #	Local Staff & Division	Document & Section in Question	Draft Policy	Mississauga Staff Comment - July, 2021	Region of Peel Response	Mississauga Staff Comments - 2nd Round November 30, 2021	Action Required?	If this is a policy change, does it also need to be reflected in the report or appendices?	Comment Resolved ?
WM1	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	Waste Management Policies	General Comment	The new Blue Box Regulation that were released in 2021 by the provincial government (under the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016) are not included in this version of the ROP. This is the first time in 30+ years that the Province is rolling out significant changes to the blue box program. The regulations will require "producers to operate and pay for the collection and reuse, refurbishment and recycling of blue box materials" (source: https://pra.ca/programs/blue-box/). This is up from 50% today to now 100% responsible which will have major implications to how the Region manages recycling (Pest contact: Dove Youssif). This may require removal of references to recycling or to create a new section on recycling. There are so many unknowns about the impact at the Region (and local municipalities) that we will be addressing over the next couple of years. The regulations will come into effect for the Region (and local municipalities) in October 2024.	The Blue Box regulation on its own does not change the intent and direction of the proposed waste management policies. Under a scenario where the Region no longer provides collection services for blue box recyclables after transition, we will still continue to recycle other materials from our other waste diversion program (e.g. electrical and electronic equipment)	Response noted. As is understood, the Region will continue to offer recycling services and work with Producers legislated through the various independent producer responsibility regulations to collect and recycle materials, including and not limited to blue box materials (i.e. textiles).	Dave		
WM2	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	Waste Management Policies	General Comment	Staff understand that Regional Council has cancelled plans to build a publicly-owned anaerobic digester. It is likely now going to support a private entity to build it (Pest contact: Carol Chapuis) - this should be reflected in this ROP	A Council report on the future of organic waste processing is forthcoming. The details of the report and any endorsements, if applicable, may be reflected in the Official Plan	Region's response is noted.	Dave		
WM3	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	Waste Management Policies	General Comment	The Region of Peel no longer has any active landfills. This ROP talks about how to manage closed ones but is the Region considering opening a new landfill? If there isn't, should the ROP say so? Would or should the ROP also talk about where the waste currently goes (what landfills accept all our waste) and what the role of the Region in making sure our waste goes to such landfills? It seems a major missing piece here with respect to waste management.	There are no current plans to build a new landfill. The intent of the waste management policies is not to note in detail the waste management disposal process (which may change frequently) but simply to provide planning guidance to help meet our objectives	Region's response is noted.	Dave		
CC1	Development & Design, Planning and Building, Mississauga	Climate Change - General	New climate change policies - general	The City is encouraged for the good representation of Climate Change in the draft ROP. Climate change has been added to the Purpose of the ROP and is included in the Overarching Themes section and throughout the ROP, including a short section on climate change and air quality. Sounds like a similar approach we are taking in our local OP.	Comment is noted.	Region's response is noted.	Derek		
CC2	Environment, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	Draft Policy, section 1.6	Themes of the Plan	In the Overarching Theme, draft policies mentions GHG reduction only. Consider adding "climate adaptation" as referenced in the Purpose section and throughout the ROP.	The introductory paragraph in section 1.6 Overarching Themes, provides an overview of significant issues related to sustainable development including climate change mitigation and adaptation.	Response is noted and the City agrees adaptation is captured however in the second paragraph which discusses the environmental imperative adaptation to climate change could be further integrated. Further in section 1.7 goals. Climate Change mitigation and adaptation is not specifically addressed as a goal. (Consider evaluating further with regional contacts: Christine Tu or Anthony Parente)	Derek		
CC3	Environment, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	Section title, Housing and Climate Change (before 5.9.46)	Housing and Climate Change	"Housing and Climate Change" title: this appears out of realm with other standard titles. No where else in the report do the other relevant sections (e.g. energy, water, natural hazards and transportation) pull out "climate change" in the title. The only other title is Climate Change and AI Quality (which makes sense).	The comment is noted and will be considered in finalizing draft policies for the amendment. No change to the policy is recommended at this time.	Region's response is noted.	Derek		
CC4	Development & Design, Planning and Building, Mississauga	3.7.8 Energy Resources	Requiring municipalities to incorporate policies re sustainable site and building design construction practices	The City is encouraged with this policy as will support the upcoming update of the Green Development Standards	Comment is noted.	Region's response is noted.	Derek		
CC5	Development & Design, Planning and Building, Mississauga	3.7.17 Energy Resources	Requiring energy systems feasibility studies	Although an admirable policy that staff agree with, this policy should also be at the local OP's to have strength.	A new Section 7.6 Sustainability provides comprehensive direction and enabling policies for the development and implementation of green development standards through the local land use planning process.	Newly added section 7.6 in addition to revised section 3.7.17 address the City's main comment. Further the City recommends including some further language to support renewable energy and district energy specifically. The City noted section 3.7.7 addresses district energy specifically and recommends further strengthening the language to include language to enable local municipalities to assess opportunities to conserve energy, reduce peak demand and provide resilience to power disruptions as part of new development. The City recommends considering specific references to local integrated energy solutions that incorporate renewable energy such as district energy, geothermal and waste heat energy capturing systems and energy storage.	Derek		
WR1	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	2.6 Draft Policy, Water Resource System	To identify Water Resource System features and areas as shown on Schedules X1, X5 and X6 and direct the local municipalities to further interpret, refine and designate as appropriate, Water Resource System features and areas in their official plans.	City Staff would like more clarity on this policy. Schedule X5 shows an extensive area as requiring interpretation, refinement and designation. City Staff would like to better understand how this policy will be met through MOP.	The Provincial Policy Statement 2020, Section 2.2.1 (d) requires that Planning Authorities identify water resource systems consisting of ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas and surface water features etc. The intent of this policy is to implement the requirements directed through the PPS. The term "as appropriate" has been added in order to allow the local municipalities flexibility to determine how the PPS policy will be addressed in the local official plan. For example, the local municipalities may choose to undertake the refinements through studies completed as a part of the development review process or through an alternative process. No change to the proposed policy is required.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR2	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Watersheds, Section 2.6.19.5	Require the local municipalities, in consultation with the Region and conservation authorities to prepare subwatershed plans, or equivalent studies, prior to the development of a new or a major update to an existing secondary plan or local plan, or settlement area boundary expansion.	A "local plan" could be an tract of land smaller than applicable to a subwatershed study. Suggest omitting that term. Furthermore, the City could undertake a major review or a new local plan for a subwatershed area (e.g., Eglington Major Node). This policy would trigger the requirement to prepare a subwatershed study. There should be a distinction between new areas (greenfields and expansions) versus built-up areas	The inclusion of the wording "subwatershed plans, or equivalent studies..." is intended to provide flexibility to scope appropriate studies when secondary plan/local plans are being updated and apply to smaller areas and situations when a "subwatershed plan" would not be required. The policy applies equally in both greenfield areas and existing built up areas. There is no requirement to make a distinction between the two. No changes are recommended.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR3	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Section 2.7.6	Direct the local municipalities to identify the boundaries of vulnerable areas including wellhead protection areas, highly vulnerable aquifers, intake protection zones, significant ground water recharge areas, and issue contributing areas in their official plans.	A scan of the CTC mapping suggests that Mississauga would not be subject to this requirement. The policy implications are concerning and, as such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Should this mapping be required in the OP, guidance on phasing for conformity would assist the City in navigating this requirement	The development of source water protection policies and mapping of vulnerable areas associated with threats to drinking water sources is a requirement under the Clean Water Act, 2006. Municipalities must either conform with or have regard to policies in the Source Protection Plans depending on the level of significance. While there are no significant threat policies applicable to Mississauga, there are moderate and low level water threat policies, for which the Mississauga Official Plan can have regard to. When implementing these policies, mapping would be needed in the areas where the policies apply. The mapping data layers are generated by and available from the appropriate Source Protection Authority. Mapping information is not generated locally since it requires provincial approval of the boundaries. Mississauga would not be required to generate new data to be mapped. Mississauga would apply the approved mapping data which is currently available.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR4	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Section 2.7.27	Encourage the local municipalities to require a salt management plan as part of a complete application in all vulnerable areas where the application of road salt to impervious areas is a moderate or low threat in wellhead protection areas A, B, C, D and E, highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas.	Mississauga has implemented a Salt Management Plan but is not understood to be subject to the areas noted here. As such, further to the City's concern w.r.t. 2.6.6, the policy implication here is not felt to be applicable.	The policy is an "encouragement" policy. Mississauga is not required to undertake an action if local staff determine that the existing Salt Management program is sufficient.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR5	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Haltom Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.42	Identify highly vulnerable aquifers on Schedule X5	The policy implications are concerning and, as such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Should this mapping be required in the OP, guidance on phasing for conformity would assist the City in navigating this requirement	The mapping data has been developed by the Source Protection Authority, approved by the Province and is available for download. Mississauga is not required to generate new mapping data.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR6	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Haltom Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.43	Direct the local municipalities to protect highly vulnerable aquifers in wellhead protection areas in accordance with the policies of this Plan.	The policy implications are concerning and, as such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Should this mapping be required in the OP, guidance on phasing for conformity would assist the City in navigating this requirement	The proposed policy notes that the protection of highly vulnerable aquifers is "in accordance with the policies of this Plan". In relation to the City of Mississauga the policies direction in the Regional Official Plan is not mandating. The policy language "encourages".	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR7	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Haltom Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.44	Work with the local municipalities to encourage land uses considered to be a high risk to ground water that are located within areas of high aquifer vulnerability to implement best management practices including requiring the submission of a contaminant management plan as a condition of development approval.	The policy implications are concerning and, as such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Should this mapping be required in the OP, guidance on phasing for conformity would assist the City in navigating this requirement	The policy specifically states "encourage" not require consideration be given to the use of tools which can assist in protecting ground water. The Region can work with the local municipality to identify potential tools and the implementation process which can be considered an applied if the local municipality determines their use would be beneficial.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR8	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Haltom Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.45	Encourage the local municipalities to require a salt management plan to reduce the future use of salt as a condition of development in highly vulnerable aquifers in accordance with the applicable source protection plan.	Mississauga has implemented a Salt Management Plan but is not understood to be subject to the areas noted here. As such, further to the City's concern w.r.t. 2.6.6, the policy implication here is not felt to be applicable.	The intent of the policy is to encourage proponents of a development to consider the implications of applying road salt on water resources. The policy is intended to be a tool to promote awareness. The term "encourage" is used in order to provide flexibility in determining when and how the policy is applied.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR9	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Haltom Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.46	Identify significant groundwater recharge areas on Schedule X6	The policy implications are concerning and, as such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Should this mapping be required in the OP, guidance on phasing for conformity would assist the City in navigating this requirement	The mapping data has been developed by the Source Protection Authority, approved by the Province and is available for download. Mississauga is not required to generate new mapping data.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		
WR10	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Haltom Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.47	Direct the local municipalities to protect significant groundwater recharge areas in accordance with the policies of this Plan.	The policy implications are concerning and, as such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Should this mapping be required in the OP, guidance on phasing for conformity would assist the City in navigating this requirement	The intent of the mapping is to identify where vulnerable areas are in order to provide a reference to understand where attention can be given in order to achieve the greatest impact.	Region's response is noted.	Gail		

WR11	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Halton Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.48	Direct the local municipalities to require development in significant groundwater recharge areas to implement low impact development stormwater practices to maintain pre-development recharge rates to the greatest extent feasible in accordance with applicable provincial and municipal requirements.	The policy implications are concerning if these areas are to be mapped in detail in the City's Official Plan. As such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Policy intent could be met with draft policy 2.6.9 (which would apply city-wide), without the need to map all significant groundwater recharge areas	The intent of the policy is to encourage the use of low impact development. The policy recognizes feasibility in order to allow the local municipality to apply discretion in determining when and where the policy should be applied. The Significant Groundwater Recharge Area mapping is a tool to help identify the locations where the greatest benefits to the water resources system could be achieved.	Region's response is noted.	Gail
WR12	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Source Water Protection, Halton Hamilton Source Protection Plan, Section 2.7.49	Encourage the local municipalities to consider requiring a salt management plan to reduce the future use of salt as a condition of development in significant groundwater recharge areas in accordance with the applicable source protection plan.	The policy implications are concerning and, as such, the City requests clarification as these policies do not seem appropriate. Should this mapping be required in the OP, guidance on phasing for conformity would assist the City in navigating this requirement	The policy is an "encouragement" policy. Mississauga is not required to undertake an action if local staff determine that the existing Salt Management program is sufficient.	Region's response is noted.	Gail
WR13	Environmental Services, Transportation & Works, Mississauga	Schedule X5, Highly Vulnerable Aquifers	Glossary: highly vulnerable aquifer (HVA): an area underground that contains water that is being withdrawn for human use and is particularly susceptible to contamination because of its location near the ground's surface or where the overlying material in the ground above it is highly permeable.	Mississauga is late-water based and does not extract groundwater for human use. As such, further to the City's concern w.r.t. 2.6.6., the implications and policies connected with Schedule X5 are not felt to be applicable. It is understood that these areas may be susceptible to environmental contamination, however the wide-scale policy prohibitions remain concerning to the City.	Both the Region and the City are required to conform to source protection plans approved in accordance with the Clean Water Act, 2006 and to be consistent with policy direction in the FPS. The City is subject to the CTC Region Source Protection Plan and the Halton Hamilton Source Protection Plan and the policies of Section 2.2 of the FPS. In the CTC Source Protection Plan, Appendix B sets out the significant and moderate threat policies that affect decisions under the Planning Act and Condominium Act. Municipal official plans must be updated to "conform with" the significant threat policies in the applicable SPPs and "have regard for" low or moderate threat policies. The policies relating to Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRAs) and Highly Vulnerable Aquifers (HVAs) are not "significant threat policies" in the CTC Plan. However, land use policies for these areas are identified as "moderate threat policies". The Region's draft policy direction has had regard for the policy direction in the CTC Source Protection Plan and provides appropriate direction to the local municipalities. Areas of SGRAs and HVAs are mapped in Mississauga. A policy and mapping relating to the SGRAs and HVAs would be appropriate to include in the City's OP to demonstrate the "have regard for" conformity standard of the Clean Water Act. Additional information on conformity with source protection plans is provided in the "Protecting Water Resources: Source Protection Plan Implementation" discussion paper available on the Region's Peel 2031 project website and the CTC Source Protection Region website (https://ctcwp.ca).	Region's response is noted.	Gail
AG1	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	3.3.21 Urban Agriculture	Supporting Agriculture and Food System - General comment	Urban agriculture is being recognized as a growing opportunity to aid in mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change (e.g., storm water retention, flood resiliency, reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from transportation of food), but also provides food security and a greater sense of community, with positive health and wellbeing benefits. It also supports local rural farmers/growers and small commercial enterprises and enables a more sustainable distribution and production system to support employment.	Comment noted.	Region's response is noted.	Don
AG2	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	3.3.21 Urban Agriculture	Supporting Agriculture and Food System - General comment	Urban agriculture is well represented in the ROP in section 3.3.21 - Supporting Agriculture and Food System. Small suggestions: Propose to include some examples: 3.3.21.4 - To support and enhance urban agriculture opportunities (e.g. small gardens including on rooftops, vertical and tactical gardens and aquaponics) through the planning process.	The definition of urban agriculture in the Glossary provides examples. No change is recommended.	Region's response is noted.	Don
AG3	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	3.3.21.12 - Urban Agriculture	require that local planning initiatives such as secondary plans, district plans, neighbourhood plans and transportation and mobility plans, are designed and developed in a manner that facilitates access to affordable, healthy food and locally grown food within neighbourhoods and in adjacent neighbourhoods.	Change require to "encourage that local planning initiatives... consider..." - food considerations may be out of scope for many local planning initiatives	The policy encourages local municipalities to include such policies in their SPPs. It does not require it. No change is recommended.	Region's response is noted.	Don
AG4	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	3.3.21.7 Urban Agriculture	Supporting Agriculture and Food System -include reference to Peel Food Charter	Suggest in the policies section that reference should be made to the Peel Food Charter, a living document developed by the Peel Food Security Taskforce of the Peel Poverty Reduction Strategy Committee in 2017. Perhaps link it to the following 3.3.21.7 Encourage and support agricultural sector organizations, the local municipalities and other public agencies to advance the Peel Food Charter and engage and consult with the Peel Agricultural Advisory Working Group respecting major initiatives affecting the Agricultural System.	It is recommended that Policy 3.3.21.6 be modified as follows: add "and other stakeholders" after "agricultural organizations"; and add "and advance the Peel Food Charter" after "Agricultural System". The comment will be addressed in finalizing the proposed amendment. No change to the policy is recommended at this time.	Response noted, proposed later amendment addresses the City's comment.	Don
AG5	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	3.3.21.9 Urban Agriculture	Supporting Agriculture and Food System -include reference to local municipalities current or future strategies and plans	The City of Mississauga is currently developing a comprehensive Urban Agriculture Strategy. Perhaps in the objectives or policies it could be included that the ROP -Support programs, strategies and plan of local municipalities which encourages urban agriculture the efforts of local municipalities urban agriculture strategies and plan to enhance the regional network of urban food growers and growing activities" or link it to 3.3.21.9 Support programs, strategies and plan of the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, local municipalities and other organizations which encourage and assist farmers in developing and following conservation measures and sustainable farming practices that will protect and enhance the long-term productivity of agricultural lands and the health of the natural environment.	It is recommended that the Policy be amended as proposed by the City of Mississauga	Region's response is noted.	Don
GM1	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	4.3.7 - Existing Policy, Amendments Suggested	To provide the basis for the periodic review of the Region's Development Charges By-law and costs related to growth.	The added, "costs related to growth", is this in the context of Peel's integrated growth management strategy and improving the timing between infrastructure planning and collection of growth revenues?	Yes, planning and managing growth in the context of the Schedule 3 population and employment forecasts and the municipal allocation	Region's response is noted.	Duran
GM2	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	4.3.9 - Existing Policy, Suggested	Require an amendment to this Plan initiated by the Region for changes to the population, household and employment forecasts shown in Table 3.	Does this mean changes to Table 3 forecasts can be initiated by the Region through a Municipal Comprehensive Review and as a standalone amendment through Municipal Comprehensive Reviews? For example, can a development applicant request a change to Table 3 and then it be initiated by the Region?	Policy clarifies that changes to the municipal allocation as identified on Table 3 will be initiated by the Region through an amendment to the Plan.	The Region's response is noted, however the initial comment by City staff was whether this policy could mean a development applicant could request a change to Table 3 and have that change be initiated by the Region? Staff are wondering what is the threshold for Regionally-initiated amendment to change Table 3?	Duran
GM3	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	4.3.13 - New Policy	The population and employment forecasts will be utilized to support the review of development applications where infrastructure upgrades and capital investments are required.	What is the intent of this policy? Is the idea that should the proposed growth from an application be greater than what is forecasted for that site and necessitates infrastructure upgrades and capital investments, the forecasted growth would likely take precedence? Therefore likely resulting in the development application not being supported?	There are many considerations through the development review process. The allocation of growth should be one of the factors to support the development review process.	Region's response is noted.	Duran
GM4	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Table 3 - New Table	Population, Household and Employment Forecasts for Peel	Why is the 2041 Mississauga population 916,000? Last few draft forecast versions have kept the 2041 population figure at approximately 920,000	The Interim 2041 population will be updated based on the final allocation.	Region's response is noted.	Duran
GM5	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.4.17 - Existing Intensification Preamble	For the purpose of measuring intensification, the Growth Plan requires that by the year 2015 and for each year thereafter, a minimum of 40 per cent of all residential development occurring annually within the Region will be within the built-up area.	Is this supposed to reference year 2021, a minimum of 50 per cent of all residential development occurring annually, and delineated built up area? Connected to policy 5.4.17.12 of the ROP consolidation. Also reference: Growth Plan policy 2.2.2.1	The provincial minimum is 50% as noted in the preamble. 5.4.17.12 is the applicable policy for the Region	Region's response is noted.	Duran
GM6	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.4.17.11 - Existing Policy, Amendments Suggested	Accommodate intensification within Urban Growth Centres, intensification corridors, nodes and Major Transit Station Areas and any other appropriate areas within the built-up area.	Is this supposed to reference the delineated built up area?	Yes	Region's response is noted.	Duran
GM7	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.4.18.8 - Existing Policy, Amendments Suggested	Development within the Designated Greenfield Areas shall be designed to meet or exceed the following minimum densities: City of Mississauga - 28-67 residents and jobs combined per hectare.	Clarify how this Greenfield Area density was determined for Mississauga. ROPA 33 (Adopted March 12, 2020), which incorporated policies for Ninth Line area, amended the ROP to require Mississauga to achieve a density of 70 residents and jobs combined per hectare.	Additional intensification opportunities within the designated greenfield areas of Mississauga 2031-2051. The latest SGU forecast has 9,500 people and jobs by 2051 in Ninth Line.	Region's response is noted.	Duran
GM11	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.14.17.15 - Existing Policy, Amendments Suggested	Require the local municipalities to develop intensification strategies that demonstrate how the minimum intensification target prescribed in the Section 5.4.17.12 will be achieved within the Delineated Built Boundary.	What is the Region's expectation around these intensification strategies? Is this, for example, municipal strategy documents endorsed by Council and/or embedded throughout local Official Plan policies, etc.? Clarify how one local municipality can ensure a minimum percent target is achieved that applies to the entire Region.	Growth Plan policy 2.2.2.3 requires all municipalities to develop a strategy to achieve the minimum intensification rate. Draft policy should be linked to 5.4.17.13 in ROP consolidation. GP policy 2.2.2.3 also provides criteria that should be addressed.	The Region's response is noted. It is understood through this response that an intensification strategy isn't thought of as strictly a "strategy document", but can be a combination of documents, plans, planning policies and zoning, and infrastructure planning and investment, for example, to achieve the intensification target prescribed in policy 5.4.17.13 in ROP consolidation	Duran
GM12	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.8.12 - New Policy, Adjustments Made	To support the development, maintenance, and implementation of a coordinated employment strategy between the local municipalities and Region.	What is the Region's expectation of a coordinated employment strategy? Is this referencing Cushman & Wakefield's 2017 and then subsequent reports? Is this for example, municipal strategy documents endorsed by Council, embedded throughout local Official Plan policies, and/or economic development strategies with Regional coordination, etc.?	The Region supports a coordinated employment strategy to mitigate risks to meeting our employment forecasts. The Employment Strategy identified several recommendations that could be implemented by Regional and/or local municipalities, to support employment and responding to the risks that may impact the achievement of the employment forecast	The Region's response is noted. It is understood through this response that an employment strategy is not thought of as strictly a "strategy document", but can be a combination of documents, plans, and recommendations from the Employment Strategy, for example, to achieve the employment forecast.	Joy
GM13	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.6.19.2	Encourage a mix of transit-supportive uses, as defined by local municipalities, such as residential, retail, offices, open space, and public uses that supports the needs of employees and residents in a walkable environment	revise "... as defined by local municipalities" more appropriate to have local municipalities "identify" with land uses rather than define transit-supportive uses	Agreed	Recommend inserting "balanced" to suggest a more balanced mix of uses. "5.6.19.2 Encourage a balanced mix of transit-supportive uses..."	Joy

GM14	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.6.19.3	Support a diverse range of station typologies that accommodate increased densities and increased transit ridership.	This statement is confusing, as station typologies do not determine densities and ridership. It is the designations within an MTTSA. If that was the intention, this should be clarified.	The station typology as identified in the Region's work (primary/secondary) is linked to the ability to meet minimum provincial densities. Secondary station may not meet minimum densities but will have a commuter focus and look to increase transit ridership. We will continue to review based on comments from the Province and Brampton/Caledon	Suggest rewording from "Support a diverse range... to Recognize a diverse range... and add "...where appropriate" in the end to emphasize the current and short term context of the stations. Otherwise it is unclear how this policy would be implemented as currently worded.	Joy	
	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.6.19.8	Direct the local municipality to plan to achieve the minimum density target for each Primary and Secondary Major Transit Station Area as prescribed on Table 5. It is recognized that in some cases, the minimum density may be achieved beyond the planning horizon of this Plan.	As per Table 5, suggest reduction of the currently proposed density target increments to units of 5 or 10 (similar to other municipalities such as Toronto (units of 5), or Halton Region to units of 25).		no further comments		
GM15	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.6.19.10	Encourage the local municipalities to establish policies that support gentle intensification and improved multi-modal access and connectivity on lands within close proximity to transit stations and stops.	This can create interpretational issues, gentle intensification and "within close proximity" need to be more clearly defined. This policy can be used loosely to support higher densities outside MTSAs	Supporting intensification and more compact built forms is an objective of the Growth Plan. The policy encourages municipalities to support gentle intensification, which may also include additional residential units.	We still see the benefit in providing more clarity on what is defined as "in close proximity", and include in the wording the intent of gentle intensification (i.e. secondary units and multiplexes, and mid rise built form along corridors).	Joy	
GM16	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.6.19.9 or 5.6.19.13	Until such time as the local municipality has established Major Transit Station Area policies in accordance with Section 16(16) of the Planning Act, proposed developments within a Major Transit Station Area identified on Schedule Y1 shall be reviewed with consideration to the objectives of this Plan to ensure the proposed development:	Include a policy addressing employment conversions or a cross-reference to the appropriate policy in the employment section. The policy should be clear that employment conversions within PSEZ (within MTSAs) shall be municipally related.	Currently there is a policy cross reference to the special flexible policy which permits mixed uses in select MTSAs in employment areas; see policy 5.6.19.9 in the latest draft consolidation. This MTTSA policy and the employment policy 5.8.32 directs local municipalities to establish these land uses, not private developers. Employment conversion and flexible employment policies in the draft ROP all require an MCR or municipally-initiated study.	The current wording does not provide the cross reference noted. The current policy also references policies prior to the establishment of MTSAs but does not explain that once MTSAs are established, conversions would be municipally-led. We agree with the intent identified in the response but the wording is not reflective or clear. Suggest additional wording along the lines of "strategies to support and retain a balanced mix of employment and non-employment uses" either within this policy or as an additional policy.	Joy	
	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.6.19.13 (d)	Provides an appropriate mix of land uses with a balance of employment and non-employment uses and amenities that foster vibrant, transit supportive neighbourhoods;	Suggest highlighting or underlining "with a balance of employment and non-employment uses" to add additional emphasis on a mix of uses to avoid mass conversion requests.				
GM17	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.6.19.9.1	Policies that prohibit the establishment of land uses and built forms that would adversely impact the ability to meet the minimum density prescribed on Table 5;	Generally the City does not include prohibitive policies, but rather assumes that if the uses are not within the permitted uses it would not be accepted. Therefore, suggest wording such as "I) policies that only permit the establishment of land uses and built forms that do not adversely impact the ability to meet the minimum prescribed density".	Growth Plan policy 2.2.6.8 refers to uses being prohibited. The exclusion of uses not permitted does not clearly define prohibited uses and may allow for the consideration of uses that are not desired.	Region's response is noted.	Joy	
GM18	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.8.26 - Policies	Employment Areas are encouraged to be planned to achieve a minimum employment density of: - 26 jobs per hectare in Caledon - 30 jobs per hectare in Brampton - 45 jobs per hectare in Mississauga	Clarify how these employment density targets were developed. This is the first time City staff has seen an Employment Area density set and we've seen the technical work behind this yet	Employment targets are based on calculations using the SGI forecast allocation (i.e. Jobs within Employment Areas / Employment land area). The figures are subject to change based on finalizing the draft Employment Area mapping and allocation	Region's response is noted.	Joy	
GM19	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.8.28	Require the local municipalities to include policies in their official plans that prohibit the conversion of lands within Employment Areas to non-employment uses such as retail, commercial, residential, and other sensitive land uses in accordance with Section 5.8.30.	Subject to an MCR or until the next MCR process. Conversions can be permitted through the MCR process in GP. All that is needed is section 5.8.30 in ROP.	Staff will consider if this policy has added value or can be removed.	Region's response is noted.	Joy	
GM20	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.8.30	Permit the conversion of lands within Employment Areas identified on Schedule Y6, to non-employment uses, only through a municipal comprehensive review undertaken by the Region that demonstrates:	Include compatibility policy as per 2.2.5 (7) of the Growth Plan	Is this suggested Growth Plan policy reference supposed to be 2.2.5.7.c. or 2.2.5.8? Staff will consider depending on draft ROP policy 5.8.30 with growth plan reference or to further speak to the content of these growth plan policies.	Both 2.2.5.7 and 2.2.5.8 speak to compatibility of non employment in proximity to employment. The link to these Growth Plan policies will be helpful to reiterate land use compatibility considerations for any employment land conversion.	Joy	
GM21	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.8.31	Notwithstanding Section 5.8.30, the local municipalities may accommodate new retail and commercial uses in Employment Areas by designating lands Business Corridor in Brampton or Mixed-Use in Mississauga, subject to a municipally initiated study and local official plan policies to the satisfaction of the Region that demonstrate the following:	Do you mean "Business Employment"? Retail commercial uses are already permitted in Mixed Use designations. We believe that "Business Employment" was intended. Assuming this applies to all lands within PSEZs.	The intent was to keep additional retail and commercial uses limited to Mixed-Use lands (which are typically along transit or community nodes), and not introduce additional permissions to the business employment designation, which encompasses much larger areas. This is intended to apply to lands within PSEZs.	Region's response is noted.	Joy	
	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy 5.8.43	Monitor, in cooperation with the local municipalities, the supply of employment land on an annual basis to determine if the employment forecasts (an adequate supply of land exists to accommodate the forecasts in Table 5)	Awkward and unclear wording as it relates to "to determine if the employment forecasts if an adequate supply of land exists to...". Consider rewording.		wording still needs revision		
GM22	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Schedule Y6	Major Transit Station Areas Subject to a Flexible Employment Policy in the Regional Plan	It is unclear which policy is this referencing to. The policy number should be referenced to avoid ambiguity	Policy numbers were included in earlier versions but changed to a generic reference as the consolidation continues to have fluctuating policy numbers. A policy number will be added back on to the map at for a recommended ROPA package. Currently the flexible employment policy number is 5.8.32.	Region's response is noted.	Joy	
	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Table 5	MTSA Minimum Density	City staff finds the increments used for the alternative minimum density targets in the table (of 50 pop) to be too large. We suggest increments of 25 or 10 would be more appropriate given the context of each MTTSA and to set more reflective targets. Smaller increments than those suggested are already proposed by surrounding municipalities (i.e. Toronto)		comment resolved.		
GM8	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft policy Section 5.8.20.1	To stage and sequence the development within delineated secondary planning areas in accordance with the logical phasing of development in Designated Greenfield Areas.	City staff support the provision of staging and sequencing plans to manage growth. However, it seems the terms phasing, staging and sequencing were all used interchangeably. It is suggested that one term be consistently used throughout (e.g. phasing).	We have looked at this collectively across the draft policies and in-effect policies. Typically, we reference staging and sequencing when referring to the more detailed development processes. Typically, phasing is used for more higher-level strategic planning. We have gone in an edited some policies to reflect this structure.	Region's response is noted.	Kathryn	
GM9	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft Policy, Section 5.8.20.1.4.2	To stage and sequence Secondary Plans in accordance with the logical phasing of development in Designated Greenfield Areas.	City staff support the provision of staging and sequencing plans to manage growth. However, it seemed the terms phasing, staging and sequencing were all used interchangeably. It is suggested that one term be consistently used throughout (e.g. phasing).	We have looked at this collectively across the draft policies and in-effect policies. Typically, we reference staging and sequencing when referring to the more detailed development processes. Typically, phasing is used for more higher-level strategic planning. We have gone in an edited some policies to reflect this structure.	Region's response is noted.	Kathryn	
	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Draft policy, Section 5.8.20	Designated Greenfield Areas	City staff want to ensure that Mississauga's DGA lands (e.g. Ninth Line and parts of Churchill Meadows) can continue to develop as planned, and that no additional planning work is required. A distinction between Built DCA/Approved DCA and new DCA would ensure clarity.	We have looked at the Mississauga Official Plan and our policies. We do not see additional work being required for these lands as these lands have already taken these policies into consideration prior. If necessary, we can discuss further.	1. Further to the above under comment GM10. The following policies are from Mississauga Official Plan for the Designated Greenfield Area in the Churchill Meadows Neighbourhood. Based on the growth management work, are there amendments required to 16.4.1.17. Current Mississauga Official Plan Policies: 16.4.1 Designated Greenfield Area There are some lands in the Churchill Meadows Neighbourhood Area identified on Map 16-4.1 as a designated greenfield area pursuant to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. 16.4.1.1 The designated greenfield area will be planned to achieve a minimum density of 77 residents and jobs combined per hectare, excluding permitted environmental take-outs. 2. Schedule Z-1 shows the Ninth Line overlay in a colour different than the legend 3. Just wondered if it should be "road carrying capacity"? RE: ROP policy 5.10.34.2 To control access to Regional Roads through the planning and development process so as to: c) Optimize road carry capacity; and		Kathryn
GS1	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	2.14 Greenlands System	Figure Y3 is a conceptual depiction of a regional scale natural heritage system based on conservation authority studies. It 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.	There are no policies related to Figure Y3 yet it is intended for local municipalities to further interpret and identify. City Staff would need more clarity and guidance as to how Y3 relates to Y1 and Y2 and when should it be considered.	The policy direction regarding natural heritage system identification and protection is found in Section 2.14.35 generally and Section 2.14.35 a) specifically. The boundaries of the CAs NWS as shown on Figure Y3 are not designated in the Regional Plan and are not required to be designated in the City of Mississauga Official Plan. The interpretation of Figure Y3 is clearly outlined in the Preamble to Section 2.14 (last paragraph). Figure Y2 is a mapping depiction of the Regional Greenlands System Core Areas, Natural Areas and Corridors, and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors policy framework, focusing on natural heritage features that are required to be protected pursuant to the PPS and Regional OP. The mapping of features shown on Figure Y2 are also provided to assist the City in interpreting the policy framework but need to be further interpreted, verified and mapped by the City in accordance with the Regional OP policy framework. It is expected that the local municipalities will be reviewing their natural heritage system and features mapping policies for conformity/consistency with provincial and regional policy and introducing updates in their OPs accordingly.	Region's response is noted.	Leanne	

		2.14 New Policy, Adjustments Suggested	Reference to Figures Y1-Y3 on page 97	Further clarification is needed for the section where it references Figures Y1-Y3. What is the rationale for the Figures? The section should include a discussion of existing municipal NHSs and the overlap between those NHSs and the NHS displayed in the Figures.	Figures Y1, Y2 and Y3 are not formally part of the Regional Official Plan and are provided for informational purposes only to assist readers in understanding the policy direction in Section 2.14. The City of Mississauga's identification of its natural heritage system and features mapping may already be more refined and more accurately depict natural heritage features boundaries and a natural heritage system for the City. The implementation of the Region's policy framework will provide an opportunity for the City to review its policies and mapping to determine if the current policies and mapping in the City's OP sufficiently address policy direction to ensure alignment to provincial and regional policy. The identification and protection of Core Areas of the Greenlands System on Schedule Y1 is subject to more directive policy in the Regional Plan and should be recognized and implemented in the City's OP in accordance with the policy direction. The City currently has a policy in the City's OP for the Regional Core Areas that achieves minimum conformity. The City may consider adding a schedule or figure to depict the Core Areas mapping directly in the City's OP or incorporate the mapping into Mississauga's Green System Framework which would be consistent with both the Region's OP framework and the City's "Living Green" principles as outlined in the Mississauga OP. The Regional OP framework is sufficiently clear. Discussion of the existing municipal NHSs in the Regional OP is not recommended.	Region's response is noted.			
G52	Forestry, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga								
G53	Forestry, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	2.14.12.iv New Policy, Adjustments Suggested	Compensation for Core Areas	Compensation needs to be further defined, including what is expected from the compensation (e.g., net benefit/gain). Further clarification is needed to determine when compensation is appropriate and who determines this (particularly when conservation authorities are not involved). Compensation guidelines would be required for the entire region, consistent across each conservation authority. Compensation should be a last resort.	It is recommended that ecosystem compensation guidelines provide clarity on how compensation is defined and required when it is considered in accordance with provincial, regional and local official plan policy and the mitigation hierarchy principles. No changes are recommended.	Region's response is noted.			
G54	Forestry, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	2.14.13 New Policy, Adjustments Suggested	Damage to Core Areas	Further clarification of terms is required (e.g., natural causes, protected areas)	Regional staff do not recommend adding a definition of "natural causes". Protection is a generally well understood term in the Regional and local official plans. No changes are recommended.	Region's response is noted.			
G55	Forestry, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	2.14.14.c New Policy, Adjustments Suggested	Change in reference material for significant woodland and significant wildlife habitat.	Please clarify as to why the Peel-Caledon Significant Woodland and Significant Wildlife Habitat study is no longer referenced in this section. Why has the scope changed to MNR's ecoregion schedules?	The MNR's Criteria Schedules for Ecoregions BE and Significant Wildlife Habitat study is no longer referenced in this section. The Peel-Caledon Study remains as a relevant background study in cases where further interpretation and implementation of the MNR Criteria Schedules is required.	Region's response is noted.			
G56	Forestry, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	2.14.28 Existing Policy, Amendments Suggested	Exclusion for treed communities	Overall, items are re-defined in this section. Further consideration required into implications for small urban ravine systems that are dominated by invasive trees but also provide a functional/ecological benefit to the system.	The wording for Policy Section 2.14.28 was developed in accordance with the Peel-Caledon Significant Woodlands and Significant Wildlife Habitat Study with assistance from technical MNR and CA reviewers and a woodland ecologist retained by the Region. The policy wording was developed based on subject matter expert experience in implementing significant woodland policy in Ontario in order to address how woodland exclusions should be considered in accordance with woodland ecology science. The policy is sufficiently clear. No changes are recommended.	Region's response is noted.			
G57	Forestry, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	2.14.29 New Policy, Adjustments Suggested	Core areas that have undergone change	Further definition of "invasive species" is required. If it includes invasive plants, this policy is in contradiction to policy 2.14.28. If it is meant specifically for invasive pests, this should be identified.	The Regional OP is to be read in its entirety. Policy 2.14.29 would not preclude woodland exclusions from being considered in accordance with Policy 2.14.28. No changes are recommended.	Region's response is noted.			
G58	Forestry, Parks Forestry & Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	2.14.36 New Policy, Adjustments Suggested	Ecosystem compensation guidelines	Similar comments related to compensation in section 2.14.12	See response to comment #G53 above. No changes are recommended.	Region's response is noted.			
G59	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	2.14 Greenlands System		Note: The City of Mississauga will be sending further comments regarding the draft Greenlands Systems policy at a later date	Comment noted.	Region's responses provided clarifications to previous City's comments. No further comments on the Greenlands System policies.			
H0U1	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.23 - New Policy, Adjustments Made	Direct the local municipalities to include policies in local municipal official plans that permit additional residential units in new and existing residential development, redevelopment and intensification, including: a) minimum of two residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse, and b) the use of a residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse.	There are a few areas that require discussion and clarification regarding this draft policy and direction. (1) It appears this draft policy is addressing Section 16(3) of the Planning Act. If so, the additional level of detail to specify the type of development ("new and existing", "residential development", "redevelopment", and "intensification") is not apparent in Section 16(3) and does not seem necessary to ensure local municipalities are permitting additional residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse, which in itself is a form of infill development. (2) Why was the "minimum of" added? It implies the possibility of more than 2 residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse, and... and (3) It appears with this policy, local municipalities would need to permit additional residential units as-of-right through local Official Plan policy with no consideration for appropriateness and fit with the surrounding neighbourhood and context. Is this the case? We can see through draft policy 5.9.24 to, "encourage additional residential units in new and existing detached semi-detached or rowhouse development, where appropriate," context-supportive and fit considerations are being referenced. Would there be flexibility in how local municipal official plans implement this Regional direction to achieve the intent of enabling additional residential units in Mississauga?	Points 1 and 3 are being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council. Point 2 has been addressed through the correction of 5.9.23 a) to reflect language in Planning Act Section 16(3). Thank you for your comment.	It is noted that Point 2 will be addressed by correcting the proposed new policy 5.9.23 to reflect the language in Planning Act Section 16(3). The words "new and existing residential development" should also be removed as it is believed Section 16(3) is speaking to permitting additional residential units within existing dwellings. City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions, especially after the Region's review of points 1 and 3. The wording of this policy is essential to directing and supporting local implementation.			
H0U2	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.24 - New Policy, Adjustments Made	Encourage additional residential units in new and existing detached, semi-detached or rowhouse development, where appropriate.	What is it meant by "encourage"? Can the Region provide examples of this? Is it that the Region should be encouraging additional residential units throughout Peel Region in existing detached, semi-detached, and rowhouse development, where appropriate? And/or the Region would be encouraging local municipalities to permit additional residential units in existing detached, semi-detached, and rowhouse development, where appropriate?	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	The Region's response is noted. Staff are also left wondering how does the "encouragement" in this policy interact with the "direction" of policy 5.9.23? Moreover, the use of "new" and "existing" implies this would be permitted in "new" eligible dwellings from the start of development when it is the belief that Section 16(3) of the Planning Act is speaking to permitting additional residential units within existing dwellings. The previous policy's "direction" would be further strengthened if policy 5.9.24 could be revised along the lines of: "Support additional residential units in new and existing detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse development in Peel". City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions to improve local implementation.			
H0U3	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.26 - Existing Policy, Amendments Suggested	Work with the local municipalities to promote additional residential units through the development of educational materials.	What is the reason for including this policy? What are some examples of these educational materials? Does the Region view their role in additional residential units as facilitating education?	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	The Region's response is noted. Based on what our increasing Housing Choices in Neighbourhoods work has shown, local municipalities are better positioned to provide and disseminate educational materials, while looking to upper-tier municipalities for policy development, and program support on ARUs (e.g. second unit renovation program with forgivable loans and conversion of non-registered units to registered). For example, perhaps the policy could be broadened and revised along the lines of: "Work with local municipalities to develop initiatives that further the implementation of additional residential units and shared housing arrangements". This could also provide a nod to the Region's current Home Share pilot. City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions to improve local implementation.			

HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.42 - New Policy	Encourage the local municipalities to support shared housing arrangements which meet the needs of specific population groups, including economic, accessibility, safety or lifestyle needs.	What do we mean by "meet the needs of specific population groups" in this context?	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. In addition to the initial question posed by City staff, staff are wondering how does the "encouragement" in this policy interact with the "shall" direction from the Provincial Policy Statement policy 14.3.3 to provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options (defined as "... The term can also refer to a variety of housing arrangements and forms such as, but not limited to life lease housing, co-ownership housing, co-operative housing, community land trusts, land lease community homes, affordable housing, housing for people with special needs, and housing related to employment, institutional or educational uses. Something to consider that has come up since this initial circulation, is how the Region's Home Share pilot fits into the Region's encouragement and support for shared housing arrangements? The Region has an opportunity through this policy to further support local municipal implementation of shared housing arrangements. For example, perhaps the policy could be revised along the lines of, "Support the local municipalities to support the implementation of shared housing arrangements in Peel to provide more housing options to a variety of household types in Peel, where appropriate, which meet the needs of specific population groups, including economic, accessibility, safety or lifestyle needs." City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions to improve local implementation.	Paul
HOUS	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.15 - New Policy	Direct the local municipalities to include policies in their official plan to require that an affordable housing assessment be undertaken to evaluate how both local and Regional affordable housing policies are met and contributions towards the housing unit targets shown in Table 4 are being considered for large development applications.	What is considered a "large development application"? Is the size/unit threshold at the discretion of the local municipalities? Is/will there be a Regional terms of reference for the affordable housing assessment or will it be up to the local municipalities to scope and review the assessment? Needs to be distinction between an "affordable housing assessment" that the municipality is required to undertake through area planning vs. assessment that developer needs to undertake for site specific affordable housing assessments. Needs a different name. Please offer more clarification around intent of area planning housing assessments. How do we balance city-wide needs vs. local area needs? In some cases, should there be a balance? Consider existing initiatives at local level and criteria for site-specific housing submissions. https://www7.mississauga.ca/documents/Business/Housing_Report_Terms_of_Reference.pdf	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.68	Direct the local municipalities to prepare an affordable housing assessment in consultation with the Region in order to include policies in new or revised secondary plans, block plans and area specific neighbourhood plans to ensure a diverse mix of housing types and tenure, and the provision of affordable housing.	Related to comments on 5.9.15 - consider distinguishing names. Consider scale. Is it most appropriate to consider housing mix at the local scale only? For example, some character areas may have a significant rental stock, but the City on the whole is lacking rental stock. How will City-wide objectives be balanced with local area circumstances? Perhaps the local area assessment could fine tune what we already know through a city-wide assessment. What should the assessment report cover? Need a clear criteria.	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.44 c) - New Policy	work with local municipalities to establish a framework to ensure that the collection of any proceeds from the sale of units above the affordability threshold for moderate income households obtained through inclusionary zoning prior to the determined affordability period are returned to local or regional affordable housing initiatives.	Is a minimum affordability period being identified at the Regional level or is it at the discretion of local municipalities?	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	Table 4 - Targets		We need a very clear reporting and monitoring system so that we understand where gaps are and how we plan to fill them. We need a reporting inventory on city-wide annual units that fill these targets.	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.20	In collaboration with the local municipalities, consider available planning tools to support the inclusion of an appropriate proportion of 1, 2 and 3+ bedroom unit types in new multi-unit residential developments. The appropriate proportion of unit types shall align with housing need as identified through Regional and local municipal strategies, planning processes, needs assessments and market studies, and may vary over time.	What is the actual housing need for various unit sizes? Similar to discussion around UZ unit size proposed policy, could this policy refer to family-sized units instead?	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.30	Direct the local municipalities to establish a local municipal rental vacancy rate, or if data is not available, utilize the Regional rental vacancy rate of 3 per cent for the preceding 3 years as reported by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. This rate shall be used as a minimum threshold to permit the conversion of residential rental units to ownership/tenure or demolish residential rental units, unless replacement units are provided.	As previous staff comments have suggested, the requirement for a 3-4 average is not consistent with Mississauga's Rental Housing Protection Bylaw. Please amend to make policy more flexible.	The policy directs local municipalities to establish a local municipal rental vacancy rate (i.e. the City of Mississauga's Rental Housing Protection By-law). If data is not available, that is where the Regional rental vacancy rate of 3 per cent for the preceding 3 years as reported by CMHC would be used.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.31	Encourage the local municipalities to establish that, if the replacement of rental units is permitted under the local municipal criteria to regulate rental demolition and conversion, replacement rental units should include the same or higher number of units of comparable sizes, types and affordability, and tenant relocation and assistance should be considered.	Previous Mississauga staff comments that have not been addressed: Suggest adding language around "retention" in addition to "replacement". Retention is contemplated in Mississauga's regulations where conversion is proposed (i.e. conversion to condos may be permitted if the units are retained as rental units for a period of time). Mississauga's regulations do not contain a requirement for tenant relocation; the by-law and guidelines rely on the Residential Tenancies Act. More discussion on this aspect of the policy is required. The Region would need to play a role in assisting developers with finding suitable relocation for tenants. There is also a landlord education piece to this. Consider a policy that contemplates support for existing lower renewal through incentives. There may be precedents set in Toronto, Ottawa, and Hamilton in terms of an incentive policy for lower renewal.	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.35	Give priority to the development of affordable housing on surplus Regional municipal property while ensuring the goals, objectives, and priorities of this Plan and the area local municipal official plans are adhered to.	What is meant by "give priority to"?	This comment is being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of final policies to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.43	Direct the local municipalities to establish an official plan framework to implement inclusionary zoning through zoning by-laws in applicable Major Transit Station Areas and community planning permit system areas on or before the next local municipal official plan review that address the following: a) establish minimum unit thresholds for inclusionary zoning to apply and a percentage of the gross floor area to be provided as affordable housing considering the unique characteristics and objectives of the Major Transit Station Areas recognizing that the market conditions of some Major Transit Station Areas are stronger than others; b) phase in inclusionary zoning to endeavor to achieve a minimum of 10% of the gross floor area or an equivalent percentage of units to be provided as affordable housing where market conditions demonstrate viability, while considering other potential factors to increase land value such as higher height and density and existing or planned infrastructure without the need for additional financial incentives; c) ensure rental rates or sale prices of units provided through inclusionary zoning are no greater than what is affordable to moderate income households and consistent with measuring and monitoring undertaken for the Peel regional market area; d) establish 2 and 3+ bedroom units as the predominant units provided through inclusionary zoning; e) exempt or require reduced inclusionary zoning requirements for purpose built rental developments; f) prioritize affordable units provided through inclusionary zoning to be provided on-site; and g) consider transitioning and phasing when implementing inclusionary zoning when appropriate based on market and other local conditions.	If locals are being directed to introduce IZ, there must be support from the Region to administer IZ units. Clarify applicable PMSAs not MTSAs Please do not tie IZ to official plan review; this is not a conformity exercise. It is a discretionary policy. It is separate from the OP review. Specific Commentary a) ok - we have to do this anyway by the Planning Act. b) It may be problematic to set any percentages in the ROP, even if aspirational. Each MTA is different and unique. Also, what is meant by "Phase in" - this could be interpreted many ways. I believe phasing is already and better addressed in proposed policy (g). In this context here, phasing sounds like we want initially propose 10%, even though it is visible in the LRT corridor. c) ok. d) It may be problematic to assume that 3+ bedrooms are required. Does this reflect the housing need? What are household sizes like in these MTSAs already? Also, market analysis tested a suite mix that reflected market suite mix (can clarify with NLCB but the average unit size was a weighted average reflection of the suite mix I believe). e) Consider refining this policy to ensure rental market is not permitted, as opposed to outright suggesting that requirements for rental developments should be reduced/eliminated. f) ok, although onsite delivery may not make sense in some scenarios g) ok	The Plan's use of the term MTA infers that Planning Act regulations related to the application of inclusionary zoning in PMSAs will be adhered to. Inclusionary zoning is not tied to the official plan review but does require the Province's approval of the definition of MTSAs, which is part of the Official Plan review. Other comments are being reviewed and will be addressed at a later date prior to the submission of the final office consultation submitted to Regional Council.	This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable. The Region and local municipalities have been working together to refine the Inclusionary Zoning framework and the City would like to review any revised policies.	Paul
HOUE	City Planning Strategies, Planning & Building, Mississauga	5.9.44	In order to support local municipalities in establishing and implementing inclusionary zoning, the Region will: a) collaborate with local municipalities to monitor and report on affordable housing acquired through inclusionary zoning and update Market Assessments in accordance with Provincial requirements; b) collaborate with local municipalities, developers and non-profit organizations on administration to support long term affordability of units; and c) work with local municipalities to establish a framework to ensure that the collection of any proceeds from the sale of units above the affordability threshold for moderate income households obtained through inclusionary zoning prior to the determined affordability period are returned to local or regional affordable housing initiatives.	These policies demonstrate Regional commitment to collaboration.	Thank you. We look forward to continued collaboration with local municipalities.	Region's response is noted.	Paul

TS1	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.10 Page 265 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	a) Are safe, sustainable, accessible and equitable.	Is "accessible" a defined term?	Accessible is not a defined term.	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS2	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.10 Page 265 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	b) Facilitate the efficient movement of people and goods while reducing fatal and injury collisions.	Why is safety bundled with efficiency? Consider moving safety considerations to dedicated sub-policy.	Will be modified to add "while reducing fatal and injury collisions" to (b); however (a) notes safety as a primary concern	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS3	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.10 Page 265 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	b) Facilitate the efficient movement of people and goods while reducing fatal and injury collisions.	Following Peel Vision Zero Road Safety -- "No loss of life is acceptable due to a motor vehicle collision" consider replacing "reducing" with eliminating or another word with a similar "stronger" connotation.	Policy will be modified to add "while reducing fatal and injury collisions" to (b); however (a) notes safety as a primary concern	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS4	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.15 Page 266 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Work with provincial and federal agencies and ministries to identify and secure sustainable and , predictable funding to support the provision of transportation infrastructure and services for the movement of people and goods in the Region.	comma to be removed. Consider having final draft text copy-edited	Agreed	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS5	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.16 Page 266 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	c) Consider the separation of modes within corridors, where appropriate, to promote the safe mobility of all road users.	Only for safety? What about efficiency (for transit)?	Efficiency captured in preamble to policy	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS6	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.23 Page 267 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Work with Metrolinx, other Provincial agencies and ministries, local municipalities, and other regions and municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe to implement the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan and contribute to future updates of the Regional Transportation Plan.	Note that GGH Transportation Plan is referenced below, in policy 5.10.32.25 but not here.	Policy 5.10.23 will be modified to include reference to GGH plan	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS7	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.25 Page 267 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	c) collaboration on relevant transportation projects, forecasting and modeling to support transportation projects, and to support the development of performance measures.	We should take the opportunity to encourage transportation data to be updated and shared with local municipalities and Metrolinx.	Agreed, policy will be revised as follows: "Work with the Province and other levels of gov't to improve the standardization, collection and sharing of transportation data..."	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS8	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.21 Page 272 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	c) Support the achievement of complete communities to ensure the safety and needs of all users are appropriately accommodated.	Not sure if this completely addresses the need for a Complete Streets policy. It's not just safety and needs, but comfort as well.	The term "needs" is broad enough to cover off various aspects including comfort	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS9	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.29 Page 273 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Work with the local municipalities and all relevant agencies to achieve a balanced approach that reduces reliance on the automobile and increases use of transit and active transportation through a complete streets approach in design, refurbishment, or reconstruction of the planned or existing network.	Consider referencing this policy in policy 5.10.34.9	OP is intended to be read in its entirety	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS10	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.31 Page 274 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Work with the Province, local municipalities, and all relevant agencies to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity at and around existing and planned highway interchanges, designated truck routes, waterways, railways, major Regional Intersections, and grade separations, where feasible.	Why is "where feasible" required? Isn't that a given? Suggest removing.	"where feasible" accommodates where constraints exist	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS11	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.32 Page 274 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Support the implementation and protection of rapid transit corridors, as shown on Schedule Y4, as well as those additional higher order transit, or priority transit corridors proposed on Regional roads by the local municipalities or Provincial transit authorities. Any changes to rapid transit corridors shown on Schedule Y4 will require an amendment to this Plan.	What "Provincial transit authorities"? Metrolinx? If only Metrolinx, then perhaps say "Metrolinx"	Agreed, policy will be modified to read "local municipalities or the Province"	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS12	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.33 Page 274 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Support the provision of transit services to rural communities by the Province, local municipalities and/or privately run transit services where feasible and functional.	What does functional mean in this context? If not clear, suggest removing.	Agreed. Policy will be revised to remove word "functional"	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS13	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.35 Page 274 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	a) Rapid transit projects in Peel included in the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan and the Greater Golden Horseshoe Transportation Plan; and	GGH Trans. Plan included here, but not in Policy 5.10.23.	Agreed. Policy 5.10.23 will be revised accordingly	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS14	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.36 Page 275 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	b) provide two-way, all day commuter rail GO service on the Kitchener lines, between Union Station and Bramalea and further to Mount Pleasant GO Station;	Isn't this included in (a), above? (*a) provide two-way, all day commuter rail GO service on the Milton and Kitchener lines.")	Agreed, policy will be updated.	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS15	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.36 Page 275 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	c) Improve the frequency of service of the Lakeshore West, Kitchener and Milton commuter rail GO lines and in particular the provision of a minimum two-way, all-day, 15-minute service;	a, b, and c all seem to overlap or are similar. Can they just be one?	Agreed, policy will be updated	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS16	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.36 Page 275 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	e) provide increased inter-municipal/inter-regional express GO bus service in corridors where there is sufficient demand or demonstrated demand;	Can the Region of Peel provide this service? If not, consider rephrasing policy.	preamble reads "work with" therefore Region's role would be advocacy where appropriate	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS17	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.9.5.2.9 Page 276 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Work with Metrolinx and other levels of government to investigate the potential use of existing underused and abandoned rail lines for future passenger service.	This is removed because it's repetitive with 5.10.32.36 (d) and 5.10.32.77	addressed through 5.10.28	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS18	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.41 Page 276 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	a) The development of a network of mobility hubs (as identified in the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan) and other transportation hubs (as identified by the area municipalities and the Region);	Are mobility hubs no longer part of MX plans (and have been replaced by MTSAs)?	Reference to mobility hubs has been removed from the OP and replaced with transportation hubs and MTSAs as appropriate	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS19	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.32.44 Page 277 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Work with the local municipalities to plan for and protect Regional corridors and rights-of-way for transit as shown in Schedule Y4 to meet current and projected need, where justified and feasible.	Why use the term "justified" here?	Term "justified" is used to ensure higher order transit projects are supported by an accompanying TMAP process	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS20	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.34.9 Page 284 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Ensure that, where possible, adequate transportation capacity on Regional roads is based on a "Level of Service" Policy" adopted and periodically reviewed by Regional Council.	This needs to be balanced against the needs and safety requirements of other road users. Suggest reference policy 5.10.32.29 here.	OP is to be read in it's entirety which includes policies supporting safety such as policy 5.10.32.25. see 100	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS21	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.37.3 Page 289 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Work with GTA municipalities, the Province and stakeholders to minimize traffic congestion , air pollution and noise pollution from vehicles by encouraging and facilitating the increased use of sustainable modes of travel.	Why is this part of environmental section? Traffic congestion may lead to increased pollution but there may be context where it does not. Less traffic congestion does not always lead to fewer environmental impacts. Suggest removing.	Section 5.10 provides the policy framework for the Transportation System in Peel. Policies under subsection 5.10.37 Environmental Impact are specific to the transportation system and policy 5.10.37.3 is intended to promote the shift to sustainable modes from the vehicle which has a lesser environmental impact.	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS22	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 5.10.38.2 Page 296 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Support increased coordination of transportation services among Transp&E, local municipalities, community-based agencies and for hire companies to provide a collaborative, integrated and equitable transportation for persons with disabilities.	Don't need to mention this in the OP, but this is an opportunity to work with Uber and Lyft to provide accessible services.	Noted for future Regional transportation studies.	Region's response is noted.	Tina		
TS23	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 7.10.7 Page 343 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Require the gratuitous dedication of additional land, free and clear of all encumbrances, including environmental contamination, to the Region of additional land to provide buffer blocks and 0.3 metre reserves, 15 metre by 15 metre daylight corner triangles (or as otherwise required by the design), bus bays and additional traffic or bus lanes at intersections, at roadways grade separations, or where acceleration or deceleration or active transportation facilities lanes are required.	Very specific. Is this specifically required in an OP?	yes, specificity is required to meet ROW requirements	Region's response is noted.	Tina		

TS24	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 7, 10, 13 Page 343 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Within 245 metres (804 feet) of any intersection of a Regional Road intersection (on either side of the intersection, and starting at the centre line of the intersection), protect an additional 5.5 metres (18 feet) over that identified on Schedule Y3 for a single left turn configuration, right turn lanes, multi-use path or transit-related improvements. Intersection right-of-way requirements shall be confirmed by a Transportation Impact Assessment and/or functional design acceptable to the Region.	Very specific, is this sort of specificity required?	specificity is required to determine ROW requirements at intersections	Region's response is noted.				Tina
TS25	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 7, 10, 15 Page 344 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Protect additional rights-of-way where necessary to provide for turning lanes, multi-use path, or transit related improvements at the intersection of all designated rights-of-way. Accordingly, within 245 metres (804 feet) of an intersection (on either side of the intersection and starting at the center line of the intersection) the rights-of-way may be up to a total 13.5 metres (44.3 feet) wider than the designated Regional road rights-of-way as shown on Schedule Y3.	Very specific, is this sort of specificity required?	specificity is required to determine ROW requirements at intersections	Region's response is noted.				Tina
TS26	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 7, 10, 16 Page 344 Draft Tracked Changes as of June 23 2021	Recognize Industrial Connectors identified through the Regional Road Characterization Study as being of strategic importance to the movement of goods in and around Peel Region and restrict access to and from these corridors accordingly.	What sort of access will be restricted? Vehicular, or also cycling and pedestrian access?	reference to industrial connectors and movement of goods speaks to vehicular access, which is restricted through the controlled access bylaw	Region's response is noted.				Tina
		Schedule Y4	Peason Transit Hub	Airport Transit Hub should be included in this Schedule as well. It was included in Schedules Z1 and Y0	Agreed. Schedule Y4 will be updated accordingly.	Region's response is noted.				Tina
TS27	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Schedule Y4	Rapid Transit Corridors (Long Term Concept)	Consider removing the distinction in the schedule between GO Transit Rail lines based on frequency, just have one dark green line to represent two-way all day service (Lakeshore, Kitchener, and Milton). The draft Rapid Transit Corridors Schedule Y4 is showing Lakeshore Rd as an LRT and not a BRT. Also, the Lakeshore West GO line as not including 15min service (which it is planned to have), while the Milton GO line is showing 15min service when that is only planned for rush hour and not all day.	Frequency speaks to Council endorsed advocacy position. LRT is shown along Lakeshore as Schedule Y4 is a long term concept and is based on the Metrolinx 2041 RTP. Map does not depict what is planned, rather what Peel's advocacy positions are. Lakeshore GO rail line will be updated to show 15 min service.	Region's response is noted.				Tina
TS28	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Schedule Y8	Existing and long-term cycling network	Could you clarify what this map represents? It seems that the full network is not depicted, this only seems to show separated trails, rather than network itself and doesn't show anything along Hurontario LRT corridor	Schedule will be reviewed	Region's response is noted.				Tina
TS29	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, Mississauga	Schedule Y9	Existing and long-term pedestrian network	Could you clarify what this map represents? It seems that the full network is not depicted, this only seems to show separated trails, rather than network itself and doesn't show anything along Hurontario LRT corridor	Schedule will be reviewed	Region's response is noted.				Tina
CH1	Heritage Planning and Indigenous Relations, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 3.6	The discussion portion mentions 'various Indigenous' communities. (paragraph 1)	The specific Indigenous communities who hold Treaty or Traditional Territory within the Region of Peel should be mentioned individually. Some communities, such as the Haudenosaunee, specifically reject the use of the term Indigenous.	While we understand the Haudenosaunee may not recognize the term Aboriginal or Indigenous, our research suggests Indigenous communities is the most inclusive manner to broadly speak to Inuit, Metis and First Nation communities. Further, it is being used in alignment with the PPS and GP.	Region's response is noted.				Vipal
CH2	Heritage Planning and Indigenous Relations, Mississauga	Draft Policy Section 3.6	Archaeological resources in treaty territory (Paragraph 2)	Policy should include traditional territory as well as treaty territory. Landmark judicial decisions such as Vs. Hiawatha or the Ipperwash Inquiry lay out rights for engagement in traditional territory.	Noted, change will be made in future.	Region's response is noted.				Vipal
CH3	Heritage Planning and Indigenous Relations, Mississauga	Draft policy, 3.6.7	Ministry Standards	Proper title of the document is the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. Archaeological assessments are a process set forth under those standards.	Noted, change will be made in future.	Region's response is noted.				Vipal
CH4	Heritage Planning and Indigenous Relations, Mississauga	Draft policy 7.4.10	draft policy, discussion section, legislated requirements for engagement	Provincial requirements for delegated Duty to Consult are set out in the Environmental Assessment Act. Neither the Planning Act nor the Ontario Heritage Act legislative engagement or Duty to Consult. Provincial policy (PPS) and regulation under both acts does require engagement. Furthermore, the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act and Cemeteries Act both require engagement and should be included.	Requirement to be specific on legislation may not be necessary in this context.	Region's response is noted.				Vipal
CH5	Environment, Community Services, Mississauga	1.2 Geographic Scope				Treaty No. 14, 1800 description does not match the description provided in the legend in the image on page 13.				

From: Christian Binette <Christian.Binette@mississauga.ca>

Sent: March 4, 2022 2:41 PM

To: Simms, Joy <joy.simms@peelregion.ca>

Cc: Osojnicky, Ivana <ivana.osojnicki@peelregion.ca>; Katherine Morton <Katherine.Morton@mississauga.ca>; Buonpensiero, Tara <tara.buonpensiero@peelregion.ca>; Lewkowicz, Paul <paul.lewkowicz@peelregion.ca>; Eniber Cabrera <Eniber.Cabrera@mississauga.ca>

Subject: RE: FYI - Draft Peel 2051 New Regional Official Plan Consolidation

Hi Joy,

Please see attached City staff comments on the Regional Official Plan consolidation dated March 1, 2022.

Our housing team is reaching out to Regional housing staff to discuss the housing policies in greater detail. We have a few questions and comments that could benefit from a discussion. In the meantime, I have included our housing staff's preliminary comments to the attached spreadsheet.

Happy to discuss if you have any questions regarding our comments.

Thank you and have a great weekend!

Christian

Comment #	Local Staff & Division	Policies in Question	Draft Policy	Mississauga Staff Comments March 2022	Proposed Policy Changes
CC1	Environment, Community Services	2.12.12.3.2	Work with the Town of Caledon as well as other agricultural organizations to support and enhance the Agricultural System through the development and implementation of agri-food strategies, food systems planning and other approaches.	- The City of Mississauga has a role to play in supporting and enhancing the Agricultural System.	- Add "other local municipalities" as follows: Work with the Town of Caledon as well as other local municipalities and other agricultural organizations...
CC2	Environment, Community Services	3.7.7 and 5.6.20.13	3.7.7: Support energy conservation and efficiency and low carbon energy alternatives in buildings and planned development through... and through the development of alternative and renewable energy systems... 5.6.20.13: Ensure that community block plans for new neighbourhoods and communities are developed in a manner that will address the principles of sustainability such as... planning for alternative and renewable energy systems, including district energy , and respecting natural and cultural heritage...	- There is an opportunity to strengthen the two policies with reference to low carbon alternatives in the design of district energy.	- Add the words "low carbon" before district energy (bolded).
GM1	City Planning Strategies, Planning and Building	5.4.18.15	Direct the local municipalities to develop intensification strategies that demonstrate how the minimum intensification target prescribed in Section 5.4.17.13 will be achieved within the Delineated Built Boundary.	- Why was the direction changed from "require" to "direct"? Is this tied to the Province's comments?	N/A
MTSA1	City Planning Strategies, Planning and Building	5.6.19.15	Direct the local municipalities to establish policies in their official plans that identify Planned Major Transit Station Areas and protect them for transit supportive densities, uses, and active transportation connections.	- City staff are concerned that the second half of the policy could imply encouragement (and tacit approval) of higher densities for non-protected MTSAs prior to detailed study and review to delineate boundaries and set appropriate density targets.	- Consider eliminating the portion of the policy referencing protection of transit-supportive densities and uses, and retain protection for active transportation connections.
MTSA2	City Planning Strategies, Planning and Building	5.6.19.13	Require the local municipalities to establish policies that support gentle intensification and improved multi-modal access and connectivity on lands within delineated major transit station areas that have limited redevelopment potential close proximity to transit stations and stops.	- Gentle intensification is not well defined and should be replaced by the words "modest growth" to avoid confusion and misinterpretation.	- Replace the words "gentle intensification" with "modest growth". - Alternatively, the Region could provide examples of gentle intensification built forms.
HOU1	City Planning Strategies, Planning and Building	5.9.11	Require a housing assessment for planning applications of approximately 50 units or more. Local municipalities or the Region can require a housing assessment for applications less than 50 units, as deemed appropriate. The housing assessment will demonstrate conformity with local and Regional housing objectives and policies and demonstrate contributions towards Peel-wide new housing unit targets shown in Table 4. The housing assessment, while being required by local municipal official plan policies, shall be undertaken by a development applicant as directed.	- City staff recommend more general language on the requirement for a housing assessment to allow for flexibility and changes based on continual evaluation of performance. The criteria for requiring a housing assessment are best dealt with through a local municipal terms of reference document. - City staff are concerned that there may be operational challenges if the assessment outcomes must demonstrate conformity with all Regional policies. For example, based on the definition will a housing assessment be required where an IZ by-law is in effect? - The housing assessment definition requires local municipalities to ensure that the housing assessment conforms to and is consistent with regional policies and definitions. - What is the expectation around Peel-wide housing targets being satisfied on a specific site? At what point would we refuse a development application on the basis of what is stated in a housing assessment?	- Remove numeric threshold requirement at the beginning of the policy. - Re-consider the level of conformity and consistency for meeting Regional housing targets in an individual application to enable flexibility where the outcomes of a housing assessment are aligned with the Regional objectives (but may not necessarily meet housing targets specifically).
HOU2	City Planning Strategies, Planning and Building	5.9.25	Collaborate with the local municipalities and other stakeholders to advocate to the Federal and Provincial governments to revise current policies and regulatory frameworks to address existing barriers to creating and financing innovative and alternative housing types and arrangements.	- Region held meetings and workshops with local municipalities where this policy was developed. - Suggestion was made to reference "housing options" to better align with the Region and PPS definition.	- Replace the words "housing types and arrangements" with "housing options".
HOU3	City Planning Strategies, Planning and Building	5.9.37	Encourage the local municipalities to explicitly permit, through official plan policies and zoning by-laws, special needs and supportive housing, shared housing arrangements, shelter/emergency housing, and innovative and alternative housing types and arrangements in residential or other suitably zoned lands where appropriate.	- City staff are unsure how to explicitly permit shared housing arrangements such as co-ownership, co-housing, and co-living in zoning especially. When we say "explicitly", does that look like: (1) naming these housing arrangements specifically in the Zoning By-law and permitting them (which is unnecessary in Mississauga's case) or (2) enabling the built form conditions (e.g. appropriate max heights) that can support them? - City staff are considering acknowledging the potential of these shared housing arrangements to improve housing options for Mississauga through the ongoing Mississauga Official Plan review.	- Replace the word "explicitly permit" to "enable" in the wording of the policy.
HOU4	City Planning Strategies, Planning and Building	N/A	<i>Previous large site housing policy appears to have been deleted.</i>	- City staff are supportive of general policy language stating the importance of having a range of housing based on income levels as a principle of good planning in larger developments outside of MTSAs similar to what was approved for Reimagining the Mall.	- Consider including general policy language for the building of housing tailored to range of income levels for larger developments outside of MTSAs. - City staff to meet with Regional housing staff to discuss further.