

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

Note: This table includes the public comments received by the Region of Peel prior to statutory consultation where responses were not previously provided, and comments received during the statutory consultation period from October 6, 2021 to December 31, 2021. The numbering of policies, schedules, and figures of the Regional Official Plan may be changing with updated versions of the new Official Plan. The numbering in this comment response table generally refers to the [October 1st consolidation of the draft Regional Official Plan](#). Bolded text located in the Response Summary column refers to 2022 Public Comment Response Tables comment ID's where the comment has since been addressed.

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
Public				
OP-17-001	September 17, 2017	Malone Given Parsons	Proposed employment conversion for a mixed use residential, office, and commercial development of the subject lands located north of Queen Street (Regional Road No. 107) and west of Regional Road No. 50 in Brampton. See OP-19-030.	The site on Queen Street west of Highway 50 has been recorded as employment conversion request B10. See Response to OP-19-030.
OP-18-011	June 8, 2018	Nancy Frieday Wellings Planning Consultants Inc.	Request for meeting to discuss potential for an employment conversion for 9381 and 9393 McLaughlin Road North.	The site at 9381 and 9393 McLaughlin Road N has been recorded as employment conversion request B9. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information refer to the updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-18-012	July 27, 2018	Orest Stoyanovskyy	Informed by City of Mississauga Planning Staff to inquire about the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review in relation to the proposed development of 2120 Dundas Street East.	The site at 2120 Dundas Street E has been recorded as employment conversion request M13. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-18-013	July 27, 2018	Brian Champ Bridging Finance Inc.	Provided comments with respect to the Regional Official Plan Review Growth Plan conformity exercise in respect to 3420 Queen Street East in the City of Brampton. Proposed density and land use mix increase along Queen Street East, based on proximity to transit services.	The site at 3420 Queen St E has been recorded as employment conversion request B13. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-18-015	October 30, 2018	Mark Bradley Associate, GSAI	GSAI represents two properties in the Dundas Connects study area at Dundas Street and Mattawa Avenue. Inquired if the Region may provide a more detailed updated on the status of the approval of the MCR as GSAI staff are actively working on considering additional non-employment uses on these properties with City Staff in an effort to advance development proposals for them.	The site Dundas Street East and Mattawa Avenue has been recorded as employment conversion request M14. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-18-016	October 10, 2018	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	The subject lands located at 1000 Steeles Avenue are designated Employment (Business Corridor) in the City of Brampton Official Plan and zoned Industrial. Warehousing uses currently exist on the site. The applicants are looking to redevelop the subject lands into an entertainment complex, requiring an employment conversion.	The site at 1000 Steeles Ave has been recorded as employment conversion request B11. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process. For more information refer to the updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-18-017	November 12, 2018	Mark Bradley Associate, GSAI	Requested further information on the MCR process for reviewing this site on Stanfield Road, south of Dundas St E, similarly to conversion requests at Great Punjab Centre in Malton and employment lands in the Lakeview area.	The site south of Dundas Street East on Stanfield Road has been recorded as employment conversion request M15. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-19-028	April 25, 2019	Mustafa Ghassan Senior Project Manager Delta Urban Inc.	Notification of upcoming Employment Conversion Application for 10 Victoria Crescent, 376 Orenda Road, 387 & 391 Orenda Road, and 26 Victoria Crescent in the City of Brampton to allow for mixed residential uses.	As part of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review, these and other lands owned by Lark Investments are being reviewed as employment conversion requests B15, B16, B17, B18, B19, B34, and B37. See Response to comment STAT-21-057.
OP-21-029	July 15, 2019	John Lohmus President, Plan Logic Consulting Inc.	Request for notice of all future meetings regarding the Regional Official Plan Review in which designation of employment lands is discussed. Support for the Region's recommendation to remove 1000 Dundas Street East from the PSEZs.	1000 Dundas Street E has been recorded as employment conversion request M17. Regional staff continue to recommend employment conversion M2 (which encompasses this site M17) for the identified area of the Dundas Connects Master Plan to be removed from the Regional Employment Area. Local land use designations continue to apply and any development proposals on the site will require the standard development application review processes (such as official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments).

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-19-030	December 13, 2019	Gaetano Franco Castlepoint Investments Inc.	Request to consider integrating a proposed concept plan for Part of Lots 4 and 5, Concession 10 N.D. on the northwest corner of Queen Street and Highway 50 into the Regional Official Plan update. The proposed concept permits the residential, commercial, and office mixed-use development of the site. See OP-17-001.	<p>The site on Queen Street west of Highway 50 has been recorded as employment conversion request B10.</p> <p>An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
OP-19-031	December 2, 2019	Marcus Lou 2644083 Ontario Limited	18 Corporation Drive is currently zoned Industrial by the City of Brampton. The applicant proposes to amend Brampton's Official Plan and Zoning By-law to allow an extended range of commercial uses on the property based on the Service Commercial category under the current Official Plan, Secondary plan, and Zoning By-law.	<p>The site at 18 Corporation has been recorded as employment conversion request B14.</p> <p>An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
OP-19-032	January 11, 2019	Michael William Biljetina Architect & Associate, ATA Architects Inc.	Represents the owners of 1699 and 1701 Dundas Street East, where the Coptic Orthodox Church is located. It is proposed that an eight-storey seniors' residence with commercial uses on the ground floor be developed, while retaining the existing place of religious assembly. Request for conversion forwarded by City of Mississauga staff.	<p>This site at 1699 and 1701 Dundas Street E has been recorded as employment conversion request M22. Regional staff continue to recommend employment conversion M2 (which encompasses this site M22), for the identified area of the Dundas Connects Master Plan to be removed from the Regional Employment Area. Local land use designations continue to apply and any development proposals on the site will require the standard development application review processes (such as official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments).</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage:</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-20-117	December 3, 2020	Ralph Grittani Principal, RG Consulting Inc.	Request to consider permitting a place of worship and private school within a designated employment zone on the property north of Countryside Drive, west of Coleraine Drive in the City of Brampton. See OP-21-238.	The site has been recorded as employment conversion request B24. See response to comment OP-21-238.
OP-20-120	December 22, 2020	David Sajecki Sajecki Planning	The subject property of 5170 Dixie Road is currently designated as Mixed Use in Schedule 10 of the Mississauga Official Plan. The proposal is for a mixed-use development with residential and commercial land uses. Sajecki Planning seeks to be included in all discussions regarding the potential conversion of lands from employment to mixed-use through a Municipal Comprehensive Review.	5170 Dixie Road has been recorded as employment conversion request M23. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-20-121	December 9, 2020	Mustafa Ghassan Senior Project Manager Delta Urban Inc.	<u>Written Submission for the January 14, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Represents Lark Investments Inc. with respect to 10 Victoria Crescent, 376 Orenda Road, 387 Orenda Road, 391 Orenda Road and 26 Victoria Crescent in the City of Brampton. Provided justification as to why the subject lands should be re-designated to support residential/mixed uses, while the Region currently proposes that the lands be designated Employment. Provided comments on the Region's Official Plan Review materials.	As part of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review, these and other lands owned by Lark Investments are being reviewed as employment conversion requests B15, B16, B17, B18, B19, B34, and B37. See response to comment STAT-21-057.
OP-21-008	February 5, 2021	Jim Levac Partner, GSAI	Employment land conversion request for the 150 Bovaird Drive West and 10064 Hurontario Street properties in the City of Brampton to accommodate future mixed-use redevelopment. The current and potential transit infrastructure serving the two subject properties make this potential intersection node of Hurontario Street and Bovaird Drive worthy of MTSA status.	The sites 150 Bovaird Drive West and 10064 Hurontario Street have been recorded as employment conversion request B22 and B23, respectively. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-21-015	February 22, 2021	Nick Dell Harper Dell & Associates Inc.	Request for an employment conversion for the property 11 Perdue Court from the current employment designation to residential for a retirement residence to accommodate the aging population.	The site at 11 Perdue Court has been recorded as employment conversion request C2. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				management.asp .
OP-21-023	March 25, 2021	Maurizio Rogato Principal, Blackthorn Development Corp.	Proposed the development of high density condominiums on the subject lands located at 2250, 2280, and 2300 Queen Street East. Has had preliminary discussions with City of Brampton staff regarding the possibility of introducing mixed use development to the area. The lands are in proximity to a proposed MTSA but are also within a PSEZ.	<p>The sites 2250, 2280, and 2300 Queen Street East at Torbram Road have been recorded as employment conversion request B29.</p> <p>An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
OP-21-077	June 14, 2021	Constance Ratelle Korsiak Urban Planning	Proposed development of 8383 Mississauga Road, including one 11-storey mixed-use building providing 131 residential units, 896 square metres of ground floor-retail and service commercial uses, and 760 square metres of second-floor office space. The applicant seeks to rezone the property to a site-specific Residential Apartment (R4B-AAAA) zone to permit this development.	<p>The site at 8383 Mississauga Road has been recorded as employment conversion request B30.</p> <p>An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
OP-21-201	July 15, 2021	Brandon Evangelista Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	<p>The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents and increase the supply of affordable housing and the potential for inclusionary zoning to support this objective.</p> <p>The Region has led feasibility analysis of inclusionary zoning in Protected Major Transit Station Areas, which is where Provincial regulations permit this policy to be used. Feasibility analysis identified opportunities for inclusionary zoning and suggested that if inclusionary zoning is required at rates higher than what is feasible, development will likely not occur which will further limit the supply of available housing. Inclusionary zoning is one tool available to contribute to affordable housing.</p> <p>There is no mechanism available to require affordable housing in every development, but local and Regional municipal staff continue to request contributions to the Regional affordable housing targets through developments.</p> <p>Draft policy directions encourage the development of more affordable rental and ownership housing units while not preventing new units, particularly</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				purpose built rental, from being built. Draft policies propose to set a minimum size or percentage and targets for affordable housing in new developments where inclusionary zoning applies, with consideration to the unique characteristics of the area. These policies prioritize on-site affordable housing units and establish larger size (2+ bedroom) units as the predominant affordable units provided through inclusionary zoning.
OP-21-202	July 15, 2021	Anabelle Gravelijn Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-203	July 16, 2021 August 8, 2021 September 13, 2021	Lenore Black Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-207	July 23, 2021	Rohini Patel Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city.</p>	
OP-21-208	July 23, 2021	Silvia Farias Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-209	July 23, 2021	Cheryl Craig Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-210	July 23, 2021	Andrea Hodgson Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city.	
OP-21-211	July 23, 2021	Ferdinant Avdyllari Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-212	July 23, 2021	Hariharan Somaskantha-Sarm Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-213	July 23, 2021	Crystal McLeggon Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
OP-21-214	July 24, 2021	Robert Luis Balansche Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-215	July 24, 2021	Lisa Bailey Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-216	July 24, 2021	Gerene O'Riley Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-217	July 24, 2021	Giovanni Rico Peel's ACORN Inclusionary	The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Zoning Campaign	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	
OP-21-218	July 26, 2021	Rosemary Keenan Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-219	July 27, 2021	Taramattie Rambharose Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-220	July 27, 2021	Florette King Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>developments set aside as affordable rental housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	
OP-21-221	July 27, 2021	Mary Barnes Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-222	July 27, 2021 and August 19, 2021	Bette-Ann Goldstein Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-223	July 28, 2021	Rod Woolridge Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	
OP-21-224	July 28, 2021	Tima Imsirovic Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-225	July 28, 2021	Tisa Muhammed Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-226	July 28, 2021	Astrid Hardjana-Large Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>housing</p> <p>5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city.</p>	
OP-21-227	July 31, 2021	Bisi Banu Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <p>1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing.</p> <p>2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever.</p> <p>3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more.</p> <p>4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing</p> <p>5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city.</p>	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-228	August 1, 2021	Daniela Mergarten Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <p>1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing.</p> <p>2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever.</p> <p>3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more.</p> <p>4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing</p> <p>5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city.</p>	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-229	August 3, 2021	VarahPrashad Reddie Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <p>1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing.</p> <p>2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever.</p> <p>3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more.</p> <p>4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing</p> <p>5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning</p>	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city.</p>	
OP-21-230	August 3, 2021	Olivier Spencer Peel's ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-233	July 23, 2021	Michael Testaguzza The Biglieri Group Ltd.	TBG has reviewed the Hemson documents and concurs that the "most appropriate location for development in Caledon is as intensification and in SABE areas around Bolton and Mayfield West", including the subject site of 4810 Mayfield Road, Caledon. TBG would like to be updated with respect to the Region's MCR and Official Plan Review. SABE ID #72	Noted and added to the project email notification list. This site has been recorded as SABE request #72.
OP-21-238	August 3, 2021	Michael Cara Overland LLP	<p>Gobind Marg Charitable Trust is a faith-based organization that has purchased the property of 0 Countryside Line and intends to seek an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law amendment, and Site Plan Appeal to develop a school and place of worship on the property. Provided planning justification for this proposal. See OP-20-117.</p> <p>Enclosed an evaluation of the proposal prepared by urbanMetrics and a planning justification report prepared by RG Consulting Inc.</p>	<p>The site has been recorded as employment conversion request B24.</p> <p>An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p> <p>Outside of the Peel 2051 MCR process, on January 28, 2022 the Province filed a Minister's Zoning Order through Ontario Regulation 38/22 which permits a mix of institutional, open space, and industrial land uses.</p>
OP-21-240	August 23, 2021	Tom Dolson Peel Federation of Agriculture	<p>There is concern among the landowners who live around the Etobicoke Creek Headwaters Wetland Complex that recent mapping of the wetlands and woodland features in this watershed are flawed and have not been updated.</p> <p>An environmental consultant was retained by the Peel Federation of Agriculture (PFA) to evaluate the lands in question. The fieldwork for this evaluation was completed in July 2021 and the PFA are currently in the process of formal submissions. The PFA realizes the time-sensitive nature of the submissions as the Region of Peel approaches</p>	<p>The mapping of evaluated provincially significant wetlands are included in the identification of Core Areas of the Greenlands System on draft Schedule Y1 based on wetland evaluations approved and provided by the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (MNDMNR). Wetland evaluations are open files and may be reviewed and updated by MNDMNR when new information is provided. There are no timelines associated with wetland evaluation updates, as periodic updates undertaken by MNDMNR depend on the size and scope of the changes.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			completion of its 2051 Official Plan Update. The PFA is requesting a conference call with Peel staff at their earliest convenience.	The draft policies in the Peel 2051 Office Consolidation include an interpretation clause in Section 7.3 Interpretation (specifically section 7.3.4) which confirms that minor amendments to the Core Areas of the Greenlands System or Water Resources System to adjust the boundaries of features shown on the Regional Official Plan schedules do not require an amendment to the Regional Official Plan. Any update of the Etobicoke Creek Headwaters Wetland Complex mapping approved by MNDMNR would be recognized in accordance with this policy. Similarly, any boundary refinement to woodland mapping in the Regional Official Plan Schedule that is made based on field studies and approved in accordance with the policies of the Regional Plan would not require an amendment to the Plan.
OP-21-243	August 31, 2021	Julie Scott Crozier Consulting Engineers	Requested confirmation that the infrastructure proposed in the Water and Wastewater Master Plan (2020) by GM BluePlan Engineering will continue to move ahead as scheduled.	Staff responded to this correspondence advising that the Water and Waste Water Master Plan is an important guiding document when undertaking Capital Planning in the Region, but another important consideration is the best available information on the anticipated timing of development to ensure infrastructure delivery decisions that are strategic from a financial perspective. In addition, the 2020 Water and Wastewater Master Plan horizon is to 2041 and will need to be updated to reflect the 2051 horizon once the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review is complete and the settlement expansion lands are finalized.
OP-21-244	August 27, 2021	Maurizio Rogato Blackthorn Development Corporation	Employment conversion request #B33 to convert 5923 Mayfield Road to permit a mix of commercial/retail, office, and residential uses. Provided proposed Site Plan and Tertiary Plan.	The site at 5923 Mayfield Rd has been recorded as employment conversion request B33. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-21-245	August 25, 2021	Kevin Nunn GSAI	Submitted a letter in response to the Region of Peel's Land Needs Assessment Report and Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis and an update letter from the Region. Provided an opinion that the Orion Gate property should be given further consideration to permit residential uses and a range of other uses in the preliminary concept. Encouraged the Region and local municipalities to consider sharing the responsibility of evaluating employment conversion requests. Related to previous comments on employment conversion #B21: OP-21-237.	The sites on Steeles Ave between Kennedy Rd and the Highway 410 have been recorded as employment conversion request B21. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing nonemployment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage:

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focusareas/growth-management.asp .
OP-21-246	September 15, 2021	Peggy Hammett Peel ACORN's Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	Please see response to comment OP-21-201.
OP-21-247	September 13, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL	<p>Submitted a letter of support for the Region's westward settlement expansion of Bolton to include their clients' lands, the concession block bound by Healey Road to the north, The Gore Road to the east, Mayfield Road to the south and Centreville Creek Road to the west.</p> <p>The letter states that Wildfield Village represents a logical first phase of expansion for Bolton and an orderly extension of the Vales of Humber community to the south, with the opportunity to extend existing collector roads and municipal infrastructure to the south. The expansion also provides an opportunity to develop a community in the area, as the expanded employment area of Tullamore is located nearby. SABE ID #57</p>	<p>This site has been recorded as SABE request #57.</p> <p>Noted. Policies are included in the draft amendment to guide the future staging and sequencing of growth to 2051.</p>
OP-21-248	September 13, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL Planning & Design Inc.	<p>Within the Peel 2051 Draft Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Update and Revised Mapping, the Region proposes revised mapping for part of their clients' lands in the concession block bound by Mayfield Road, The Gore Road, Healey Road, and Humber Station Road. On behalf of Solmar Developments, SGL disagrees with the Region that the portion of the lands south of the GTA West Corridor "could still accommodate and are suitable for smaller scale employment uses or potentially larger uses." SABE ID #64</p>	<p>This site has been recorded as SABE request #64. Staff continue to recommend the lands bound by the Mayfield Road to the south, the GTA West Corridor to the east and north and natural heritage system to the west be included in the draft SABE as Employment Area. It is recognized that buildings with larger building footprints may be a challenge however the area would still be appropriate for smaller footprint employment uses.</p>
OP-21-249	September 13, 2021	Hamid Razavi Apex Technical Ltd.	<p>Request to include 13535 Heart Lake in the SABE and FSA to develop a proposed Plan of Subdivision on the property. Proposed Site Plan provided. SABE ID #74</p>	<p>This site has been recorded as SABE request #74.</p> <p>The subject property did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the FSA (refer to study Phase A Focus Study Area, Feb. 25, 2020) and inclusion of these lands in the SABE is not permitted by Provincial Policy as it is not contiguous to an existing or proposed settlement area.</p>
OP-21-250	September 18, 2021	Annette Belvedere	<p>Opposed to the expansion of the Caledon East settlement area boundary to develop 39 hectares of the Greenbelt (16494 Innis Lake Road) and an additional 61 acre expansion</p>	<p>This property has been recorded as SABE request #2.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			of the settlement area to include George Crescent. The proposal to include 16494 Innis Lake Road in the SABE fails to meet criteria set out by the Growth Plan for SABEs. The proposal exceeds the maximum size allowed, is not a natural extension of Caledon East, and is unnecessary given the available land in Caledon's Whitebelt. Asked Councillors to ensure this proposal is denied. SABE ID #2	Noted. Residential growth to 2051 can be accommodated within the draft SABE and therefore staff continue to not recommend expansions of rural settlements into the Greenbelt. For more information refer to the Rural Settlement Technical Memorandum with Recommendations, Jan. 13, 2022 available on the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion focus area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/settlement-area-boundary.asp .
OP-21-251	September 10, 2021	Andy McLean	Opposed to the proposed development of 96 acres of farmland at 16494 Innis Lake Road. The proposal runs contrary to the current Official Plan and would violate the Province's Growth Plan. The proposal is ten times larger than the maximum limit on SABEs and is not a natural extension of a SABE. There is enough land in Caledon's Whitebelt to meet the Region's 2051 growth target. Caledon has seen a lot of new housing development. The residents of Caledon and Caledon East do not want this proposed new development. SABE ID #2	This property has been recorded as SABE request #2. Please refer to the response above to OP-21-250.
OP-21-252	August 23, 2021	Andrew Miller Turnbridge	Opposed to the development of 16494 Innis Lake Road, as it violates several criteria in the Province's Growth Plan. The proposal is ten times larger than the maximum limit on SABE and not a natural extension of a SABE. There is more than enough land in Caledon's Whitebelt to meet the Region's 2051 growth targets. SABE ID #2	This property has been recorded as SABE request #2. Please refer to the response above to OP-21-250.
OP-21-253	September 16, 2021	Maurice Luchich GSAI	GSAI has been retained as the planning consultants to review policy planning initiatives and advance development applications regarding 1435 Dundas Street East in Mississauga. Provided an overview of their understanding of the planning processes directly impacting the subject site, including the City of Mississauga Official Plan Review, the Little Etobicoke Creek hydraulic modelling, the Dundas Connects Master Plan, support for the Dixie/Dundas Employment Area conversion (M2), and a Major Transit Station Area Study as part of the Region of Peel's Official Plan Review. Encouraged staff to evaluate these matters concurrently to maintain consistency. Requested to remain updated the aforementioned policy initiatives.	Comments noted. 1435 Dundas Street has been recorded as M30. Regional staff continue to recommend employment conversion M2 (which encompasses this site M30), for the identified area of the Dundas Connects Master Plan to be removed from the Regional Employment Area. Local land use designations continue to apply and any development proposals on the site will require the standard development application review processes (such as official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments). For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp . 1435 Dundas St E continues to be within the proposed "primary" Dixie GO MTSA (DUN-16) which has a minimum density target of 160 people and jobs per hectare.
OP-21-254	September 28, 2021	Steven Pham Weston Consulting	Confirmed support for the proposed SABE Community Area designation which now encompasses the entirety of 12600 Bramalea Road. SABE ID #51	This site has been recorded as SABE request #51. Noted.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
OP-21-255	August 30, 2021	Peter Van Loan Aird & Berlis LLP	Confirmed support for the Regional Staff's recommendation to recommend 75 Bramalea Road for conversion.	Noted. 75 Bramalea Rd has been recorded as employment conversion request B8. An employment conversion via removal of the site from the Regional employment area is supported. Local land use designations continue to apply and any development proposals on the site will require the standard development application review processes (such as official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments). For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
OP-21-256	October 4, 2021	Paula Tenuta BILD	Provided a memo from Altus Group Economic Consulting on behalf of BILD reviewing the Region's ongoing inclusionary zoning exercise. Key points included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking clarity on specifics of IZ policy framework and future by-laws • Request for additional sensitivity analyses • Seeking clarity on DC by-law reviews and other evaluations of costs and revenues • Questions regarding timing and other technical assumptions in NBLC's analysis • There are significant charges already imposed on new housing • Need for investment, incentives, and offsets to avoid IZ impacting overall housing supply • Practicality of Region's Housing Target • Concerns about reduced housing activity and that adoption of IZ may run counter to transit-oriented development objectives • Questions regarding calculation of core housing need 	Staff have provided a response to the questions provided by Altus on behalf of BILD. There is a need in Peel Region to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents to increase the supply of affordable housing and better address local need. Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) is one tool to support this objective. Ultimately, IZ is a tool that must be implemented by local municipalities. The Region of Peel has offered ongoing resources and is engaged in discussions with local municipalities to support their efforts in implementing IZ. The Region of Peel is responsible for establishing an overarching IZ Policy framework that provides direction to local municipalities as they develop an IZ by-law and implement this policy tool. As a result, local municipalities will be responsible for determining the set-aside rate, affordability period, and detailed transition policies, and consideration of incentives or offsets for each local Protected Major Transit Station Area (PMTSA) market area. Further consultation by local municipalities will be undertaken as part of IZ implementation through official plan amendments and zoning by-law amendments. These consultations will provide an opportunity for BILD, its members, and other stakeholders to provide further input and address more specific comments on IZ implementation. In addition, developers acquiring land within PMTSAs should be conscious of the ongoing consultation process regarding the potential for IZ.
OP-21-257	September 24, 2021	Phil Stewart Principal, Pound & Stewart Planning Consultants	Represents GreyCan 6 Properties Inc. c/o CAP Ontario Inc. regarding 4700, 4800, and 4900 Dixie Road, 1330 Eglinton Avenue and 1221 Crestlawn Drive in the city of Mississauga. Provided comments related to the Regional Official Plan policies for the Dixie MTSA, wherein the subject lands are located. Requested that the Dixie MTSA (403-9) be reclassified as a "primary" in the draft policy framework.	It is recognized that these sites benefit from transit access on Eglinton Ave and on the Highway 403 Bus Rapid Transit Corridor. "Secondary" MTSA's are constrained by existing land use patterns and built forms and may require an alternative density target. These stations may take on a commuter station function but may still support a mix of uses. In the case of Dixie (403-9) on the Highway 403 Bus Rapid Transit corridor, the secondary classification is

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				proposed because the existing built form, provincially significant employment zone, active industrial land uses, and few potential redevelopment parcels across the entire MTSA result in an achievable MTSA-wide density that is lower than the Growth Plan minimums. No change to the “secondary” classification is proposed.
OP-21-258	September 30, 2021	Sanjam Raisuada GSAI	Submitted an Economic Analysis Report in support of the Employment Land Conversion request for 9400 Goreway Drive, on behalf of the landowners.	See response to comment STAT-21-387.
OP-21-259	October 4, 2021	Rohan Sovig Malone Given Parsons	<u>Oral Submission for October 7, 2021 PGMC Meeting:</u> Provided comments on the latest Regional MCR Update Report/Mapping on behalf of Royal Glen Eagle Investments Limited and a presentation to be submitted being presented at PGMC on October 7, 2021. SABE ID #39	This property has been recorded as SABE request #39. Regional staff have reviewed this request further and recommend the boundary adjustment as proposed.
OP-21-261	October 4, 2021	Mark McConville Humphries Planning Group Inc.	<u>Written Submission for October 7, 2021 PGMC Meeting:</u> Provided planning justification in support of the request to include 8575 Patterson Road in the SABE for Palgrave. Outlined how the Growth Plan, ORMCP and Town of Caledon policies support this request. SABE ID #46	This property has been recorded as SABE request #46. Staff recognize the request for expansion of 8575 Patterson Road proposes to include portion of the lands designated a Countryside Area and not the portion designated Natural Core Area. Residential growth to 2051 can be accommodated within the draft SABE and therefore staff continue to not recommend expansions of rural settlements into the Greenbelt. The only possible exception could be if a proposal was to meet a demonstrated need for a specific rural community that is unable to be located within the existing boundary. Clarification from the Province states that expansion into the Natural Core Area or Natural Linkage Area is prohibited and amendments to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) must be undertaken by the Minister. The email from the Ministry does not state that expansions into the Countryside Area would not require an amendment to the ORMCP. Staff and our consultant’s interpretation of Section 10 of the ORMCP permits that Official Plans and Zoning By-laws can make further refinement to designations to show greater precision of land uses without an amendment. An expansion to Palgrave to include lands within the Countryside Area would not be considered a refinement to show greater precision and therefore would require the Minister to amend the ORMCP. For more information refer to the Rural Settlement Technical Memorandum with Recommendations, Jan. 13, 2022 available on the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion focus area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/settlement-area-boundary.asp

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				Comment addressed in 2022 Public Comment Response Table (January 1, 2022 – March 28, 2022), see comment STAT- 22-022
OP-21-263	October 4, 2021	David Sajecki Sajecki Planning	Requested that 12505 Heart Lake Road be included within the SABE. Inquired as to whether any other information would be required to be submitted. Requested to be kept of Official Plan Review updates. SABE ID #10	This property has been recorded as SABE request #10. The portion of 12505 Heart Lake Road outside of the GTA West Corridor and Provincial Greenbelt is proposed to be included in the draft Settlement Area Boundary as Employment Area.
OP-21-264	January 11, 2021	Steven Ferri Partner, Loopstra Nixon	<u>Oral Submission for the January 14, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Provided comments on behalf of the Bolton North Landowners Group. Requested that the remaining northerly portion of the Option 1 lands be included within the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion. Noted that the addition would be consistent with Provincial planning policies, represents good planning, and is cost effective from a servicing perspective. SABE ID #65	This site has been recorded as SABE request #65. The portion of the lands in Option 1 outside of the Provincial Greenbelt are proposed to be included in the draft SABE as Community Area.
OP-21-265	April 30, 2021	Maurizio Rogato Principal, Blackthorn Development Corp.	Provided comments on behalf of Polco Investments Limited regarding 2250, 2280, 2300 Queen Street East at Torbram Road in the City of Brampton. Blackthorn Development Corp. supports the ongoing Peel 2051 MCR and policy framework to allow for greater flexibility to introduce mixed use permissions within Employment Lands, including lands within Provincially Significant Employment Zone No. 14. Enclosed concept plans prepared by Turner Fleischer Architects, demonstrating how the subject lands could accommodate a mix of land uses (including commercial, employment/office, and residential uses). Provided planning justification for this concept plan. The subject lands are located with Planned Torbram (QUE-9) MTSA. Supports the recommendation to further study the delineation of this MTSA to better align with policy objectives and increase development/market potential through land use changes. Also supports the delineation of the Torbram MTSA through the MCR to continue to include the subject lands and the proposed density targets. Requested that the subject lands be shown as being ‘underutilized’ within the Draft Employment Lands mapping, to merit an employment conversion to permit mixed-use development. Also requested that Section 5.7.2.18 in the Draft Growth Management policies be broadened to allow employment conversions outside of an MCR to occur within planned MTSA’s and through privately initiated Official Plan Amendments.	The sites 2250, 2280, and 2300 Queen Street East at Torbram Road have been recorded as employment conversion request B29. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
STAT-21-001	October 9, 2021	Balkaran Dhillon	<u>Written Submission for the November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Sandhill Area:	Staff continue to recommend the lands north of Healey Road/Old School and south of King Street as Future Strategic Employment Land. Draft policies permit settlement expansion of Sandhill for dry industrial uses in strategic locations within the Future Strategic Employment Area based on the results of an

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>The lands north of Healey Road, south of King Street, west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road are proposed to be future reserves for employment area. This land is suitable for employment purposes, especially for trucking and outdoor storage. There is currently a huge demand for employment lands throughout Peel Region, especially in the Caledon area.</p> <p>Suggested adding this land to the employment area and improving the road network of Innislake Road to support the future growth of employment. This area is suitable, close to the GTA West corridor and will act as an engine for employment growth in Peel Region. Even though the GTA West was cancelled, Airport Road, Mayfield Road and King Street can accommodate traffic to move goods. This will help to reduce traffic because people travel south in the morning and north in the evening. Therefore, it will help to spread traffic, create more jobs and industries, which are key components of Peel Region and the Province of Ontario.</p> <p><i>Humber Station Road Area:</i></p> <p>Agreed with the Region's proposal for residential area around Humber Station Road. This will help residents work close to their homes and help the existing Bolton employment area. The proposed Humber Station GO Station can serve the entire area from Mayfield Road to King Street, Bolton and even the Sandhill area. The servicing (water, stormwater management, etc.) should be through Humber Station Road from Brampton to King Street, which can serve the land on both sides of the road.</p> <p><i>North of King Street:</i></p> <p>Proposed further employment lands along Airport Road, north of King Street, south of Castlederg Side Road, as a future reserve for employment land. This will save the Region a Municipal Comprehensive Review in the future and help to allocate the area. This area will serve the long-term demands of Employment lands and create many jobs for our Region.</p>	<p>assessment undertaken by the local municipality in consultation with the Region. The assessment will need to address the requirements of the Growth Plan related to <40 ha settlement expansion requirements.</p> <p>Staff will continue to monitor the development of employment lands and if required, additional employment lands can be considered as part of the next Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The lands along Airport Road north of King Street and south of Castlederg Side Road were not studied as part of the SABE study. Staff continue to recommend the lands along Airport Road between Old School/Healy and Sandhill Road as Future Strategic Employment and additional Future Strategic Employment Area is not recommended.</p>
STAT-21-002	October 12, 2021	Sukhman Dhillon	<p><u>Written Submission for the November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>After reviewing the 2051 SABE Study Plan, suggested including the lands located north of Healey Road, south of King Street, west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road in the current employment area – as opposed to a reserve. This is crucial for the progress of the Town of Caledon. Area seems very suitable for current employment growth, as it will allow for the movement of goods and traffic to occur smoothly.</p> <p>If this occurs, the lands north of King Street and south of Castlederg Side Road can be taken as a long-term employment reserve. As those lands are also located within the white belt, this will provide a reserve for the Town to grow in the future.</p>	See response to STAT-21-001.
STAT-21-003	October 13, 2021	Pramanth Misra Peel ACORN Inclusionary	Provided comments on the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Study and Policy Directions. The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not	The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents and increase the supply of affordable housing

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Zoning Campaign	<p>go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	<p>and the potential for inclusionary zoning to support this objective.</p> <p>The Region has led feasibility analysis of inclusionary zoning in Protected Major Transit Station Areas, which is where Provincial regulations permit this policy to be used. Feasibility analysis identified opportunities for inclusionary zoning and suggested that if inclusionary zoning is required at rates higher than what is feasible, development will likely not occur which will further limit the supply of available housing. Inclusionary zoning is one tool available to contribute to affordable housing.</p> <p>There is no mechanism available to require affordable housing in every development, but local and Regional municipal staff continue to request contributions to the Regional affordable housing targets through developments.</p> <p>Draft policy directions encourage the development of more affordable rental and ownership housing units while not preventing new units, particularly purpose built rental, from being built. Draft policies support long term affordability and direct local municipalities to set minimum unit thresholds and maximize affordable housing in new developments where inclusionary zoning applies, with consideration for the unique characteristics of the area. Policies prioritize on-site affordable housing units and ensure that a range and mix of units sizes including family-sized (2 or more bedroom) affordable units are provided through inclusionary zoning.</p>
STAT-21-004	October 14, 2021	Ankush Singla Peel ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>Provided comments on the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Study and Policy Directions. The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	See response to comment STAT-21-003.
STAT-21-005	October 14, 2021	Baha Alsharif Peel ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>Provided comments on the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Study and Policy Directions. The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new 	See response to comment STAT-21-003.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>developments set aside as affordable rental housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	
STAT-21-006	October 15, 2021	Gregory Stensrud Peel ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>Provided comments on the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Study and Policy Directions. The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	See response to comment STAT-21-003.
STAT-21-007	October 16, 2021	Julie Daly Peel ACORN Inclusionary Zoning Campaign	<p>Provided comments on the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Study and Policy Directions. The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	See response to comment STAT-21-003.
STAT-21-008	October 8, 2021	Karen Bennett Senior Associate, GSAI	<p>Provided comments on behalf of Flato Bramalea Meadows Holdings Inc. related to the Region's 2051 Growth Management and the 2051 Draft SABE Mapping for the lands located at 13386 Bramalea Road in Caledon. Requested that the Region consider including the subject lands in the SABE. SABE ID #75</p>	<p>This property has been recorded as SABE request #75.</p> <p>Subject property did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the FSA (refer to study Phase A Focus Study Area, Feb. 25, 2020) and therefore not studied</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				through the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion study. Inclusion of these lands in the SABE is not recommended.
STAT-21-009	October 15, 2021	Maham Siddiqui Planner, Sajecki Planning	Requested that 1330 – 1350 Crestlawn Drive, 1330 – 1344 Fewster Drive, 4520 – 4540 Dixie Road, 4500 Dixie Road, 1310 Fewster Drive, and 4560 Dixie Road in Mississauga be converted from Business Employment to Mixed Use. Provided a concept drawing set for a mixed use development.	The sites at Dixie Road and Crestlawn Drive have been recorded as employment conversion request M24. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information on the Region’s employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
STAT-21-010	October 18, 2021	Himanshu Kumar	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Requested that the properties north of Healey Road, south of King Street, and west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road be included in the SABE, rather than in a reserve. These lands are the ideal location for employment, as they would permit the continuous circulation of products and transit. Including these lands in the SABE will allow the lands between north of King Street and south of Castlederg Side Road within the employment reserve to be included.	See response to comment STAT-21-001.
STAT-21-011	October 9, 2021	Naomi Castellino	I'm writing to you about the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Analysis and Policy Directions being consulted on right now. Peel is in the middle of a housing crisis, and low-and-moderate-income-people are increasingly feeling the pinch. COVID-19 has only highlighted the housing affordability crisis. Inclusionary Zoning is a huge opportunity for the Region to get affordable units built, but the plan as outlined, does not go far enough, because it is more focused on protecting developer profits than making Peel affordable for the majority of its inhabitants. I support Peel ACORN's campaign demands for strong Inclusionary Zoning: 1) We need a minimum of 20 - 30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. The proposed range of 5 to 10% and lower for purpose built rental sets the bar too low, and does not match the level of crisis we are in. 2) The affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Inclusionary Zoning should apply to developments with 60 units or more. Exempting developments of 100 units up to 140 units is too limiting. 4) We need DEEP affordability, so that people making between \$20,000 and \$60,000 can afford 'affordable' housing. 5) We need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary Zoning Requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) That the Region requires every development include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies	See response to comment STAT-21-003.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city</p> <p>On behalf of renters, tenants and low to moderate income families across Peel Region, I look forward to hearing back about your support on Peel ACORN's Inclusionary Zoning Campaign.</p>	
STAT-21-012	October 19, 2021	Aniket Saini	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Requested that the properties north of Healey Road, south of King Street, and west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road be included in the SABE, rather than in a reserve. These lands are the ideal location for employment, as they would permit the continuous circulation of products and transit. Including these lands in the SABE will allow the lands between north of King Street and south of Castlederg Side Road within the employment reserve to be included.</p>	See response to comment STAT-21-001.
STAT-21-013	October 20, 2021	Sara Tavakoli and Kevin Gauthier	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More native trees or tall bushes planted along public paths and in public parks/children's play areas to make shade more readily available during increasingly hot summer months • Allow significant patches of grass to grow wild in public parks and along some paths as they offer important shelter to pollinators and other important wildlife. Cut grass along paths looks maybe pleasing to some but it offers no significant ecological benefits, and wildflowers are beautiful. • Plant native flowers and bushes were along paths or in public gardens (instead of the generic annuals we commonly see) to provide important food sources and shelter to native insects, birds etc. • Add designated bike paths along busy streets (Erin Mills Parkway, Winston Churchill Boulevard, etc.) and along other residential two-lane streets (like Truscott Drive), to encourage road sharing and cycling. The City of Toronto has some nice, designated bike lanes along Bloor Street and Lakeshore Road downtown and further west in Etobicoke as well that could be used as models for future planning initiatives. • More speed humps (that can be by-passed by emergency vehicles) and stop signs especially in busy residential streets (like Bromsgrove and Truscott Drive for example) to promote street calming and make busy streets more pedestrian and bike friendly. • Ban heavy transport trucks from busy residential streets as they impact noise and air quality in an entire neighborhood (not just residents that live on those streets) as air and noise dissipate readily. • Orient plazas toward street, with parking lots around back so the stores are readily accessible to pedestrians and bikers, and so you don't need to cross parking lots to get to a store, this would make those urban developments more aesthetically pleasing as well (I think we can all agree that parking lots are 	Noted. Will consider in future updates to the Region's Sustainable Transportation Strategy, Vision Zero Road Safety Strategic Plan, Road Characterization Study and Goods Movement Strategic Plan.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			ugly).	
STAT-21-014	October 18, 2021	Nancy Hurst	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Regarding POPA 2021-0005, RZ 2021-0007 & SPA 2021-0013 - 0 and 12035 Dixie Road, it is blatantly obvious that this is being pushed through with the idea that the GTAW will be built in close proximity. Ontario is losing 175 acres of farmland per day and make no mistake; this land is Prime #1 soil according to the Ministry soil maps. Claiming that the land is vacant or 'merely producing cash crops' does nothing to diminish the fact that Tribal's aim is to pave millions of square feet of this precious resource to build yet another distribution centre. Aware that there is yet another part of this application behind it on the northern section of the block, which is to be a larger section of warehouse, also on Prime Farmland between two Greenbelt Fingerlings. Pushing through the southern portion now ahead of MCR through an MZO is underhanded and must be seriously questioned.</p> <p>MZOs are deeply unpopular, as are the people who use them to get their way despite the wishes of the public. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture shouldn't need to beg for farmland to be saved and run petitions before our elected officials recognize that Ontario's food security relies on us having enough Prime farmland to feed our growing population. SABE ID #40</p>	<p>The comments regarding the importance of agriculture, the issue of agricultural land consumption for employment uses and use of MZO's are noted.</p> <p>Regarding the Region's Peel 2051 Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) Study and the recommended identification of new Employment Areas in Caledon, the impact of settlement area expansion on the Region's Agricultural System land base, including on Prime Agricultural Areas was considered in the Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) component of the SABE Study. The evaluation of alternative locations for settlement expansion based on avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts on the Agricultural System was addressed through the SABE Study and AIA, and included the consideration of alternatives that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - avoided Prime Agricultural Areas; and - considered use of lower priority agricultural lands within Prime Agricultural Areas. <p>It is noted that the subject lands are proposed to be included in the SABE as employment area to accommodate growth to 2051.</p> <p>The AIA recommendations to mitigate impacts to agricultural lands and operations are being implemented in policy direction in the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>Agricultural criteria, including minimizing the consumption of agricultural land, was also considered in the development of growth management policies and the Land Needs Assessment that established the need for settlement expansion.</p>
STAT-21-015	October 21, 2021	Jerry Kajfasz	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Our municipal politicians and planners are turning Peel and specifically Mississauga into a ghetto with little vision, character, and a sense of community.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The condo ghettos that are popping up and sprawling in Mississauga along with increasing crime rates. • The municipal expenditures are focusing on the wrong priorities. I.e., Expenditures on transit that few people use or want to use. 	<p>Transit ridership has been increasing in Peel pre-pandemic, and in pandemic recovery since the initial drop in ridership of March 2020.</p> <p>It continues to be a priority of the Province (see policies in the Growth Plan) and Region of Peel to plan for complete communities where more residents and workers have equitable access to transit and can use transit or active transportation for their daily needs.</p> <p>The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents, including types, densities and ownership and rental tenure, and increase the supply of affordable housing. Condominium and rental tenure housing in taller buildings are two of many diverse and safe housing options that meet housing need and support density and intensification goals and the goal of creating compact transit-oriented</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				complete communities.
STAT-21-016	October 5, 2021	Mustafa Ghassan Delta Urban Inc.	On behalf of Lark Investments Inc., requested Council's consideration for a resolution endorsing and supporting a Minister's Zoning Order for a mixed use development on the lands located at the northwest corner of Bramalea Road and Steeles Avenue. The subject lands are located within the Bramalea GO MTSA. The proposed development includes a broad range of residential and employment uses and will provide approximately 6,427 residential units and 1,237 jobs. Provided justification for this proposal.	Regional staff provided comments to the city of Brampton regarding the request for a Minister's Zoning Order outside of the Regional Official Plan Review, as Minister's Zoning Orders are a tool of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. As part of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review, the lands owned by Lark Investments are being reviewed as employment conversion requests B15, B16, B17, B18, B19, B34, and B37. See response to comment STAT-21-057.
STAT-21-017	October 22, 2021	Matthew Cory Malone Given Parsons (sent via Elyse Holwell)	<u>Oral Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Provided comments on behalf of Brookvalley Project Management Inc., regarding the Peel 2051 Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and Land Needs Assessment Report. Requested that the identified areas within the Mayfield West Study Area that are contemplated to accommodate the GTA West Corridor be included in the SABE Community Area designation. Further requested that the Mayfield West Study Area lands be included in their entirety in the phasing of growth to 2041. SABE ID #22	This property has been recorded as SABE request #22. Staff are not recommending inclusion of the GTA West Corridor in a designation that would permit development because the Provincial Policy Statement requires municipalities to plan for and protect corridors and rights-of-way for infrastructure and shall not permit development in planned corridors. Subsequent Official Plan reviews can re-examine this issue if more certainty on the future of the corridor becomes available. Policies are included in the draft amendment to guide the future staging and sequencing of growth to 2051. Comment addressed in 2022 Public Comment Response Table (January 1, 2022 – March 28, 2022), see comment STAT-22-012.
STAT-21-018	October 22, 2021	Mike Sahota Manager, Zoom Rent-A-Car	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Provided the following comments regarding the draft SABE as a resident of the Town of Caledon: Sandhill Area: The land was proposed as a future reserve for employment areas (North of Healey Road, south of King Street and West of Innislake Road, and East of Torbram Road). This land is suitable for employment purposes – i.e., outside storage, logistics/transportation/warehousing/factory purposes. This area is ideally situated close to the GTA west corridor. The roads in this area can handle the increased traffic and facilitate the movement of goods and services. Humberstation Road Area: Able attend a few meetings when this area was discussed in regard to the plan and services. All city officials agreed that routing the services through Humberstation is a good idea as it will serve as a good backbone for the future residential development of the area. The location relative to the Employment area and the Bolton corridor is	See response to comment STAT-21-001.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>suitable for people to live close to where they work.</p> <p>Area North of King Street – Whitebelt:</p> <p>Noticed there is a gap along the Airport Road corridor north of King Street, south of Castlederg Side Road. This area, that abuts the Greenbelt, is being neglected in this plan. Leaving such a small portion of Whitebelt does not seem feasible in terms of future development. There is an opportunity to save future municipal time and expense if this pocket was incorporated into this plan. Similar to the comments for Sandhill, this area is ideally situated to be part of the Growth Plan today and would be a strong catalyst for employment growth for the entire region. This extra space would be a great attraction for large businesses to relocate close to future housing (close source of workers from Humberstation and already developed residential pockets of Caledon). It is strategically located close to the new GO station and public transit and close to a major GTA thoroughfare in Airport Road. Extending the boundary beyond King Street would be a positive step for the Town by freeing up a larger and more manageable growth area to attract medium to large employers to the Region to support the population growth expected for the area. Right now, the land in this area is very fragmented in terms of ownership which will only increase if not developed resulting in higher acquisition costs for future potential employers. Any growth in this area, besides creating much needed employment opportunities, would also add much needed revenue to the Town through land transfer, development fees, and an increased corporate tax base. Freeing up this space would make the area much more attractive for such growth.</p>	
STAT-21-019	October 25, 2021	Paul Takhar VP Sales and Marketing, Vision Hotels Group	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided the following comments regarding the draft SABE as a resident of the Town of Caledon:</p> <p>Area North of King St – Whitebelt:</p> <p>The parcel along Airport Road, north of King Street, should be confined within in this plan as it will save time and not accrue additional expenses to the city. This area is ideally positioned and will be a prodigious asset to the future growth and development plan. This will appeal to large business, employment, and housing for the labor market as it conveniently located to public transit and GO station. As of now, the parcel of land in the Greenbelt are very fragmented pertaining to ownership, which is concerning as it will only surge by acquisition of various investors. Having this area included in future development will not only attract potential employers, but also help the Town in taxes, fees, development charges, and corporation taxes</p> <p>Sandhill Area:</p>	See response to comment STAT-21-001.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan in terms of the following policy requirements and/or development principles, the land was proposed as a future reserve for employment areas (north of Healey Road, south of King Street, west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road). This area is ideally situated close to the GTA west corridor. The roads in this area can handle the increased traffic and facilitate the movement of goods and services. I think this land is suitable for outside storage, and logistics/transportation/warehousing/factory purposes.	
STAT-21-020	October 23, 2021	Anil Joshi	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided the following comments related to the draft SABE:</p> <p>Airport Road north of King Street, south of Castlederg Side Road:</p> <p>This area is ideally situated to be part of the Growth Plan today and would be a strong catalyst for employment growth and residential for the entire region. This extra space would be a great attraction for large businesses and to future housing (close source of workers from Humberstation and already developed residential pockets of Caledon). It is strategically located close to the new GO station and public transit and close to a major GTA thoroughfare in Airport Road. Extending the boundary beyond King Street would be a positive step for the Town, as it would free up a larger and more manageable growth area to attract medium to large employers to the Region to support the population growth expected for the area. Any growth in this area will really help residents of peel in creating much needed employment opportunities and residential needs. Adding this area into the plan would make the area much more attractive for such growth. It is the main road and can handle the traffic and it will help the people who want to live in the Region. Will be helpful for housing affordability.</p> <p>Sandhill Area:</p> <p>The land was proposed as a future reserve for employment areas (north of Healey Road, south of King Street, west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road). This land in is suitable for employment purposes. I think this land is suitable for outdoor storage and logistics/transportation/warehousing/factory purposes. This area is ideally situated close to the GTA west corridor.</p> <p>Humberstation Road Area:</p> <p>Able to attend a few meetings when this area was discussed in regard to the plan and services. All city officials agreed that routing the services through Humberstation is a good idea as it will serve as a good backbone for future residential development of the area. The location relative to the Employment area and the Bolton corridor is great for people to live close to where they work.</p>	See response to comment STAT-21-001.
STAT-21-021	October 26, 2021	Keith MacKinnon Partner, KLM Planning	<p><u>Oral Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p>	See response to comment STAT-21-400.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Partners Inc.	Provided Regional Council with a deputation within the statutory Public Meeting process, regarding their clients' lands and the proposed land use designations which would require employment land conversions within the Regional MCR process. Sites are located at Steeles and Mississauga Road (employment conversion Request B32), and on Mississauga Road north of Wardsville Drive (employment conversion Request B38).	
STAT-21-022	October 26, 2021	Jessica Ferlaino Senior Policy Advisor, Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation	How is affordability defined and what are the affordability periods being considered? If using 30% of a household's income to define affordability, what is being done to address the need for deeply affordable housing and supportive housing in the Region, chiefly for those in the first to third income deciles? In the Region's Housing and Homelessness Plan, it showed that in 2020 households with income of \$59,156 and less represented the highest gap in housing (70% of these households, or 90,000+ in Peel are living in unaffordable housing, whereas only 29% of those in the fourth to sixth income deciles are living in unaffordable housing), figures that were likely exacerbated by the pandemic.	<p><u>Affordable housing:</u></p> <p>a) In the case of ownership housing, the least expensive of housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 percent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area;</p> <p>b) in the case of rental housing, the least expensive of a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.</p> <p><u>Low income:</u> In the case of ownership housing, households with incomes in the lowest 30 percent of the income distribution for the regional market area, or in the case of rental housing, households with incomes in the lowest 30 percent of the income distribution for renter households for the regional market area.</p> <p><u>Moderate Income:</u> In the case of ownership housing, households with incomes between 30 to 60 percent of the income distribution for the regional market area, or in the case of rental housing, households with incomes between 30 to 60 percent of the income distribution for renter households for the regional market area.</p> <p>The housing target on affordability, housing assessment for large development applications, and Inclusionary Zoning will create affordable housing that is affordable to both lower and moderate income households. The housing target on affordability mandates that 30% of all new development be affordable to lower and middle income households, of which 50% of this affordable housing should be affordable to lower income households.</p> <p>In terms of affordability period, the N. Barry Lyon Consultants feasibility study on Inclusionary Zoning policy tested a 25-year affordability period and long term affordability (perpetuity). The specific affordability period of various affordable units created through Inclusionary Zoning will be determined by local municipalities when implementing a local Inclusionary Zoning by-law. Regional policies include the Region collaborating with local municipalities, developers, and non-profit organizations on the administration of affordable units created through Inclusionary Zoning to support the long term</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				affordability of these units.
STAT-21-023	October 27, 2021	Rosemarie Humphries Associate, Humphries Planning Group	<p><u>Written Submission for the November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided a letter to support the request that a portion of their clients' property, 8575 Patterson Sideroad in the Town of Caledon, is included in the SABE for Palgrave. The subject lands are designed Countryside Area within the rural settlement boundary for Palgrave. Provided a response to the Regional staff's comments.</p> <p>HPGI followed up with Provincial staff and the Director of Policy with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to provide clarification regarding whether Rural Settlements can expand into the Countryside Area designated lands that would require an amendment to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conversation Plan by the Minister. Appended an email from Kristin Jensen of the MMAH.</p> <p>Provided further justification as to why the subject lands should be considered for the SABE as part of Peel 2051. SABE ID #46</p>	Refer to response to comment OP-21-261.
STAT-21-024	October 26, 2021	Judy Mabee Belfountain Community Organization West Caledon Communities Aggregate Group	<p><u>Written Submission for the November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>There are no blasting quarries in Caledon, as are there are no policies to guide this action, especially for below the water table blasting.</p> <p>Land use compatibility needs to be considered when locations for quarries are considered near sensitive receptors. Setbacks in such areas for blasting and the possibility of flyrock should be 500-1000m from sensitive receptors to reduce land use planning conflict.</p> <p>Water is a significant issue for the West Caledon Aggregate Communities Group, especially when it comes to a potential quarry proposal such as the Votorantim Cimentos quarry in Cataract. Massive dewatering of surface and groundwater for extended periods of time, 50+ years cannot help but impact private and public wells as well as water quantity and quality as it is pumped out from the floor of the quarry.</p> <p>Has the cumulative impact been assessed? Studies initiated years ago on the subwatershed areas remain incomplete. Settlement area boundaries need to remain the same, no expansion.</p> <p>Municipalities need to have jurisdiction to regulate the depth of aggregate extraction.</p> <p>How will they strengthen their role in issuing water taking permits in the approval process?</p> <p>There needs to be careful consideration of below water table extraction and proposed final after use of water bodies.</p>	<p>The comments are noted and will be considered as part of the Aggregates Policy Review component of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The aggregate resources policy review will examine best practices and opportunities to address: the land use compatibility of aggregate extraction adjacent to sensitive land uses; the consideration of cumulative impact assessment requirements; and update the current policies in the Regional Official Plan to ensure that the impacts of future aggregate extraction on communities and the natural environment, including groundwater, are properly studied, considered, and addressed in decision making.</p> <p>Regarding protection of water resources, the proposed water resources policy review is currently proposing revisions to policies that will provide objectives and clarify policy direction to:</p> <p>"Protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water resources, including Water Resource System features and areas, key hydrologic areas and key hydrologic features, and their hydrologic functions, and related natural systems, features and areas, including their linkages and related functions, jointly with the local municipalities, conservation authorities and other related agencies."</p> <p>The comments regarding water taking permits, the municipal authority to regulate depth of extraction and settlement area boundary expansion are also noted.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Attention must be given to cultural heritage landscapes that are negatively affected by the visual changes from aggregate extraction.	
STAT-21-025	October 27, 2021	Christina Fang-Denissov Principal, Urban Strategies (sent via Alex Heath)	<u>Oral Submission for November 4, Council Meeting:</u> Discussed the designation of 3155 Argentia Road (SmartCentres Meadowvale), 1100 Burnhamthorpe Road West, and 780 Burnhamthorpe Road West as Employment Areas (as identified in the Draft Regional Official Plan policies and mapping) and requested employment conversions for the sites (now filed as requests M25, M26, and M27 respectively).	See response to comments STAT-21-058, STAT-21-065, and STAT-21-066.
STAT-21-026	October 28, 2021	David Sylvester Forks of the Credit Preservation Group	<u>Oral Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Expressed concerns related to the protection of water resources and aggregate extraction policies. Also commented on the current system for Permits to Take Water, policies for extracting below the below water, and minimum separation distances.	See response to comment STAT-21-024.
STAT-21-027	October 19, 2021	Abhishek Ganghas	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Considering adding the properties (north of Healey Road, south of King Street, west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road) rather than putting them in a reserve, which is critical for Caledon's development. This location appears to be suitable for current employment because it allows for continuous product and transit circulation. This will be critical to the Town's prosperity and will enable us to incorporate the areas between King Street and Castlederg Side Street into the employment reserve.	See response to comment STAT-21-001.
STAT-21-028	October 20, 2021	Peel Resident	<u>Written Submission for November 4, Council Meeting:</u> Economic prosperity does not have to come from rapid population growth and environmental destruction. The Region, and more broadly Canada, needs to learn how to grow the economy by utilizing the existing population better vs. relying on rapid population growth as the primary driver of economic prosperity. If this is not in Peel's control, then Peel should push back on the Province and the Feds to make them realize that building economic prosperity through forced population growth is a short-sighted approach. While it can certainly yield a higher total GDP quickly (more taxes into governments' coffers), it often results in a lower effective income for most individuals, not to mention the environmental costs associated with the destruction of fields and green spaces (paved spaces everywhere and the standard of living decreasing), resulting in talented portions of the population eventually leaving. Even China has rejected the strategy of attaining GDP growth via population growth. They are already able to experience a healthy economic growth while maintaining more or less constant population levels and are preparing for continued growth in the era of declining population (via the use of AI and automation). We have such capable and diverse communities in Peel and we should be able to find	Population growth is projected based on current trends such as births, deaths, migration to Peel from within Canada, and immigration. A significant portion (55%) of Peel's growth is being accommodated through intensification in existing built-up areas. Some of this is population growth and some is through the addition of jobs in existing employment areas where lands are vacant, or where redevelopment can occur to support higher density employers (such as offices).

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			the workforce and economic success we are seeking from within.	
STAT-21-029	October 27, 2021	Ancur Joshi	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided the following comments as a resident of Caledon:</p> <p>Airport Road, north of King Street, south of Castledeerg Side Road:</p> <p>This area will be an attractive catalyst for both employment and residential growth. The location is well-situated for large commercial businesses as well as residential housing. This is due to its close proximity to Humberstation and already developed pockets of Caledon. The above-mentioned area is also close to the new GO station and accessible by public transit.</p> <p>Extending the boundary beyond King Street will help to promote manageable growth that would be able to sustain the professional and community expansion.</p> <p>Airport Road is already prominent. The expansion would appear natural and expected. The potential increase in housing would also bode well for the economy.</p> <p>Humberstation Road Area:</p> <p>When this area was discussed as part of the plan, all city officials agreed that routing services through Humberstation would be a great idea. Humberstation would serve as a strong backbone for future residential growth. The location relative to surrounding employment hubs would be great news for those aiming to live close to where they work.</p>	See response to comment STAT-21-001.
STAT-21-030	October 28, 2021	Mark J. McConville Associate, Humphries Planning Group Inc.	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>On behalf of Vincent and Carlo Mastrogiuseppe, requested that 5171 Countryside Drive in the City of Brampton be considered during the Region's MCR to be included as a Node/Centre within the Region's Strategic Growth Areas shown on Schedule Z2. Further requested that the site be shown within the Employment Area, with added Mixed-use land use permissions. Provided planning justification to support this proposal.</p> <p>Provided comments on the Land Needs Assessment completed as part of the Region's LNA.</p>	<p>This site and general area has not been identified as a strategic growth area in the Regional Official Plan or on Schedule Z2. Based on the hierarchy of areas to accommodate density in the Region, the City of Brampton 2040 vision, and draft Brampton City Structure, this area has not been identified to accommodate high densities. The site will continue to be identified as within the mapped Regional employment area designation.</p> <p>Specific land use designations and densities will be identified at the local municipal level in keeping with the Region's employment area policies.</p>
STAT-21-031	October 28, 2021	Jass Dhillon	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided the following comments as a resident of Caledon:</p> <p>Sandhill Area:</p>	See response to comment STAT-21-001.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>The land north of Healey Road, south of King Street, west of Innislake Road and east of Torbram Road was proposed as a future reserve for employment areas. This land is suitable for employment purposes. There is huge shortage of outside storage in this area. There is not enough land for outside storage, transportation, and other employment activities. This area is suitable for employment and can accommodate future growth in the Town of Caledon and Region of Peel. This area is connected with three major Regional roads (Mayfield Road, Airport Road and King Road), which are all connected with major highways.</p> <p>Suggested that this area is suitable for outside storage, and logistics/transportation/warehousing/factory purposes. The roads in this area can handle the increased traffic and facilitate the movement of goods and services. It will help to reduce the congestion of highways because traffic travels south in the morning and north in the evening, it will help to spread the traffic in both ways and reduce overall congestion and better growth planning.</p> <p>Humberstation Road Area:</p> <p>All city officials agreed that routing the services through Humberstation is a good idea as it will serve as a good backbone for future residential development of the area. The location relative to the Employment area and the Bolton corridor is great for people to live close to where they work. Suggested north of Healey Road should be residential and south of Healey Road could be either employment or residential, depending upon the planning.</p> <p>Area North of King Street – Whitebelt:</p> <p>Noticed there is a gap along the Airport Road corridor north of King Street, south of Castlederg Side Road. This area abutting the Greenbelt is being neglected in this plan. Leaving such a small portion of the Whitebelt does not seem feasible in terms of future development. There is a tremendous opportunity to save future municipal time and expense if this pocket was incorporated into this plan. Similar to the comments for Sandhill, this area is ideally situated to be part of the Growth Plan today and would be a strong catalyst for employment growth for the entire Region. This extra space would be a great attraction for large businesses to relocate close to future housing.</p> <p>It is strategically located close to the new GO station and public transit and close to a major GTA thoroughfare in Airport Road. By extending the boundary beyond King Street, it would be a positive step for the Township by freeing up a larger and more manageable growth area to attract medium to large employers to the Region to support the population growth expected for the area. Right now, the land in this area is very fragmented in terms of ownership which will only increase if not developed resulting in higher acquisition costs for future potential employers. Any growth in this area besides creating much-needed employment opportunities would also add much-</p>	

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			needed revenue to the township through land transfer, development fees, and an increased corporate tax base. Freeing up this space would make the area much more attractive for such growth.	
STAT-21-032	October 30, 2021	Jessica Johal	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided the following comments as a resident of Caledon:</p> <p>Airport Road, North of King Street, South of Castlederg Side Road:</p> <p>This area is ideally situated to be a beneficial part of the current Growth Plan. It would be a strong opportunity for employment and residential growth for the entire Region. This extra space would be a great attraction for large businesses and future housing developments (close source of workers from Humberstation and already developed residential pockets of Caledon). It is strategically located close to the new GO station and public transit and close to a major GTA thoroughfare in Airport Road. Extending the boundary beyond King Street, would be a positive step for the township by freeing up a larger and more manageable growth area to attract medium to large employers to the Region to support the population growth expected for the area. Any growth in this area will really help residents of Peel create much-needed employment opportunities and residential needs. Adding this area into the plan would make the area much more attractive for such growth. Its the main road and can handle the traffic and it will help the people in Peel and those who want to move to the Peel region. Additionally, in lieu of the increased demand for housing as well as increased pricing of housing, this opportunity will help people find housing in the Region and provide opportunities for work.</p>	See response to comment STAT-21-001.
STAT-21-033	November 1, 2021	Clarence Riepma President, Riepma Consulting	On behalf of the property owner, requested that the property legally known as Part Lot 28, Concession WHS, King Street West (north side, north of Sloan Drive), be added to the Victoria Settlement Area as part of the MCR. Provided planning justification for the inclusion of these lands with the lands to the east for Industrial Employment purposes. SABE ID #76	<p>This site has been recorded as SABE request #76.</p> <p>The subject lands are located within the Protected Countryside in the Provincial Greenbelt. Victoria is designated as a Hamlet under the Greenbelt Plan and the corresponding policies do not permit expansion of a Hamlet into the Protected Countryside.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Rural Settlement Technical Memorandum with Recommendations, Jan. 13, 2022 available on the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion focus area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/settlement-area-boundary.asp</p>
STAT-21-034	October 6, 2021	Jason Afonso Senior Associate, GSAI	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Submitted comments on behalf of Alloa Landowner Group in regard the lands bound by Mississauga Road to the west, Old School Road to the north, Chinguacousy Road to the east, and Mayfield Road to the south. GSAI is generally supportive of the Draft ROPA and the proposed phasing policies for New Community Areas as it relates to the subject</p>	<p>This has been recorded as SABE request #5.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The CP tables/mapping support the Region in allocating growth and testing servicing costs for the purpose of our conformity work with the Growth Plan</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			lands. Request confirmation that the progression of growth presented in the 2051 Scenario Community Planning Tables are conceptual and phasing will be determined at the local level. SABE ID #5	requirements. Draft policies in the Regional Official Plan require the local municipalities to stage and sequence secondary plans for new communities to support orderly development, ensure infrastructure is delivered efficiently, and protect the financial and economic well being of the Region and its local municipalities.
STAT-21-035	October 29, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL Planning & Design Inc. (sent via Sierra Horton)	<u>Oral Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Commented on the Regional Official Plan Review and MCR as its related to the Wildfield Village lands, on behalf of the Wildfield Village Landowners Group. SABE ID #57	This has been recorded as SABE request #57. Noted.
STAT-21-036	November 2, 2021	Steven Pham Weston Consulting	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Provided a letter of record providing feedback on the Region’s SABE, specifically the latest conceptual mapping of the Focused Study Area and the proposed SABE communities, as it relates to 7904 Mayfield Road, on behalf of the owners of the subject property. Weston continues to be supportive of including this property in the SABE and other draft policies. Asked that the Region ensure that the broadest range of industrial uses be permitted within Employment Areas, along with supportive and compatible commercial and retail uses. SABE ID #49	This property has been recorded as SABE request #49. Noted. While specific land use designations are established and the local municipal level, the PPS, Growth Plan, and Regional Official plan do define employment areas to include industrial uses and other land uses such as “manufacturing, warehousing, offices, and associated retail and ancillary facilities.” Regional employment policies in section 5.8 of the ROP have been expanded upon and clarified regarding the permission for or limitation on the inclusion of commercial and retail uses, and where may be directed in employment areas.
STAT-21-037	November 2, 2021	Jennifer Le Forestier	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> The Region of Peel received a letter from the Minister of Transport Carolyn Mulrone on August 13th which states that it is uncertain that there will be a GO train in Caledon at any time in the next 30 years. Ministerial Zoning Orders are being handed out to municipalities across the GTA for sprawling developments and the public is being told that it is because these developments will be serviced by transit. However, Caledon Station is yet another development on greenfields that will not be serviced by the province and so will be yet another financial burden to the Region of Peel. Why are we planning like we are getting a GO Train? We are not. If developments like the Caledon Station subdivision, the massive Amazon warehouse that was just fast-tracked through a request by the proponent for an MZO, as well as the Sandhill Industrial lands, are approved through the MCR, we will not make a dent in our climate targets, and we will not be building complete communities. We will have more subdivisions surrounded by trucking hubs and warehousing. The analysis being put forward by Caledon staff and councillors regarding the GTA West Highway 413 is that Regional roads will cost more. This is not representing the public interest nor is it proven to be factual. To say road infrastructure will cost \$6 million so it is the preferred option ignores the estimated \$10 to \$20 billion cost of the highway, the devastating environmental cost and the long-term health impacts that have yet to be	The Region is proposing a balanced approach to accommodating growth between development in new designated greenfield areas and intensification in existing communities. This will provide for a mix of housing types and options, and employment opportunities in Peel. The Region is establishing intensification target of 55% and minimum greenfield density target of 70 people and jobs per hectare, both of which are higher than the Provincial requirements. The details of the calculations for accommodating this growth is available in the Land Needs Assessment Report on the Region’s Growth management focus area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp . A Major Transit Station Area has been identified as a delineated “primary” MTSA at the future Bolton GO station (see HUB-1) in the Regional Official Plan Table 5 and Schedule Y7. This will require that a minimum density of 150 people and jobs per hectare is planned for. A “planned” MTSA (HUB-2) is also identified at the Mayfield West future transit hub. The Region continues to advocate for additional transit service to Peel and specifically the designated greenfield areas to be developed in the future, to ensure that sustainable travel modes are available for residents to use instead of settling into car-centric travel habits.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>studied by either MTO, AECOM, or WSP. Attended both Community Value Plan meetings and all the Public Information meetings for the 413. The studies for air and noise impacts of the GTA West have not been done.</p> <p>For residents who live near the pits and quarries that will extract and transport all the gravel required, who have already suffered through a \$45,000 tribunal at LPAT, who are on private wells, approving more trucking and sprawl will be yet another assault on West Caledon which is happening still despite the onslaught of development, a UNESCO World Biosphere.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are schools in Caledon near the proposed route in the designated study area. Has anyone at MTO, Aecom, WSP, the Town of Caledon or the Region of Peel, addressed the impacts to those students?</p> <p>Further I have not seen any documentation that the public supports the 413 in Caledon. Finally, Caledon staff do NOT represent the public interest.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the Region of Peel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Direct staff to prepare an alternative plan which would accommodate the entire demand for housing within the existing settlement area. 2) Direct staff to prepare a set of draft zoning and OP amendments, including as of right semi-detached homes on any currently single-family dwelling lot and any which would bring existing neighborhoods up to densities and mixes of uses that would bring active transportation modal share above 60% - at minimum 90 people & jobs per hectare. <p>Committee members please consider the voice of the Residents of Caledon today and the guiding principals of the Growth Plan.</p>	<p>On March 11, 2021 Regional Council requested that the province not build a highway in the GTA West Corridor, and instead study options for transit provision in the corridor. In regional staff comments on the GTA West Corridor/Highway 413 Environmental Assessments, this continues to be requested, and public health concerns have been raised (i.e., requesting air quality assessments).</p>
STAT-21-038	November 3, 2021	Phil Stewart Principal, Pound & Stewart Planning Consultants	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided planning justification for 0 Heart Lake Road (Part Lot 17, Concession 3, east of Hurontario Street, Part 1, 2, and 3, Plan 43R-17849) to be designated by the Regional Official Plan Review to support employment uses. Noted that the approved City of Brampton Countryside Villages Secondary Plan identified this property as Employment Area.</p>	<p>As the Regional employment area on Schedule Y6 will be revised to be a “blanket” designation and in some places a “dual designation” with the greenlands system, this site is mapped within the Regional employment area. The development review process and local implementation will determine requirements for the protection, restoration and enhancement of the Greenlands System including the exact boundaries of the environmental features and developable area on site.</p>
STAT-21-039	November 3, 2021	Darrin Cohen Planner, Weston Consulting	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>On behalf of Tullamore Industrial Limited Partnerships, this letter advised that planning applications were filed in the Town for industrial/ warehouse/distribution space for the lands generally located both east and west of Torbram Road in the Town of Caledon. The lands are proposed to be included in the draft SABE as Employment Area. SABE ID #71</p>	<p>This site has been recorded as SABE request #71.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Policies are included in the draft amendment to guide the logical staging and sequencing of growth to 2051.</p> <p>Preparation of Secondary Plans by the Town of Caledon require public</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				consultation, so there will be opportunities to provide input.
STAT-21-040	November 3, 2021	John Malloy Vice President, Corporate Real Estate Rogers Communications Inc. (sent via Laurie Payne)	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Provided planning justification for the conversion of a portion of 8200 Dixie Road (between Orenda Road and Clark Boulevard, east of West Drive) owned by Rogers from Employment to Mixed Commercial-Residential to allow for the redevelopment of the site.	The site at 8200 Dixie Rd has been recorded as employment conversion request B31. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process. For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focusareas/growth-management.asp .
STAT-21-041	November 3, 2021	Jason Afonso Senior Associate, GSAI	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Proposed that the lands located at the south-west and south-east corners of Old School Road and Hurontario Street (legally known as Part of Lot 22, Concession 1 EHS and WHS (Chinguacousy)) in the Town of Caledon should remain Community Area, whereas the draft SABE mapping identified these lands as Employment Area. Provided planning justification for this proposal on behalf of Bill Newhouse. SABE ID #77	This site been recorded as SABE request #77. Staff have further reviewed this request and the associated technical information and have proposed a change on these lands from Employment Area to Community Area as outlined in the February 3, 2022 Planning and Growth Management Committee staff report which can be reviewed here: https://peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/reading-room/#rc2022 .
STAT-21-042	November 3, 2021	Kiranjit Kaur	<u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u> Provided the following comments as a resident of Caledon: Area North of King Street – Whitebelt: Saw there is a gap along the Airport Street corridor north of King Street, south of Castleberg Side Road. This Region that adjoins the Greenbelt is being ignored in this arrangement. Leaving such a little piece of Whitebelt doesn't appear to be plausible as far as future turn of events. Like the remarks for Sandhill, this Region is unmistakably arranged to be essential for the development plan today and would be a solid impetus for business development for the whole district. This additional room would be an incredible fascination for huge organizations to migrate near future lodging (close wellspring of laborers from Humberstation and right now created private pockets of Caledon). It is deliberately found near the new GO station and public travel and near a significant GTA lane in Airport Road. At the present time, the land in this space is exceptionally divided as far as possession which will possibly increment, if not, created bringing about higher acquisition costs for future likely employers. Opening up this space would make the Region considerably more alluring for such development. Humberstation Road Area:	See response to comment STAT-21-001.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Had the option to go to a couple of gatherings when this Region was examined with respect to the arrangement and administrations. All city authorities concurred that steering the administrations through Humberstation is a smart thought as it will fill in as a good backbone for future private improvement of the space. The area comparative with the Employment region and the Bolton hall is incredible for individuals to live near where they work.</p> <p>Sandhill Area:</p> <p>The land was proposed as a future save for work regions (north of Healey Road, south of King Street and West of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Street). This land is reasonable for employment purposes. I think this land is appropriate for outside storage, and coordination/transportation/warehousing/processing plant purposes.</p>	
STAT-21-043	November 3, 2021	Ardas Nijjer	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided the following comments as a resident of Caledon:</p> <p>Humberstation Road Area:</p> <p>Went to two or three get-togethers when this locale was inspected concerning the arrangement and administrations. All city specialists agreed that guiding the organizations through Humberstation is a brilliant idea as it will fill in as a decent spine for future private improvement of the space. The Region, relative with the Employment area, and the Bolton coordinator is mind blowing for people to live approach where they work</p> <p>Sandhill Area:</p> <p>The land was proposed as a future plan to put something aside for work regions (north of Healey Road, south of King Street and west of Innislake Road, and east of Torbram Road). This land is sensible for business purposes. I think this land is proper for outside capacity and collaborations/transportation/warehousing/handling plant purposes.</p> <p>Area North of King Street – Whitebelt:</p> <p>Saw there is a gap along the Airport Road hall north of King Street, south of Castlederg Side Road. The Region that borders the Greenbelt is being overlooked in this plan. Leaving such a little piece of whitebelt doesn't seem, by all accounts, to be conceivable to the extent of future development. Like the comments for Sandhill, this area is undeniably organized to be fundamental for the advancement plan today and would be a strong impulse for business improvement for the entire locale. This extra room would be a mind blowing interest for enormous associations to move not so distant future housing (close wellspring of workers from Humberstation and at the present time made private pockets of Caledon). It is purposely found close to the new GO station and</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See response to comment STAT-21-001.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>public travel and almost a huge GTA path in Airport Road. Right now, the land in this space is astoundingly separated similarly as ownership which will perhaps increase if not made achieving higher securing costs for future likely employers. Opening up this space would make the locale significantly more charming for such a turn of events.</p>	
STAT-21-044	November 3, 2021	Jessica Ferlaino Senior Policy Advisor, Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Canada, including the Region of Peel, is in the midst of a housing affordability crisis. To address this crisis, a multifaceted solution that leverages support of all levels of government is required. Acknowledged the Region’s efforts to produce an Official Plan Amendment that takes into consideration the needs of the Region and the availability of resources to meet these needs over the next 30 years. Concerned that the needs of the Region’s lower income communities will not be met by the proposed housing and inclusionary zoning policies.</p> <p>CERA is supportive of the targets set out by the proposed Official Plan, as well as the policies to support a range of housing types, and the inclusionary zoning framework. Worried that the definition of affordability does not meet the needs of lower-income individuals or those living in housing precarity. Important that the inclusionary zoning policies are strong enough to result in the building of a range of affordable units. Hope that the set aside rate of 10%, deemed feasible by the NBLC report, is approved.</p> <p>Asked that the following is considered when the PGMC is approving the Regional Official Plan Amendment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increase the target for affordable rental units and supportive housing, as low-income households represent the greatest housing need in the Region. It is our hope that these units will be deeply affordable and that their affordability timeline can be expanded to 99 years. 2) Tie affordability to the incomes of the tenants rather than average market rents, which do not reflect the real time needs of renter households as asking rents are considerably higher than average market rents. 3) Prioritize ownership and administration of new affordable rental housing by non-profits, co-op housing providers and other community partners, especially those built on regionally owned and underutilized lands. Public assets should be used to build deeply affordable housing that will remain affordable in perpetuity, provided by non-profits and co-operatives. 4) Encourage affordable purpose-built rental developments, as well as the creation of secondary units in the provision of affordable housing options both within and external to MTSAs. 5) Improve intergovernmental coordination to secure funding and support to 	<p>Peel-wide housing targets include an affordability target for new developments where 30% of all new units are affordable to moderate income households, of which 50% of units should be affordable to lower income households.</p> <p>Regional policies including a housing assessment to demonstrate contributions towards a Peel-wide affordability target for new developments to have 30% of units being affordable to low and middle income households, of which 50% of the units should be affordable to low income households.</p> <p>The definition of affordability is guided by Provincial policy and includes a threshold for ownership. The definition takes into account both income (what you can afford) and average market rent or below-average resale price and chooses the lower amount as the threshold.</p> <p>The IZ Policy Framework includes policies that require rental rates or sale prices that are affordable to those with low and moderate incomes, with reduced requirements to encourage deeper affordability for low income households.</p> <p>Draft policies include collaborating with local municipalities, developers, and non-profit organizations to support long term affordability. Of note is that the NBLC study identified that in strong market areas, projects can generally remain viable for affordable ownership units with long term affordability requirements. In emerging market areas, long term affordability appears to impact viability in some PMTSAs.</p> <p>Regionally-owned sites including Peel Housing Corporation sites are utilized for Regional priorities including affordable housing. The sites within the Region’s Housing Master Plan are focused on providing new affordable rental housing, emergency shelters and supportive housing, delivered by the Region of Peel and Peel Housing Corporation.</p> <p>Policies recognize the need to protect and expand our limited rental housing stock in Peel. This includes policies that introduce conditions under which rental housing may be demolished or converted into ownership housing. IZ policies will assess the feasibility of IZ, such as exemptions or reduced requirements, on rental developments so as to not prevent new purpose built rental stock from being built. The Region will continue to work with local</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>increase the supply of affordable housing.</p> <p>6) Ensure a strong IZ policy is adopted and ensure frequent reviews of the policy to improve the quality of the initiative.</p>	<p>municipalities to identify opportunities to maximize existing or expand rental housing.</p> <p>Addressing housing affordability and supply requires partnerships between all orders of government, the development industry, non-profits, and other stakeholders. Policies include advocating to the provincial and federal governments for improved cost-sharing arrangements that support the development of permanent and long-term affordable housing and the need for more sufficient, predictable funding within a flexible framework to better respond to housing need.</p> <p>IZ policies will be reviewed in accordance with Provincial requirements (reporting every two years and market assessments every five years).</p>
STAT-21-045	November 4, 2021	Marc DeNardis Planning Associate, GWD	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Represents the owners of 12404 Airport Road in the Town of Caledon, who are interested in the Regional and Town Official Plan Reviews. Supported the re-designation of their property being located within the proposed SABE Employment Area. Requested that any future employment designation on the subject lands recognize and continue to permit the historical use for transportation and storage related activities.</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #79.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Regional Official Plan identifies employment lands to accommodate growth to 2051. The permitted uses on the lands are determined through subsequent planning by the Town of Caledon.</p>
STAT-21-046	November 4, 2021	Marcia Bryan Chair, Cooksville ACORN (sent via Scott Baird)	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Provided comments on the Region’s inclusionary zoning framework. Displeased with how inclusionary zoning is applicable only along major transit routes. The currently proposed strategy is insufficient and something much bolder is needed. Peel ACORN members demand the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the maximum amount of units possible be set aside as permanent, deeply affordable, rental housing • That inclusionary zoning must be fully phased in by 2025 • That inclusionary zoning be fully phased in at 30% set aside as affordable for low-income families, which city studies have shown will allow developers to get 15% profit and landowners get 10% above the value of their land • That inclusionary zoning prioritizes affordable rental housing, which is more affordable for lower-income households, in all developments, by targeting set-aside rates that will incentivize rental over ownership • That the current proposal of units being affordable forever (no sunset clause) be maintained • That a new definition of “affordable”, based on income – not market rent – be introduced • That inclusionary zoning policies apply to all new developments with 60 units or more 	<p>The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents and increase the supply of affordable housing and the potential for inclusionary zoning to support this objective. The Region has led feasibility analysis of inclusionary zoning in Major Transit Station Areas, which is where Provincial regulations permit this policy to be used. Provincial policy does not allow for Inclusionary Zoning to be implemented in areas outside of primary or secondary Major Transit Station Areas (delineated on Schedule Y7) or areas with a Minister-ordered Community Planning Permit System. There is no mechanism available to require affordable housing in every development, but local and Regional municipal staff continue to request contributions to the Regional affordable housing targets through developments.</p> <p>The definition of affordability is guided by Provincial policy and includes a threshold for ownership. The definition takes into account both income (what you can afford) and average market rent or below-average resale price and chooses the lower amount as the threshold.</p> <p>Feasibility analysis led by the Region identified opportunities for Inclusionary Zoning and suggested that if Inclusionary Zoning is required at rates higher than what is feasible, development will likely not occur which will further limit</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				<p>the supply of available housing. The feasibility study also recommended implementing Inclusionary Zoning with consideration for transitioning and phasing, particularly in markets that are not as strong and where appropriate based on market and other local conditions.</p> <p>Policies encourage the development of more affordable rental and ownership housing units while not preventing new units, particularly purpose built rental, from being built.</p> <p>Policies support long term affordability and direct local municipalities to set minimum unit thresholds and maximize affordable housing in new developments where inclusionary zoning applies, with consideration for transition and phasing and the unique characteristics of the area.</p>
STAT-21-047	November 4, 2021	Maria Jones Project Planner, Candevcon Limited	<p><u>Written Submission for November 4, 2021 Council Meeting:</u></p> <p>Requested that mixed-use/high density residential uses be permitted within the Employment Area of the Brampton Business Employment Corridor and Lester B. Pearson Operating Area. The subject lands are located between Humberwest Parkway and Goreway Drive mid-block between Queen Street and Williams Parkway – municipally known as 9360, 9358 and 9370 Goreway Drive. Provided planning justification to satisfy the Region’s employment land conversion criteria.</p> <p>Note: Issued a correction to the initial letter submitted. The correct municipal addresses for the lands related to this request are 9360 9340, 9358 and 9370 Goreway Drive.</p>	<p>The sites on Goreway Drive have been recorded as employment conversion request B36. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focusareas/growth-management.asp.</p> <p>Comment addressed in 2022 Public Comment Response Table (January 1, 2022 – March 28, 2022), see comment STAT-22-016.</p>
STAT-21-048	November 3, 2021	Peter Walker	<p>There are many words on your website about plans. However, most of Peel Region’s emissions from natural gas and electricity can be offset via purchase agreements with a third party such as Bullfrog Power.</p> <p>Does Peel Region have any offset agreements in place and if not, why not?</p>	<p>The Region is exploring all options to reduce its corporate greenhouse gas emissions, this includes assessing Renewable Electricity Certificates (RECs). The Region of Peel has purchased RECs in the past, but at this time does not have an active contract. The Region's climate change investments are currently focused on Region of Peel assets; projects like deep energy retrofits at existing facilities and net zero new construction at new regional buildings.</p>
STAT-21-049	October 4, 2021	Sylvia Roberts	<p><u>Written Submission was received on October 4, 2021.</u></p> <p>Provided comments on the staff report “Land Needs Assessment Report” and identified flaws from Hemson Source materials and disagreed with taking a market-based approach to accommodating growth. Stressed the need to recognize that much of the residential growth from 1990 onward has been in auto-oriented communities and for the Region to figure out how to accommodate significant intensification. Requested that more MTSAs be advanced in the Regional Official Plan, particularly along Queen Street in Brampton.</p>	<p>The Region does recognize that since the 1990’s, Mississauga and Brampton has accommodated many new families in Peel, in auto-oriented development forms. The Province introduced the market-based approach through the LNA documents; however, the Region prefers the Balanced Approach to accommodate future growth in the mixed housing forms and densities (i.e., Single/semi, Row, Apartment).</p> <p>Regional Official Plan policies promote more affordable housing options of different tenures (rental and ownership) and densities. This includes requiring a housing assessment in large development applications to demonstrate contributions towards Regional housing targets and through creating an Inclusionary Zoning policy framework to guide local municipal implementation</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				<p>of this tool in Major Transit Station Areas.</p> <p>Additional MTSAs are proposed to be delineated as “primary” MTSAs along the Queen Street Bus Rapid Transit corridor in Brampton. Please see revisions to Schedule Y7.</p>
STAT-21-050	November 2, 2021	Trevor Alkema Planning Assistant, RGC Design Group	<p>Thank you for meeting with us this morning to discuss the projects at 13945 Kennedy Road and 13940 Hurontario Street. As follow up, you will find attached the letter requesting consideration under the Region MCR process submitted in May of 2018.</p> <p>Kindly confirm that the site is included in the Region’s review. SABE ID #78</p> <p>[Attached: Letter from May 2018 providing an overview of the proposed development of the subject property and the applicable land use policy]</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #78.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>13648 and 13940 Hurontario are included in the draft SABE as Employment Area.</p>
STAT-21-051	November 3, 2021	Brian Zeman President, MHBC (sent via Kim Clements)	<p>Provided preliminary comments on the draft Regional Official Plan as it relates to the aggregate sites owned and operated by Lafarge throughout the Region, including: Presswood Pit, Lawford Pit, Petch Pit, Caledon Pit, Limebeer Pit, the Caledon Ready Mix property, Smith Pit, Pit #3, the proposed Pit #3 extension, the Bolton Ready Mix property, the Brampton Ready Mix property, Cawthra Aggregate Depot, the Mississauga Ready Mix property, and the site legally known as Part Lot 17, Concession 1, WHS, Caledon as in CA25309 S/T CA25309 Willoughby Road E/S.</p> <p>Requested to be notified when the draft aggregate policies are available for review.</p>	<p>One of the objectives of the aggregate resources policy review is to ensure the Regional Official Plan is consistent with and conforms to provincial legislation. As such, the aggregate policies of the Provincial Policy Statement and relevant provincial plans, including policy direction regarding recycling of mineral aggregate resources, are being reviewed and updated. Comments regarding aggregates policies will be considered in the Aggregates Policy Review component of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Figure Y2 (renumbered to Figure 7) depicts the natural heritage features and areas that are included as elements of the Greenland System Core, NAC and PNAC policy framework. Figure Y3 (now Figure 8) is a conceptual depiction of a Regional scale natural heritage system based on Conservation Authority studies. Figures 7 and 8 do not form part of the Regional Official Plan but are provided as a reference to conceptually illustrate the System’s components.</p> <p>Refinements to the Figures may be made without an amendment to the Regional Official Plan at any time. The detailed implementation and mapping of NACs and PNACs shown of Figure 7 will be undertaken by the local municipalities in accordance with the Regional Official Plan. This does not preclude the local municipalities making refinements based on the implementation of existing approved natural heritage systems and existing approved development applications, including the implementation of approved site plans issued under the ARA to recognize the limits of extraction and the limits of protected feature boundaries. Approved site plans which authorize the removal of features that may be shown on Figures 7 and 8 would be recognized as approved refinements to Figures 7 and 8 by the Region. The Region is proposing an implementation initiative in Section 7.9 to undertake a mapping refinement exercise to refine and update the NAC and PNAC features shown on Figure 7 as may be appropriate. The information that MHBC has submitted is appreciated and will be considered as a part of any refinement initiative at that time.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				<p>Regarding Figure 8, the mapping of a conceptual Regional Natural Heritage System was undertaken by the Conservation Authorities on behalf of the Region to assist in the implementation of Greenland System policies. The mapping is to be interpreted in accordance with the Regional Official Plan policy direction and the interpretation provisions in the background report prepared by the Conservation Authorities:</p> <p>“The CA NHS mapping reflects the best available data at the time of analysis. Every effort has been made to ensure data quality and currency; however, some minor mapping errors may exist and will be corrected as appropriate (e.g., via MESP, EIR, EIS, subwatershed plans or at other points in the planning process). In addition, it is understood that local scale plans are currently underway to refine the NHS in ongoing development processes.”</p> <p>A copy of the “Regional NHS Integration Project: Conservation Authority Natural Heritage System in the Town of Caledon and Region of Peel” report is available on the Peel 2051 project website.</p> <p>In regard to the land uses located at 55 Advance and 13975 Humber Station Rd, the proposed Official Plan policies require the local municipalities to include employment designations in their official plans to accommodate a diverse range of employment uses. The range of potential employment uses is also reflected in the Employment Area definition which gives a broad range of examples: “Areas designated in an official plan for clusters of business and economic activities including, but not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, offices, and associated retail and ancillary facilities.”</p> <p>In regard to the Brampton Ready Mix Property located at 55 Advance Blvd, the Regional Official Plan proposed policy 7.3.4 is intended to clarify boundary delineation which is a general depiction at the Regional scale.</p> <p>The policy states: “7.3.4 The exact lines and boundaries for the information contained in the generalized schedules will be defined in the local municipal official plans, where applicable. The boundaries of the Core Areas of the Greenlands System shown on Schedule Y1 (now renumbered Schedule C-2), and Water Resource System features and areas shown on Schedule X1 (now Schedule A-1) are intended to be general in nature. More detailed mapping of the Core Areas of the Greenlands System and Water Resource System will be provided in the local municipal official plans and will be further determined on a site-specific basis through studies, as may be required by the local municipalities through the local planning approval process, in consultation with the Region and relevant agencies. Due to the general nature of the boundaries shown on Schedules C-2 and A-1), an amendment to the Plan is not required</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				<p>for minor boundary adjustments to the Core Areas of the Greenlands System or Water Resource System as determined through required studies or field investigations.” Amending the current identification of the feature is therefore not necessary or recommended.</p> <p>In regard to the Mississauga Ready Mix Property at 3520 Mavis Road, the Regional Plan recognizes that over time, as lands are redeveloped opportunities for environmental related enhancements may occur. The new policy framework promotes enhancements during the development and redevelopment process. Therefore, areas which could potentially be considered and benefit from future environmental enhancements have been identified. Details regarding the identification of the potential enhancement areas in Conservation Authority Natural Heritage System should be directed to the CA source documents that establish those systems.</p>
STAT-21-052	November 9, 2021	Peter Walker	<p>Reducing lane widths or removing paved-over areas beside curbs could accommodate wider bicycle lanes. The lanes on most Regional roads are wide enough to be narrowed to accommodate these bicycle lanes. The Region of Peel and City of Mississauga are not following best practices by widening the bicycle lanes.</p> <p>Newly built mixed-use pathways will not be widely adopted by pedestrians or cyclists, creating a waste of infrastructure.</p> <p>Public input and best practices about bicycle infrastructure are being ignored by the Region and the City, due to siloed planning mentalities. The planning process is very flawed.</p> <p>Attached photos of measurements of bicycle lanes and roadside infrastructure along Erin Mills Parkway to highlight the unattractiveness, show wasted areas that have been paved over, and demonstrate that there is room for a bicycle lane to be integrated and separated from pedestrian flow.</p>	Noted. Will consider in future updates to the Region’s Sustainable Transportation Strategy.
STAT-21-054	November 10, 2021	Bill Chohan	Requested to convert 9340 Goreway Drive in Brampton from Employment to Mixed Use Commercial. Proposed commercial uses on the ground level of the development and residential uses on higher levels.	See response to comment STAT-21-047.
STAT-21-055	November 12, 2021	Peter Walker	<p>Attached photos of Britannia Road, west of Erin Mills Parkway, where the paved apron beside the curb is 1 metre wide. Could also be increased to 1.6 metres by trimming each traffic lane by 20 centimetres or eliminating wasted space on the road. The specs for Regional roads could be redefined to include bicycle lanes.</p> <p>Grassy margins could be planted with natural meadowland species of grasses and flowers, which would improve views and provide significant ecological benefits.</p> <p>Provided a photo of trees planted under power line infrastructure along Britannia Road in response to a comment from the Region.</p>	Regional staff are implementing infrastructure in accordance with Provincial guidance. Staff will consider these comments in future updates to the Region’s Sustainable Transportation Strategy.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Suggested listening to an interview with the urban officials from Dundee, Scotland on CBC's The Current.	
STAT-21-056	November 10, 2021	Darrin Cohen Planner, Weston Consulting (sent via Jenna Thibault)	Weston Consulting represents the owners of 2025 – 2087 Dundas Street West in Mississauga, 5200 Dixie Road in Mississauga and 110 East Drive in Brampton, which are designated Employment Area in the respective local Official Plans. Also identified within the proposed Employment Area as per the draft Schedule Y6 of the Regional Official Plan Amendment. Described the existing conditions and summarized the applicable land use policy for each site. Preparing to submit an employment conversion request for each property to support future mixed-use development, including residential uses. Requested a meeting with staff to discuss the proposed conversion.	<p>See responses to comments STAT-21-061 (5200 Dixie Rd), STAT-21-062 (2025 – 2087 Dundas Street West) and STAT-21-405 (110 East Drive).</p> <p>The site at 5200 Dixie Rd has been recorded as employment conversion request M28. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>The sites at 2025 – 2087 Dundas St E have been recorded as employment conversion request M29. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>The site at 110 East Drive has been recorded as employment conversion request B35. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focusareas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-057	November 15, 2021	Mustafa Ghassem Delta Urban Inc.	<p>Delta Urban Inc. represents Lark Investments Inc. with respect to lands they own in the city of Brampton within the Bramalea GO MTSA. The subject lands are proposed to be redeveloped from low-order industrial uses towards a high density mixed use community. Provided a description of the vision and justification for the proposed redevelopment.</p> <p>Brampton City Council endorsed a Minister's Zoning Order Resolution Request at its October 25th, 2021 Council Meeting. Requested that the submission and MZO process be taken into due consideration as the Region continues to progress through the MCR process.</p>	<p>Regional staff provided comments to the city of Brampton regarding the request for a Minister's Zoning Order outside of the Regional Official Plan Review, as Minister's Zoning Orders are a tool of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.</p> <p>As part of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review, the lands owned by Lark Investments are being reviewed as employment conversion requests B15, B16, B17, B18, B19, B34, and B37. An employment conversion and removal of the sites from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas.</p> <p>For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-058	December 1, 2021	Christine Fang-Dennisov Principal, Urban Strategies	Submitted an employment conversion request on behalf of SmartCentres REIT for respect to 3155 Argentia Road, 12.6 hectares of land located within the larger 25.6 hectares SmartCentres Meadowvale site. The subject lands are within a Draft Employment Area as identified on the Region's Draft Employment Areas Schedule Y6. The request seeks to remove the subject lands within the Draft Employment Areas to enable a site-specific amendment to the City of Mississauga's Official Plan to provide permissions for a full range of uses, including residential uses. A preliminary development concept has been prepared by IBI Group for the subject lands to illustrate SmartCentre's vision. Described the site context, the preliminary development concept, and the applicable policy framework. Provided planning justification for the employment conversion request responding to the conversion policies set out by the PPS, the Growth Plan, the Region's current conversion policies, the Region's draft conversion policies, and the City of Mississauga's current conversion policies.	The site at 3155 Argentia Road has been recorded as employment conversion request M25. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas. For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
STAT-21-059	November 12, 2021	Leslie Marin	Provided comments on the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Study and Policy Directions. The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2) Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3) Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4) Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing 5) Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6) Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	See response to comment STAT-21-003.
STAT-21-060	November 16, 2021	Jonathan Rodger Senior Associate, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. represents Canadian Tire Corporation Limited in respect to 2021 – 2111 Steeles Avenue East, and 10 and 12 Melanie Drive in Brampton, which are proposed to be redeveloped. The proposed development includes two phases: the first phase of redevelopment for warehousing uses (with office components) and a second phase for the future development of office, retail, and commercial uses. A conversion request was submitted for approximately 4.9 hectares in the northwest corner of Bramalea and Steeles, where retail uses are currently permitted. Provided justification for this employment request. On October 25, 2021, City of Brampton Council passed a resolution related to the "Minister's Zoning Order Resolution Request – Lark Investments" for lands including the Canadian tire lands. Requested clarification regarding the basis for identifying a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer on the subject lands. Stated support of the intent of draft policies for Employment Areas that recognize the importance of accommodating warehouse uses on large	The site at 2021 – 2111 Steeles Avenue East, and 10 and 12 Melanie Drive has been recorded as employment conversion request B12. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas. For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp . The applicant's support for the proposed employment implementation policy

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>parcels of land in strategic locations and Policy 5.8.32 for the MTSA. Requested confirmation as to their understanding that that in the context of the proposed first phase of redevelopment for warehousing uses, the draft MTSA policies do not preclude the possibility of one-storey warehouse buildings where there is consideration for higher density uses at the corner of Bramalea and Steeles under a future phase. In addition, we request clarification as to the interpretation of the Draft MTSA policies as they relate to the proposed redevelopment, where a proposed warehousing building straddles the MTSA boundary.</p>	<p>framework is noted.</p> <p>The identification of Highly Vulnerable Aquifers on Schedule X5 (now renumbered Schedule A-2) is required in accordance with the Clean Water Act which requires municipal official plans to conform to source protection plans approved under the Act. The CTC Region Source Protection Plan and accompanying Assessment Report delineates Highly Vulnerable Aquifers in Peel. Both the CTC Source Protection Plan and Provincial Policy Statement require municipalities to implement necessary restrictions on development and site alteration to protect designated vulnerable areas. Designated vulnerable areas, as defined in the PPS and Clean Water Act, include Highly Vulnerable Aquifers. Policies associated with HVAs are included in the draft Peel 2051 Official Plan.</p> <p>The intent of the MTSA policies is not to preclude typical employment land uses in employment areas that overlap with MTSAs. However, it is necessary that the local municipality consider proposed developments on individual sites in MTSAs in the context of potential development on all lands in the MTSA and ultimately ensuring that the minimum density established in the ROP can be achieved.</p> <p>The applicant's intent for the corner of Bramalea Rd and Steeles Ave to include employment and commercial uses at a higher density than the proposed warehouse facility is recognized, and such proposals shall be reviewed in the context of the local municipal implementation of the Peel 2051 MTSA policy framework, secondary planning, and development application review.</p> <p>MTSA policies apply to properties within the delineated boundary. Regional staff can work with local municipal staff and the applicant to best determine an approach for review of the proposed development which spans multiple properties in and outside of the MTSA boundary.</p>
STAT-21-061	November 19, 2021	Jenna Thibault Senior Planner, Weston Consulting	<p>Requested an employment conversion for 5200 Dixie Road in the City of Mississauga on behalf of the property owner. This request will support the future mixed-use development on the site, including residential uses. Provided a description of the subject property and its policy context. Provided planning justification for the proposed request by addressing the Peel Region Employment conversion policies outlined in the Peel 2051+ Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, the draft Region of Peel 2051 Land Needs Assessment Report, draft Regional Official Plan policies, and the employment conversion request criteria set out in the Growth Plan.</p>	<p>The site at 5200 Dixie Rd has been recorded as employment conversion request M28. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-062	November 19, 2021	Jenna Thibault Senior Planner, Weston Consulting	<p>Provided an employment conversion for 2025 – 2087 Dundas Street East in the City of Mississauga. Described the existing conditions and policy context of the subject lands. Provided planning justification for the proposed request by addressing the Peel Region</p>	<p>The site at 2025 – 2087 Dundas St E has been recorded as employment conversion request M29. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Employment conversion policies outlined in the Peel 2051+ Preliminary Employment Conversion Analysis, the draft Region of Peel 2051 Land Needs Assessment Report, draft Regional Official Plan policies, and the employment conversion request criteria set out in the Growth Plan.</p>	<p>For more information on the Region’s employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-063	November 18, 2021	Sarah Clark Planner, GSAI	<p>Provided comments on the Region’s draft Prime Agricultural Area Mapping (Schedule X12) on behalf of Osprey Valley Golf Course. Will be submitting a Zoning By-law Amendment on the Osprey Valley Golf Course lands for the lands located on the west side of Main Street, 19370 Main Street, for a short course and accessory facilities, which would operate in conjunction with the existing Osprey Valley Golf Course. The draft mapping proposed to designate these lands ‘new’ Prime Agriculture lands. Requested that staff reconsider this designation. Submitted an Agricultural Impact Assessment providing justification as such.</p>	<p>The subject lands are identified as Prime Agricultural Area in the Provincial Agricultural System land base mapping issued by the Province pursuant to the Growth Plan. In accordance with the Growth Plan, the Prime Agricultural Area designation as issued by the Province is currently in effect and will apply to the review of any planning application within the Prime Agricultural Area.</p> <p>The Growth Plan requires that Prime Agricultural Areas be designated in official Plans in accordance with the mapping identified by the Province. Upper-tier municipalities may refine the provincial mapping when their official plans are brought into conformity with the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan, based on implementation procedures issued by the Province.</p> <p>The Region is proposing to refine the Provincial Agricultural System mapping through the Peel 2051 Review and designate Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Lands on a new Schedule X12 (now renumbered Schedule D-1). The proposed refinements were determined through a technical mapping refinement exercise undertaken in consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs and the Town of Caledon. The study methodology ensured a consistent approach in accordance with the Provincial implementation guidelines, utilizing results of the joint Land Evaluation and Area Review Study completed by the Region of Peel and Town of Caledon in 2016. Further details on the mapping refinement undertaken by the Region is available on the Peel 2051 Project Website in the reports titled “Agriculture and Rural Systems Discussion Paper” and “Agricultural System Mapping Refinement”.</p> <p>The subject lands are proposed to be designated Prime Agricultural Area based on the mapping refinement undertaken for the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review. The lands are being included within the Prime Agricultural Area as they are high scoring in both the Region’s LEAR Study and in the Provincial Agricultural System mapping and are part of a larger contiguous Prime Agricultural Area extending south and west of Alton.</p> <p>In accordance with provincial mapping criteria, the evaluation and designation of Prime Agricultural Areas does not exclude smaller areas of natural heritage features. In accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan, Prime Agricultural Areas include areas of prime agricultural</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				lands and associated Canada Land Inventory Class 4 to 7 lands and additional areas where there is a local concentration of farms which exhibit characteristics of ongoing agriculture. The subject lands have been reviewed by Regional staff and are recommended to be designated as Prime Agricultural Area on Schedule D-1 based on provincial criteria and the Region's mapping refinement study. No changes are recommended. Comment addressed in 2022 Public Comment Response Table (January 1, 2022 – March 28, 2022), see comment STAT- 22-014.
STAT-21-064	November 22, 2021	John Lohmus Plan Logic Consulting Inc.	The Mississauga Muslim Community Centre is seeking to redevelop the property at 2502 Dixie Road in the City of Mississauga for a 25-storey mixed-use building containing grade-related retail uses, office uses, and upper storey residential apartment units. Requested that the Region consider changing two items on the draft revised October 1, 2021 Regional Official Plan policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference to the Region of Peel to the proposed policy in Section 2.16.11.4 so that this policy commits the Region to working collaboratively with the City of Mississauga and the TRCA to evaluate the role of the existing Dixie Road bridge in flooding of the area surrounding the Dixie Road and Dundas Street East intersection by the Little Etobicoke Creek, and to implementing flood remediation measures at Etobicoke Creek and Dixie/Dundas; and • Delete the word "gentle" from the proposed policy in Section 5.6.19.10. Provided justification for each of these requests.	Policy 2.16.11.4 is intended to provide direction to the Conservation Authorities and Local Municipalities that reflects the interest of the Region to reduce the level of flooding risk. Section 2.16 of the Regional Official Plan contains the policies that address Natural and Human-made Hazards including Lake Ontario Regulatory Shoreline, Ravine, Valley, Stream Corridors and Erosion Hazards, as well as Riverine Flood Plains. The policies clarify that the Region is committed to working in collaboration with partners to address the various types of natural hazards that occur in Peel. Regional Official Plan policy would typically not provide policy direction regarding commitments to fund or implement specific public works projects. Policy 5.6.19.10 has been revised to clarify planning for intensification in MTSAs.
STAT-21-065	November 22, 2021	Christine Fang-Dennisov Principal, Urban Strategies (sent via Alex Health)	Submitted Conversion Rationale on behalf of SmartCentres REIT in support of an employment land conversion request for 1100 Burnhamthorpe Road West. The request seeks to remove the subject lands within the Draft Employment Areas to enable a site-specific amendment to the City of Mississauga's Official Plan to provide permissions for a full range of uses, including residential uses. A preliminary development concept has been prepared by IBI Group for the subject lands to illustrate SmartCentre's vision. Described the site context, the preliminary development concept, and the applicable policy framework. Provided planning justification for the employment conversion request responding to the conversion policies set out by the PPS, the Growth Plan, the Region's current conversion policies, the Region's draft conversion policies, and the City of Mississauga's current conversion policies.	The site at 1100 Burnhamthorpe Rd W has been recorded as employment conversion request M26. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas. For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
STAT-21-066	November 22, 2021	Christine Fang-Dennisov Principal, Urban Strategies (sent via Alex Health)	Submitted Conversion Rationale on behalf of SmartCentres REIT in support of an employment land conversion request for 780 Burnhamthorpe Road West. The request seeks to remove the subject lands within the Draft Employment Areas to enable a site-specific amendment to the City of Mississauga's Official Plan to provide permissions for a full range of uses, including residential uses. A preliminary development concept has	The site at 780 Burnhamthorpe Rd W has been recorded as employment conversion request M27. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported. For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			been prepared by IBI Group for the subject lands to illustrate SmartCentre’s vision. Described the site context, the preliminary development concept, and the applicable policy framework. Provided planning justification for the employment conversion request responding to the conversion policies set out by the PPS, the Growth Plan, the Region’s current conversion policies, the Region’s draft conversion policies, and the City of Mississauga’s current conversion policies.	assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp .
STAT-21-067	November 23, 2021	Daniela Niddery Environmental Defence	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	<p>Response provided to commenter stating: The Region of Peel needs to be prepared to accommodate an additional 700,000 people and 335,000 jobs over the next 30 years, to support a total of 2.3 million people and 1.1 million jobs by 2051. The Peel 2051 Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Review will result in an approved guiding document for how Peel will accommodate growth in a manner that supports healthy, livable, and complete communities.</p> <p>The Region has undertaken the Land Needs Assessment Methodology (LNA) mandated by the province. The purpose of the LNA is to ensure that sufficient land is available within Peel’s three municipalities to accommodate forecasted growth and address all forms of housing, while avoiding shortages that would increase the costs of housing and impact employment.</p> <p>The Draft Peel 2051 Official Plan Amendment incorporates a balanced approach that provides a range and mix of housing options and addresses a number of regional and provincial policy initiatives, such as responding to climate change, efficient use of infrastructure, supporting complete communities, healthy development, affordable housing, age-friendly planning, sustainable transportation, and fiscal sustainability.</p> <p>This approach results in over 75% (530,000 people and 280,000 jobs) being accommodated within existing settlement areas and 50% of all new residential development occurring within apartment-built forms.</p> <p>A minimum intensification rate of 55% is recommended, which is above the provincial minimum of 50%. This recommendation supports local planning activities, compact built forms, and transit-supportive densities. As an example, in Mississauga, over 95% of new development will be through intensification, recognizing the transit and community infrastructure is in place and planned to support higher density development.</p> <p>Recommendations for new settlement areas are focused on expansions to the communities of Mayfield West and Bolton which have been long identified as the focus for future growth. The recommendations are supported by comprehensive technical studies addressing matters such as climate change, sub watershed planning, natural heritage, agriculture, healthy development, servicing, finance, transportation, and employment.</p>
STAT-21-	November 23,	Dorothy Lorelli	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
068	2021		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-069	November 23, 2021	Kristen Dobson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-070	November 23, 2021	Pat Dwyer	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-071	November 23, 2021	Deb Dobson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	
STAT-21-072	November 23, 2021	Linda Schleihauf	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-079	November 23, 2021	Marlene Smith	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-080	November 23, 2021	Vhemsley	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-081	November 23, 2021	Krista Bowman	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-082	November 23, 2021	Alex Chamberlain	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-083	November 23, 2021	Elisia Ciancio	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-084	November 23, 2021	Jessica Whelan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-085	November 23, 2021	Debra Moy	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-086	November 23, 2021	Jan Bob Whitmore	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-087	November 23, 2021	Maria Mishdenk	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-088	November 23, 2021	Theresa Marinacci	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-089	November 23, 2021	Christina McEwen	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-090	November 23, 2021	Larry Dallan	<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-091	November 23, 2021	Lucrezia Chiappetta	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-092	November 23, 2021	Raj Dahari	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-093	November 23, 2021	Mary Ellen Branigan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-094	November 23, 2021	Bill Horton	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-095	November 23, 2021	Rhys Manning	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-096	November 23, 2021	Allison Smyth	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-097	November 23, 2021	Lynn Bennett	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-098	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Patrick McParland	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-099	November 23, 2021	Joanne Avison	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-100	November 23, 2021	Kathryn Reid	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-101	November 23, 2021	Rick and Melodie Walsh	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.
STAT-21-102	November 23, 2021	Sabeen Abbas	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-103	November 23, 2021	Susan Ware	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-104	November 23, 2021	Glo	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-105	November 23, 2021	Mike Fogt	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-106	November 23, 2021	Justin Dawson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-107	November 23, 2021	Kevin Locke	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace,</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-108	November 23, 2021	Venecia Noseworthy	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-109	November 23, 2021	Amber Murphy	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion. Constituents who want the sprawl to stop are paying close attention to the decisions Regional Council will be making.</p>	
STAT-21-110	November 23, 2021	Leanne Cooper	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-111	November 23, 2021	Jean Armogan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-112	November 23, 2021 (x3)	Marion Ward	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-113	November 23, 2021	Wanda Kwiecien	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-114	November 23, 2021	John Steckley	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-115	November 23, 2021	Coleman	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-116	November 23, 2021	Cat Young	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-117	November 23, 2021	C.B. Bredschneider	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-118	November 23, 2021	Desantos	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-119	November 23, 2021	Mona Petrillo	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-120	November 23, 2021	Jillian Lucas	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-121	November 23, 2021	Bill van Geest	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-122	November 23, 2021	Sarbjit Gill	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-123	November 23, 2021	Diana Janosik-Wronski	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace,</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-124	November 23, 2021	R. Wilson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-125	November 23, 2021	Libby Yuill	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-126	November 23, 2021	Richard Oliver	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Would like to continue hike in green space. Concerned that Ontario will not be able to feed itself in another 30 years if this proposal goes ahead and more farmland disappears at an even greater rate. The current rate of sprawl is already too great.	
STAT-21-127	November 23, 2021	Kim Thoroski	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-128	November 23, 2021	William R. Clarke	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>Would like to continue hike in green space. Concerned that Ontario will not be able to feed itself in another 30 years if this proposal goes ahead and more farmland disappears at an even greater rate. The current rate of sprawl is already too great.</p>	
STAT-21-129	November 23, 2021	Terri DeVriese	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>Would like to continue hike in green space. Concerned that Ontario will not be able to feed itself in another 30 years if this proposal goes ahead and more farmland disappears at an even greater rate. The current rate of sprawl is already too great.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-130	November 23, 2021	Roger Best	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>As a homeowner in Mississauga, there is enough sprawl already. Would hate to lose the remaining green space to more warehouses and car dependant subdivisions. Paving over these areas will have a lasting effect on future generations and works against our climate goals. We should not pander to the selfish desires of developers but try to find better solutions to meet the needs of our growing city.</p> <p>So many neighborhoods in Mississauga are car dependant, it makes no sense to continue to develop more of the same.</p> <p>Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-131	November 23, 2021	Marion Kinio	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-132	November 23, 2021	Stacie Roberts	<p>Please try to envision a future without this land and natural areas and what impact it will also have on the emotional health of future generations.</p> <p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-133	November 23, 2021	Silvana Iandoli	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.	
STAT-21-134	November 23, 2021	Beverly O'Grady	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-135	November 23, 2021	Marguerite Adamson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-136	November 23, 2021	Carol Robinson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare. Wildlife displacement is also major concern.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-137	November 23, 2021 (x3)	Geoff Day	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>At a time when there is an increasing climate crisis, we need to see leadership show that they are really serious. Focusing on economics only does not show any such leadership. Our grandchildren will pay the price.</p>	
STAT-21-138	November 23, 2021	Trevor Boston	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-139	November 23, 2021	Vivien Armstrong	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-140	November 23, 2021	Trevor Donnelly	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-141	November 23, 2021	Erika Agnew	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-142	November 23, 2021	Sarah Embers	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace,</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-143	November 23, 2021	Gerald Grant	<p>On the heels of the Provincial government being called out for their environmental performance just yesterday it is important that Peel Region does not approach development with the same ‘slash and burn’ mentality. Smart sustainable development should be at the forefront of any and all decisions as we face issues around food security and climate change, with 15-minute cities the guideline for growth.</p> <p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 23,	Carina Rampelt	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
144	2021		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-145	November 23, 2021	Meredith Bishop	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-146	November 23, 2021	Judy Totzke	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-147	November 23, 2021 (x2)	John Johnston	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-148	November 23, 2021	Christine Reynolds	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-149	November 23, 2021	Margaret Barrie	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-150	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Lise Massie	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-151	November 23, 2021	Alain Ouellet	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	
STAT-21-152	November 23, 2021	Lina D'Amico	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-153	November 23, 2021	Marg Mckillop	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-154	November 23, 2021	David Moule	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-155	November 23, 2021	Carrie Rubel	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-156	November 23, 2021	Michelle Meandro	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to impose hard urban boundaries and vote "no" to any expansion of the existing settlement areas. Staff need to re-evaluate their concepts and apply theories based on only the existing urban lines. All elected representatives need to think more creatively and truly understand the long term repercussions of your decisions. It is not that difficult in many cases. The damage caused by sprawl is no longer something we can recover from and in today's climate and environmental crisis we need to rethink what we do, when we do it and how we do it. The recent Auditor General's report should set off the alarm bells and raise the need for Council to act courageously and recognize the shortfalls of the past to make better choices.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s settlement area boundary would be a disaster for Caledon, as the last green space. Peel, as a whole, needs to understand the contribution Caledon</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>makes and its role as a rural offset to Peel's urbanization. If that is destroyed, then Peel has nothing left for our natural heritage, our ecosystems, our mental health gateways (as was evidenced by COVID), our farmland and so much more, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to nothing but bulldozers. Caledon already sees uncontrolled and poorly thought-out use of land.</p> <p>What little is left of our greenspace, farmland, wildlife habitats, wetlands etc. Furthermore, we have obligations to deal with climate change and its impact. Fragile ecologies should not be up for grabs by anybody. It is bad enough Premier Ford has taken the feet from under all Conservation Authorities, has approved what may be considered illegal MZOs, has failed to adequately assess environmental issues all of which makes one wonder about fraudulent use of office powers...and the list goes on and is growing exponentially each day. It is up to local and regional Councils to stand up for the greater good and who must now look to valid scientific authorities on their own accord.</p> <p>We also need to recognize and acknowledge that within elected members at several levels of government, there are possible conflicts of interest in this decision and an excessive degree of potential opportunity for personal, friend and/or family gains and no one is recusing themselves. This is not democracy or ethics at its finest hour. Vote no to any expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-157	November 23, 2021	Jaycei	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-158	November 23, 2021	Janet Manning	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion. This is an urgent request to leave a legacy of which your families and constituents can be proud.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-159	November 23, 2021	Allison Olmes	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-160	November 23, 2021	Lyne Deschênes	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-161	November 23, 2021	Deanna Plouffe	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-162	November 23, 2021	Wesley Choy	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-163	November 23, 2021	Mark Edwards	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-164	November 23, 2021	Magdalena and Sagi Denenberg	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-165	November 23, 2021	Marion Herron	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-166	November 23, 2021	Cindy Martins	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-167	November 23, 2021	Karen Mann	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-168	November 23, 2021	Margaret Mair	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-169	November 23, 2021	Gary Paiva	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-170	November 23, 2021	Judy Morten	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-171	November 23, 2021	Sheila Vermeersch	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-172	November 23, 2021	Anjna Jarmana	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-173	November 23, 2021	Bernadette Antonutti	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-174	November 23, 2021	Lucia Pereira	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-175	November 23, 2021	Hester Esterhuizen	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-176	November 23, 2021	Patricia Buckley	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-177	November 23, 2021	Kirpal S.	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-178	November 23, 2021	Mikaeel Ghany	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-179	November 23, 2021	Kathryn MacDuffee	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-180	November 23, 2021	Caitlin Ciampaglia	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-181	November 23, 2021	Vilma Brooker	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-182	November 23, 2021	Laszlo Zoltan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace,</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-183	November 23, 2021	Andrea Tong	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-184	November 23, 2021	Corinne Campbell	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-185	November 23, 2021	Diane Tolstoy	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 23,	Maureen Harper	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
186	2021		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-187	November 23, 2021	Joanne Toon	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-188	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Pat Treacy	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-189	November 23, 2021	Claudia Espindola	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-190	November 23, 2021	Henry Cannon	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-191	November 23, 2021	Sarah Dolamore	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-192	November 23, 2021	Vicki Tran	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-193	November 23, 2021	Kayla-Jane Barrie	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-194	November 23, 2021	Ann Campbell	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-195	November 23, 2021	Sue Carlson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-196	November 23, 2021	Al Peters	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-197	November 23, 2021	Kathleen Wilson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051, which is 917 acres per yar.</p> <p>After seeing the recent destruction in British Columbia, moving into protected areas and ecosystems destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered species and our quality farmland.</p> <p>We owe our planet more a hard no on taking away valuable land for sprawl and carbon spewing trucking and warehouses.</p> <p>Follow the lead of Hamilton and just say NO to expanding our SABE into sensitive areas.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-198	November 23, 2021	Nick	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace,</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-199	November 23, 2021	Kim McCallum	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-200	November 23, 2021	Joshua Santos	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-201	November 23, 2021	Ryan Q.	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 23,	Bette-Ann Goldstein	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
202	2021 (x2)		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-203	November 23, 2021	Dawn Gerry	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-204	November 23, 2021	Lynn Allan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion. Urged Council to take a long-range perspective and preserve lands that will be vital for biodiversity, agriculture and dealing with climate change.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-205	November 23, 2021	Stacey Wilson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-206	November 23, 2021	Tanya Grant	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-207	November 23, 2021	Linda Pim	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-208	November 23, 2021	Stephanie Jackson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-209	November 23, 2021	Nicole Bitter	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-210	November 23, 2021	Carly Balestreri	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-211	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Mike Grzyb	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-212	November 23, 2021	Emily Roeder	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace,</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-213	November 23, 2021	Christine Tassone	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-214	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Christine Webster	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-215	November 23, 2021	Patricia Conway	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 23,	Larry Flint	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
216	2021		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-217	November 23, 2021	Peter Dmytrasz	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-218	November 23, 2021	Michael Rose	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-219	November 23, 2021	Sharon Anderson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-220	November 23, 2021	Rajbalinder Ghatoura	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-221	November 23, 2021	Warren Young	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-222	November 23, 2021	Jane Kelk	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-223	November 23, 2021	Ann Lay	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-224	November 23, 2021	Mary O'Brien	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-225	November 23, 2021	Denis MacDougall	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-226	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Lou Pellegini	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-227	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Sheila Goldman	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-228	November 23, 2021	James Tennant	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-229	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Gail MacLennan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-230	November 23, 2021	Zilda Teixeira	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-231	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Al Axworthy	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-232	November 23, 2021	K. Coleman	<p>Please vote no to SABE. We cannot continue to increase urban sprawl over our farm and wetlands. Great idea to build more housing but very bad idea to eliminate the land that provides food for the people who reside in that housing. If we do not preserve our water supply, a lack of clean drinking water will result. If we do not preserve our farmlands, an unsustainable local good supply will be created. If we do not preserve our wetlands – well, we can kiss our butts goodbye. Everyone in the government must act now, not talk about, to reduce the effect of climate change.</p> <p>Please note no to expanding urban sprawl in the sensitive and live-sustaining areas and find alternatives to expand housing/industrial areas in the existing plan.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-233	November 23, 2021	Marcus Jones	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-234	November 23, 2021	David Coutts	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-235	November 23, 2021	Chris Goodhand	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Please do not allow this expansion to take place. Not only are we replacing the very wetlands that are hugely effective in combating climate change, but this is proposing to replace it with development does the opposite.</p>	
STAT-21-236	November 23, 2021	Omar Martinez	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-237	November 23, 2021	Carole Sisto	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-238	November 23, 2021	Jeanne Kannenberg	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-239	November 23, 2021	Tony Ferrante	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-240	November 23, 2021	Laurie Stewart	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-241	November 23, 2021	Wayne Van Dyke	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-242	November 23, 2021	Kathleen Moleski	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Given the climate change-related events in BC that we have witnessed this last year, you must agree that climate change is the single most important issue facing mankind. Building over farmland and green spaces is no way to act when we are such an existential threat. I ask you to take the lead of Hamilton who has just voted not to expand their urban boundary.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-243	November 23, 2021	David Zheng	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-244	November 23, 2021	Wendy Hart	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-245	November 23, 2021	Carthy Ngo	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-246	November 23, 2021	Shefaza Esmail	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-247	November 23, 2021	Jaime Kearnan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-248	November 23, 2021	John Thomson	<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-249	November 23, 2021	Spunky Romero	<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-250	November 23, 2021	Maren Nielsen	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-251	November 23, 2021	Astrid Hardjana-Large	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-252	November 23, 2021	Ian Weir	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-253	November 23, 2021	Lizzy Woods	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-254	November 23, 2021	Jenni Le Forestier	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2</p>	<p>Please see response to comment STAT-21- 067.</p> <p>A Major Transit Station Area has been identified as a delineated “primary” MTSA at the future Bolton GO station (see HUB-1) in the Regional Official Plan Table 5 and Schedule Y7. This will require that a minimum density of 150 people and jobs per hectare is planned for. A “planned” MTSA (HUB-2) is also identified at the Mayfield West future transit hub.</p> <p>The Region continues to advocate for additional transit service to Peel and specifically the designated greenfield areas to be developed in the future, to ensure that sustainable travel modes are available for residents to use instead of settling into car-centric travel habits.</p> <p>Regional staff have provided comments to the Province and expressed concerns with the use of Minister’s Zoning Orders. Further information can be found via the Region’s April 1, 2021 comments on the Proposed Changes to Minister’s Zoning Orders and the Planning Act (ERO 019-3233) (https://prod-environmental-registry.s3.amazonaws.com/public_uploads/2021-04/Region of Peel Comments on ERO 019-3233.pdf). Please note that Minister’s Zoning Orders are a Planning Act tool used by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and are not made by the Region through the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit GO station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber Station Road on greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-255	November 23, 2021	Siony	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-256	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Loyd Chaplin	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-257	November 23, 2021	James Franze	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-258	November 23, 2021	Ernest Pietrobon	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-259	November 23, 2021	Sarah Summers	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-260	November 23, 2021	Randell Family	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-261	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Leonela Zavala	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-262	November 23, 2021	Patricia DeFeudis	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-263	November 23, 2021	Beverley Bryck	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-264	November 23, 2021	Stephanie Bonnell	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-265	November 23, 2021	J.B. Murcar	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-266	November 23, 2021	Maureen and Michael Teixeira	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-267	November 23, 2021	Chris McGlynn	<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-268	November 23, 2021	Sandy Coward	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-269	November 23, 2021	Laj K.	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-270	November 23, 2021	Rita Poprawa	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-271	November 23, 2021	Dianne Cunningham	<p>Please examine alternatives to SABE given the climate change crisis. Study and think about the potential harm to be caused by this expansion. Prefers space that is livable for both wildlife and humans.</p> <p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 23,	Sue Jackson	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
272	2021		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-273	November 23, 2021	Alek Petric	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-274	November 23, 2021	Carol Aziz	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-275	November 23, 2021	Anne Chesterton	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-276	November 23, 2021	Linda Shin	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-277	November 23, 2021	Solveig Christina Voß	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-278	November 23, 2021	Tricia Prato	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-279	November 23, 2021	Howard Russo	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-280	November 23, 2021	Elisabeth Ljubicic	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-281	November 23, 2021	Hill	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-282	November 23, 2021	Robert Nicholson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-283	November 23, 2021	Mimi Chan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-284	November 23, 2021	S. Henderson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	
STAT-21-285	November 23, 2021	Lorraine Blier	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-286	November 23, 2021	Milli Pellezzari	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-287	November 23, 2021	Stephen Lum	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-288	November 23, 2021	Earl Close	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-289	November 23, 2021	Chris Cox	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-290	November 23, 2021	Al Villiers	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-291	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Christine Pearce	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-292	November 23, 2021	Jane Gray	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-293	November 23, 2021	Ruth Krampitz	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-294	November 23, 2021	David Laing	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-295	November 23, 2021	Peter Forte	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-296	November 23, 2021	Ashley P.	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-297	November 23, 2021	Philip Currie	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-298	November 23, 2021	Rodney and Sonja Barge	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-299	November 23, 2021	Peter Lewis	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-300	November 23, 2021	Elaine Cairns	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-301	November 23, 2021	Lisa Swinton	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-302	November 23, 2021	Nadia Niro	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-303	November 23, 2021	Sharon Hurlburt	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-304	November 23, 2021	Michelle Niro	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-305	November 23, 2021	Atish Pereira	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-306	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Judith Johnson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-307	November 23, 2021	Henry Ruppert	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-308	November 23, 2021 (x3), November 24, 2021	Brenda Dolling	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-309	November 23, 2021	Detrik Liznick	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit GO Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber Station Road on greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-310	November 23, 2021	Linda Lundström	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p> <p>Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-311	November 23, 2021	Franca DeAngelis	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-312	November 23, 2021	Doreen Geneau	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion. Please take action to save our much needed green space.</p>	
STAT-21-313	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Elizabeth Girouard	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 23,	Vittorio E. Iandoli	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
314	2021		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-315	November 23, 2021	Marcus Martin	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-316	November 23, 2021	Nancy Hurst	<p>Hamilton Council rejected the staff recommendation of a SABE.</p> <p>Even pro-development Councillors cited the dangers of paving over Prime 1,2,3 farmland for more urban sprawl which will only serve to line the pockets of the developers. Those developers who, for instance, donate large sums to councillors' election campaigns. Citizens here are readily able to refer to publicly available tax filings to determine which Councillors received the most donations from developers. Here in Hamilton the vote was 3-13 for no expansion, and the three Councillors who voted for expansion, have, it was noted, each received substantial donations from the development industry. These three will be acutely remembered come the next election in Hamilton.</p> <p>Peel seems to be tone deaf to the looming climate emergency and the urgent need to preserve farmland, natural heritage, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and woodlots. I would urge you to follow the example of Hamilton and look within your current boundary to find the space needed, with zoning revisions and by using existing designated greenfield areas, and grey fields to direct growth for the time being to within your current boundary. The attached map was recently published in the Hamilton Spectator and indicates all the underutilized space (sprawling parking lots and grey field areas) within our city that can be used for Missing Middle housing, semis, SDUs and other types of ground-related housing that are required to be built in order to be in conformity with the provincial growth plan. If Hamilton can find space within our current boundary, Peel should be able to do it.</p> <p>Copied and pasted the article 'Mapping Hamilton's vacant spaces helps paint a picture for the future' by Zoe Green.</p>	<p>Please also see response to comment STAT-21-072</p> <p>Addressing climate change has been an important theme throughout the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review. Climate change is now addressed in a new section, that includes broad climate goals and policy direction to conduct greenhouse gas inventories, with direction to undertake adaptation planning and emissions reduction planning. Draft climate change policies have been embedded throughout key theme areas in the Plan including in growth management, transportation, housing, energy, natural heritage, water resources and agriculture policy sections.</p> <p>Importantly, a climate change lens has been applied to the different growth management components of Peel 2051 which emphasizes a more compact and transit supportive built form; policies to support sustainable modes of transportation; implementation of alternative and renewable energy systems; watershed planning; and the protection and enhancement of natural systems. The policies provide a balanced approach and emphasize intensification to accommodate a significant portion of population growth in existing built-up areas, with policy direction to develop compact, mixed use and transit-oriented communities.</p> <p>Regarding the Region's Peel 2051 Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) Study and the recommended identification of new settlement area in Caledon, the impact of settlement expansion on the Region's Agricultural System and Greenlands System, including on Prime Agricultural Areas, was considered in Scoped Subwatershed and Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) technical studies. The evaluation of alternative locations for settlement expansion based on avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts was addressed.</p> <p>Technical study recommendations to mitigate impacts are being implemented in policy direction in the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>Climate change, natural heritage, and agricultural criteria, including minimizing the consumption of agricultural land, was considered in the development of growth management policies and the Land Needs Assessment that established the need for settlement expansion.</p>
STAT-21-317	November 23, 2021	Shirley Bevacqua	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes</p>	<p>Please see response to comment STAT-21-067</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-318	November 23, 2021	Flora Sopjani	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-319	November 24, 2021 (x4)	Sandy Venditti	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-320	November 24, 2021	Dragana Mirkovic	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-321	November 24, 2021	Myron Plex	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-322	November 24, 2021	Leah Nacua	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-323	November 24, 2021	Dianne Leigh	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-324	November 24, 2021	Kathy Jakubik	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-325	November 24, 2021	Michelle Hillier on behalf of Jenni Le Forestier	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit GO Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber Station Road on greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-326	November 24, 2021	Najamuddin Mohammed	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-327	November 24, 2021	Isabella Cervera	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-328	November 24, 2021	Doug and Anne Oldham	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-329	November 24, 2021	Katie O.	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-330	November 24, 2021	Leah Heidenheim	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-331	November 24, 2021	Janet Hill	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-332	November 24, 2021	Shirley Pottruff	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-333	November 24, 2021	Hanny Simo	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-334	November 24, 2021	Anne Solomon	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit GO Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber Station Road on greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-335	November 24, 2021	Nirmala and Jailall Subraj	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-336	November 24, 2021	Julie Di Felice	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 24,	Henry	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
337	2021 (x3)		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-338	November 24, 2021	Stephen Wilson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-339	November 24, 2021	Donna Lee Milne	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-340	November 24, 2021	Barb O’Mara	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-341	November 24, 2021	Maria Hrabovsky	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-342	November 24, 2021	Christine Schofield	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-343	November 24, 2021	Christina Cicconetti	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-344	November 24, 2021	L. Olarie	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-345	November 24, 2021	Dan O'Reilly	<p>The Region of Peel should follow Hamilton’s lead and reject the proposed draft recommended SABE and policies. Please consider any number of viable alternative options to provide needed housing over the next 30 years. Regional staff should be instructed to prepare a plan which accommodates growth within existing settlement area boundaries. A critical component of such a study would be an analysis and inventory of available serviced vacant land.</p> <p>Expanding the settlement boundary would have a devastating impact on natural heritage features and farmland and would the commit the region, for the next 30 years, to double the rate at which greenspace is being lost. The fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, would be destroyed. It is my understanding that more than 27,000 acres of Peel last remaining forests, farmlands, and natural areas will be consumed up by sprawl if this boundary expansion is endorsed.</p> <p>The world is facing a climate change crisis. Approving this expansion will only accentuate that crisis through the loss of habitat and farmland and the emission of greenhouses gases by having more traffic on local roads and highways.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-346	November 24, 2021	Judy Reid	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-347	November 24, 2021	Bunny C.	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-348	November 24, 2021	Carr and Patricia Thornton	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-349	November 24, 2021	Dario Ceci	<p>Owns 13464 The Gore Road within the Town of Caledon, which is approximately 24.34 hectares in area. The subject lands partially proposed to be located within the Conceptual SABE as per Draft Z2 (Strategic Growth Areas) of the proposed Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>Caledon’s community structure has long been fragmented through the Rural Service Centre approach between the communities of Bolton and Mayfield West. The Region’s comprehensive approach to the SABE is a welcomed approach. Supports including the partial inclusion of the subject lands in the SABE for future community and residential land uses. The subject lands represent an ideal opportunity to provide housing supply and Regional services in a timely and equitable manner for all lands being included within the Strategic Growth Areas.</p> <p>Requested Notice for any land use decisions and public input opportunities. The servicing progression should be Regionally led and not cause a fragmented</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #28.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Policies are included in the draft amendment to guide the logical staging and sequencing of growth to 2051.</p> <p>Preparation of Secondary Plans by the Town of Caledon require public consultation, so there will be opportunities to provide input.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>implementation of new community areas. Instead, the approach should be comprehensive and approach local sequencing of services to permit timely development and phasing, including for the subject lands.</p> <p>As secondary planning is implemented, the Region and Town should work with all stakeholders/landowners (including those not actively part of any landowner groups). SABE ID #28</p>	
STAT-21-350	November 24, 2021	Scott Ridge	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit Go Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber station Rd on Greenfields.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-351	November 24, 2021	Sharif Siddiqui	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-352	November 24, 2021	Beth Prashad	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-353	November 24, 2021	John and Anne MacRae	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-354	November 23, 2021 (x2)	Evan	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-355	November 24, 2021	Evan Knopp	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-356	November 24, 2021	Anna Marie Vrána	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-357	November 24, 2021	Carolyn Herbert	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit Go Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber station Rd on Greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-358	November 24, 2021	Angela Grella	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit GO Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber station Rd on Greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-359	November 24, 2021	Ron Wells	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion. Stop the destruction of eco-systems vital to the habitat and survival of many fragile species that depend on these lands and watersheds. These areas deserve greenbelt protection, not exploitation.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-360	November 24, 2021	Alanna May	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-361	November 24, 2021	Alex Srdoc	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-	November 24,	Catherine Petersen	Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
362	2021		<p>Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-363	November 24, 2021	Leszek Pisarek	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-364	November 24, 2021	Debbie Hill	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-365	November 24, 2021	Barbara Schumacher	<p>There is a wave of opposition building across the Province toward government actions and land use actions (i.e., Highway 413 and Bradford By-pass). Communities must consider the impacts of their decisions through the lens of the climate emergency that we are in. Action and mitigation need to be implemented immediately. Land use decisions must not be based on historical patterns and market demands and must instead focus on providing a safe climate future.</p> <p>Requested that Peel Region Council reject the draft recommended SABE and policies, asked that Council instead ask staff to prepare a growth plan which accommodates the next 30 years of the Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing settlement area boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s settlement area boundary would pave over our natural environments and prime farmland, which will be critical for carbon storage, flood</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			mitigation, water recharge areas, cooling tree canopy, food security, ecosystem, and natural habitat conservation. These are the invaluable services of the natural environment that must not be lost to Peel Region or the Province of Ontario.	
STAT-21-366	November 24, 2021	Ernest Scholten	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-367	November 24, 2021	Barbara Grydzuk	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-368	November 25, 2021	Marlena Perich and Jason Hull	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit Go Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber station Rd on Greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-369	November 25, 2021 (x3)	Judith Johnson	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-370	November 25, 2021	Elisabeth Evans	<p>Concerned that that further expansion into the most productive farmland, watersheds and natural areas of our region will have long-term negative effects for our population. Housing developments which are built in such a way that force people to drive everywhere are not the way forward to a sustainable future, and if these new policies will be in force for the next 30 years, you owe it to the people of Peel to proceed with the utmost caution.</p> <p>Many studies have shown, that instead of sprawl, it makes more sense to look at existing communities, and create infill projects to develop vibrant, accessible communities. Sprawl creates more congestion on highways and building new highways is not the answer.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Please keep the Greenbelt and other existing natural areas, which contribute so much to our health and well-being, intact and safe long into the future.</p>	
STAT-21-371	November 25, 2021	Ashley Lewis	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit Go Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber station Rd on Greenfields.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-372	November 25, 2021	Dr. Evan Lewis	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Sprawling illegal trucking hubs is not the appropriate land use for Class 1 and 2 farmlands. Ministers Zoning Orders are being used to fast-track e-commerce warehousing on some of Canada’s best prime farmland. This is the antithesis of what planning should look like during a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The Auditor General’s report on November 21 has stated that Ministers Zoning Orders are unlawful and violate the Environmental Bill of Rights. Minister Clarke has granted two of them to Caledon without proper justification. If Amazon has their way, they will get a third MZO to build their 2.2 million square ft warehouse on the Greenbelt ignoring the impact to a woodlot, river, and endangered species.</p> <p>There is no transit GO Station planned for Bolton in the next 30 years. Expanding the Settlement Boundary cannot be justified to build community or a sense of place for a sprawling subdivision at Humber station Rd on Greenfields.</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-254

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-373	November 25, 2021	Heather Kipling	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-374	November 25, 2021	Kate	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-375	November 25, 2021	Ravi Venkatesh	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-376	November 25, 2021	Elizabeth Eves	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region's residents said they would "much prefer" to live in a neighborhood where they "didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school."</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-377	November 25, 2021	Phil Pothen Environmental Defence	<p>Environmental Defence urged Peel Region Planning and Growth Management Committee and Regional Council to direct staff to halt any further work/consultation regarding the draft recommended SABE. Recommended that staff instead produce a plan to achieve an assessed community area land need of 0 ha and an assembled employment land need of 0 ha, through zoning and other measures which will accommodate the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing settlement area boundaries.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the Minister's intentions, the Growth Plan, the Land Needs Assessment Methodology for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Provincial Policy Statement, and other applicable planning instruments do not, in my submission, technically require an extension of the settlement area boundary. On the contrary, there is a strong case to be made that the present draft recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion is contrary to the Provincial Policy Statement. Separate from the Growth Plan intensification minimums, municipal governments are prohibited from extending their settlement area boundaries unless it is impossible to accommodate projected demand for each housing types within the existing settlement area boundary. It is evident from the relevant technical documents that the Land Needs Assessments prepared to date have not factored in the capacity, through zoning reform, to accommodate new single and semi-detached homes within on existing residential lots. In Hamilton, the factoring in of this untapped capacity led to reduction of proposed SABE to 0 ha.</p> <p>Expanding Peel's settlement area will cause an unacceptable loss of farmland and natural heritage: factoring in the large amount of excess greenfield land approved in previous rounds of settlement area boundary expansion, it would burn through roughly</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>27,500 more acres by 2051. Of particular note, in addition to destroying precious farmland itself, it is inevitable that conversion of farmland will have very serious spillover effects on adjacent natural heritage lands, destroying last remaining habitat for the endangered redbird dace.</p> <p>Expanding Peel’s settlement area, and thus squandering a large share of the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl is also incompatible with the Region’ obligation to tackle car dependency and slash carbon emissions. This would harm the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because the next 30 years of new homes and workplaces are needed to give existing neighbourhoods densities that make active transportation viable for most people. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they’d “much prefer” to live in a neighbourhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p>	
STAT-21-378	November 25, 2021	Elisa Zeledon	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-379	November 26, 2021	Shaw	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-380	November 30, 2021	Tamara Tannis Associate, MHBC	<p>MHBC represents North American Development Group with respect to three blocks of land located immediately south of the Mount Pleasant GO Station, on the north side of Bovaird Drive West with parcels situated on both the east and west sides of Creditview Road in the City of Brampton. The subject lands are located within the 800-metre walking radius of the Mount Pleasant GO MTSA are now within the MTSA’s delineated boundary. Provided comments regarding the draft Peel 2051 ROPA with respect to the subject lands.</p> <p>The OMB issued a decision to rezone the subject lands from Agricultural (A) zone to Residential Apartments (R4A-3527) and Commercial (C3-3526) in 2017. Provided further policy context on the subject lands.</p> <p>Expressed support for draft policy amendments related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directing growth to the Urban System lands with a focus on Strategic Growth Areas; • Focusing on Strategic Growth Areas for intensification; • Minimum density targets for MTSAs; • Renaming the Specific Policy Area to ‘North West Brampton’; • Increasing the general minimum density target from 50 ppj/ha to 70 ppj/ha; • Certain MTSA objectives; and • Encouraging local municipalities to ensure local municipal Official Plan policies and Zoning By-laws permitting high-density development in Strategic Growth Areas where appropriate. <p>Provided policy and schedule recommendations related to revising the schedule boundary lines on Schedules D and D4, deleting draft policy 5.9.43 d) (related to requiring 2 and 3+ bedroom units as the predominant unit form within MTSAs), removing draft policy references to local municipalities including maximum densities and building heights, including policies that support a phased building form/use, and</p>	<p>The NBLC feasibility study found that Inclusionary Zoning may be feasible without financial incentives for residential condominium projects within Peel’s stronger market areas, such as the Hurontario corridor from Port Credit to Uptown and Downtown Brampton. NBLC’s analysis also accounted for public sector initiatives in PMTSAs including density increases, transit investment, land use change, and other investments. It is important that Inclusionary Zoning be in place as these investments occur so that the value created by these investments is partially recaptured in the form of affordable housing contributions. Draft policies include continuing to advocate for incentives from federal and provincial governments and collaborating with or encouraging local municipalities to provide incentives through the planning process and consider other potential factors to increase land value and consider reduced Inclusionary Zoning requirements where market conditions to not demonstrate as much financial viability for Inclusionary Zoning.</p> <p>Draft Inclusionary Zoning policies have been revised to reference policy 5.9.19 and ensure that family-sized units (2 or more bedroom) are provided through Inclusionary Zoning.</p> <p>The Northwest Brampton Urban Development Area boundary has been revised to exclude the lands on the east side of Creditview Road, north of Bovaird Drive (lands in the Fletcher’s Meadow Secondary Plan 44). As such, the applicant’s development blocks 2 and 3 are no longer in the Northwest Brampton Urban Development Area.</p> <p>On draft Schedule Z3 – Growth Plan Policy Areas in Peel, the built-up area cannot be modified by the Region of Peel as this is based on Provincial mapping and is used for calculations in the Land Needs Assessment.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			providing housing incentives.	
STAT-21-381	November 26, 2021	Stephanie Matveeva Planner, GSAI	<p>Provided comments on behalf of BET Realty Limited and 3420 Hurontario Street Incorporated, the owners of 3420 and 3442 Hurontario Street in the City of Mississauga. The subject lands are located on the west side of Hurontario Street, south of Central Parkway West and north of Fairview Road East. Provided an overview of the policy context of the subject lands and justification for future redevelopment.</p> <p>The draft ROPA mapping identifies the subject lands as being located within the proposed Fairview (Central Park) MTSA, which is a Primary MTSA. As the subject lands are also subject to an Urban Growth Centre policy overlay as per A Place to Grow, 2020. This MTSA is therefore to be planned to achieve a minimum density of 300 residents and jobs combined per hectare. GSAI supported the MTSA delineation and minimum density target. Also supported the draft MTSA policies which require local municipalities to delineate the MTSAs established by the ROP and implement policies encouraging gentle intensification within MTSAs and protect MTSA lands for transit supportive densities, uses, and active transportation connections.</p> <p>The draft ROPA did not state nor define what an applicable MTSA is, in the context of Sections 5.9.34 and 5.9.44 – requested clarity.</p> <p>GSAI disagreed with the draft inclusionary zoning policies as presented in the draft ROPA. The local municipalities have not completed the necessary Inclusionary Zoning Study. Requiring that affordable units be predominantly two or three bedroom or larger units is restrictive and may preclude developments from proceeding.</p>	<p>Support for the MTSA policies is noted.</p> <p>The Province mandates three requirements before local municipalities can put an Inclusionary Zoning by-law in place: a Housing Strategy Data Update, a feasibility study on inclusionary zoning, and a third-party peer review of the feasibility study. All three of these requirements have been met.</p> <p>Previously numbered draft policy 5.9.43 has been reworded to provide greater clarity on where an Inclusionary Zoning by-law can be introduced: “in primary Major Transit Station Areas and secondary Major Transit Station Areas as per policy 5.6.19.X and delineated on Schedule Y7, where deemed appropriate by the local municipality, and community planning permit system areas as ordered by the Minister”.</p> <p>Draft Inclusionary Zoning policies have been revised to reference policy 5.9.19 and ensure that family-sized units (2 or more bedroom) are provided through Inclusionary Zoning to provide a mix and range of unit types.</p>
STAT-21-382	November 26, 2021	Phil Stewart Principal, Pound & Stewart Planning Consultants	<p>Provided comments on behalf of Orlando Corporation with respect to the Heartland Town Centre (HTC) lands, legally known as East Block ‘A’ and East Block ‘B’ in the City of Mississauga. Described the planning and development principles that initially supported the creation of HTC and the planning context of the subject lands.</p> <p>Highlighted that the land use planning policies and regulations applying to the HTC lands vary based on the location of the subject lands. Provided planning rationale for a partial employment conversion for select Blocks within the HTC lands.</p>	<p>The site along Matheson Blvd W in Heartland Town Centre has been recorded as employment conversion request M31. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>For more information on the Region’s employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-383	November 26, 2021	Ralph Grittani Principal, RGC (sent via Trevor Alkema)	<p>RGC represents the owners of 13945 Kennedy Road in the Town of Caledon, where a plan of subdivision for rural residential uses has been proposed. RGC has been in contact with Regional staff with respect to the Regional Official Plan Review and MCR as it related to the subject lands and inclusion in the SABE. Provided a description of the site, surrounding properties, and the vision for the proposed development. Requested that the Region include 13945 Kennedy Road within the SABE. Further requested to be notified of any future consultation, Council agendas and all matters related to decisions made in connection with the MCR process. SABE ID #29</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #29.</p> <p>The lands south of King Street, surrounding Campbell’s Cross have been included in the draft SABE as Employment Area and a transition buffer is proposed to be added to appropriate OP Schedules. This transition buffer and corresponding proposed policy requires that local municipal secondary planning provide a transition from employment uses to the Campbell’s Cross settlement area which is primarily residential.</p> <p>The appropriateness of these lands for residential would be determined</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				through the subsequent planning process and would include public consultation. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-384	November 27, 2021	Patricia Rodriguez Tillman	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable.</p>	Please refer to comment response STAT-21-072
STAT-21-385	November 30, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<p>Provided comments on behalf of the Heritage Heights Landowners Group, who own approximately 492 hectares of land within the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan. Provided the following comments related to housing policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended that Section 5.9.1 should reflect a range a range of housing types, density size and tenure, including but not limited to affordable housing, as the Region’s objective for providing housing that will contribute to the creation of healthy, mixed-use, transit supportive and complete communities – more consistent with Provincial policy. Recommended that Section 5.9.5 be amended to direct readers to where information can be found regarding achieving annual minimum new housing targets for the Region (including affordable housing), or how such targets are determined by the Region and/or the local municipality. Recognized that the Region incorporates progressive language in numerous policies in Section 5.9. In Section 5.9.12, it is not clear from the draft ROPA policies whether the implications of annual minimum housing unit targets shown in Table 4 were considered from a market demand and cost perspective. Recommended that the policy be revised to use progressive language such as ‘encourage’ and ‘strive to protect’ in Section 5.9.12. 	<p>References to Table 4 have been strengthened throughout the Plan. Regional housing targets reflect housing need and align with the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan, Regional Housing Strategy, and other relevant sources. The intent of the policy is not to update the targets annually, but to monitor achievement towards the targets on an annual basis. The title of Table 4, Policy 5.9.13 and 5.9.14 will be updated to make this clear.</p> <p>Updates to Table 4 will be undertaken based on the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan, Census of Canada results, Regional Housing Strategy, and other relevant sources and will require a Regional Official Plan amendment. Policies will be revised to clearly indicate that the table is not updated annually.</p> <p>Policy directions reflect Regional priorities and Provincial requirements.</p> <p>The Region is exploring a land banking strategy and more details will be known as work progresses. We will continue to work with local municipalities, other public agencies, and the provincial and federal governments to identify lands that are suitable for affordable housing. In addition, land conveyance is one</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested clarification regarding the minimum housing targets in terms of affordability and density set out by Section 5.9.12 and Table 4. Recommended that the policy be revised to encourage builders to offer alternative designs for second units/garden suites. • An Official Plan Amendment should be required for the Region to review and update the annual minimum new housing unit targets, as per Section 5.9.13. • Recommended that Section 5.9.14 be deleted, as the policy for updating and monitoring housing units is already provided for in Section 5.9.13. • Recommended that the Region develop Terms of Reference for the Housing Assessment before Section 5.9.15 is applied. Concerned about forcing affordable housing on the ground, including IZ. • Section 5.9.36 does not contain any details as to what the Regional land banking system consist of, nor how the Region intends to secure or finance lands that are suitable for affordable housing. The acquisition of land for affordable housing projects cannot include the gratuitous dedication of serviced land of a suitable size for high density development to be conveyed through development applications. This system should include a series of financial and planning incentives for proponents of development proposals if this option is pursued. • There are many affordable housing policies which seek to accomplish different things. Lacking clarity as to how one would separate policies would apply to certain projects. Recommended that the draft policies are amended to clarify how they interact with one another. The cumulative effect of applying several policies together on a project could have a negative effect on the viability of a proposed development. 	<p>additional way for development applications to demonstrate a contribution towards the Plan’s Peel-wide housing target on affordability.</p>
STAT-21-386	November 29, 2021	Judy Mabee West Caledon Communities Aggregate Group	<p>Submitted a report prepared by the West Caledon Communities Aggregate Group, which outlines the concerns, requests, and recommendations concerning current and future development an extraction of aggregate resources in the Town of Caledon, particularly West Caledon. This report provided a summary of research undertaken.</p> <p>Recommended changes to the Region of Peel Official Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify and strengthen Official Plan policies for the protection of water quality and quantity, environmental, social, and economic impacts. • Address quarry dewatering impacts to ensure no negative impacts. • Develop effective Peel Official Plan policies to manage blasting quarries. • Any application for bedrock blasting and dewatering quarries to have a full Provincial Environmental Assessment. • Undertake water taking permit study as recommended in “Implementation Plan for Protecting Shaws Creek 2017” as generic guides across the Town of Caledon. • Expand and expedite the Cumulative Impact Assessment Study recommendations to complete Subwatershed 15. • Research, evaluate and implement “Best” Aggregate Policies and Practices in other jurisdictions to advise future Region of Peel decisions. 	<p>The comments are noted and will be considered as part of the Aggregates Policy Review component of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The aggregate resources policy review will examine best practices and opportunities to address: the land use compatibility of aggregate extraction adjacent to sensitive land uses; the consideration of cumulative impact assessment requirements; and update the current policies in the Regional Official Plan to ensure that the impacts of future aggregate extraction on communities and the natural environment, including groundwater, are properly studied, considered, and addressed in decision making.</p> <p>Regarding protection of water resources, the proposed water resources policy review is currently proposing revisions to policies that will provide objectives and clarify policy direction to:</p> <p>“Protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water resources, including Water Resource System features and areas, key hydrologic areas and key hydrologic features, and their hydrologic functions, and related natural systems, features and areas, including their linkages and related functions,</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watershed Planning Sub-watershed 15 and others are incomplete (stopped at Phase 1 of the study process), and Watershed Planning Sub-watersheds 16 and 18 (18 focused only on the impact of sand and gravel pits and did not include limestone bedrock) are out of date. As a result, the area that the quarry application covers has not been fully or properly studied at all. 	<p>jointly with the local municipalities, conservation authorities and other related agencies.</p> <p>The Regional Official Plan is being updated to add new policies which promote watershed planning and the implementation of the guidance and recommendations provided through watershed and subwatershed planning.</p>
STAT-21-387	November 29, 2021	Sanjam Raisuada Planner, GSAI	<p>Submitted an employment conversion request for 9400 Goreway Drive, which is located on the west side of Goreway Drive, north of Queen Street and south of Williams Parkway, in the City of Brampton. This request was initially submitted on April 7, 2021. Meetings have since been held with the Region and City.</p> <p>The subject property is designated Business Corridor by the City of Brampton Official Plan. It is further located within the eastern limit of a Provincially Significant Employment Zone. Provided an overview of the background/history of the subject lands, as well as the applicable land use policy. Provided planning justification for the employment conversion.</p> <p>The subject property is located 1,500 metres north of planned MTSA QUE-12, located at Queen Street and Goreway Drive. Requested that the MTSA delineation identified for QUE-12 expand to include the subject lands. Provided planning justification as such. Submitted a surrounding uses inventory.</p>	<p>9400 Goreway Drive has been recorded as employment conversion request B27. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>For more information on the Region’s employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p> <p>The Goreway MTSA (QUE-12) is not proposed to be delineated in the ROP at this time and is a “planned” station. The MTSA boundary can be reviewed upon delineation in the future when it is appropriate to change the classification of the station from “planned” to “primary” or “secondary” and delineate it on Schedule E-2 (former schedule Y6).</p> <p>Comment addressed in 2022 Public Comment Response Table (March 29, 2022 – April 28, 2022), see comment STAT- 22-059.</p>
STAT-21-388	November 29, 2021	Philip Dixon	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space.</p> <p>While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p>	Please refer to comment response STAT-21-072

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.	
STAT-21-389	November 29, 2021	Gord Dennis	<p>Owens 7171 Healey Road in the Town of Caledon, which consists of 96+ acres of land located at the southeast corner of Centreville Creek and Healey Road. Pleas that the southern portion of the subject lands is included in the proposed draft SABE. Does not support the proposed 413 preferred route cutting diagonally through the property and the Regional Official Plan using it as a boundary for the SABE. Argued that properties located within the proposed SABE should be included entirely, less the Greenbelt designated area.</p> <p>Requested that the entirety of the subject property (less the Greenbelt designated area) be included in the SABE, thus making the boundary the Greenbelt and Healey Road, instead of Highway 413. This route would make more sense given Regional Council's opposition to Highway 413. The Region of Peel and Town of Caledon would be saved from future planning or servicing complications that would arise simply by not having the settlement boundary area be bound by existing municipal infrastructure.</p> <p>The small triangle-shaped field that would remain designated Agricultural would be impractical to continue farming cost-effectively. SABE ID #80</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #80.</p> <p>Lands north of the GTA West Corridor did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the FSA (refer to study Phase A Focus Study Area, Feb. 25, 2020).</p> <p>Expansion of the SABE to include these lands is not appropriate given the northern portion was not included in the Focus Study Area and therefore not subject to detailed study to determine appropriateness for inclusion.</p> <p>Subsequent Official Plan reviews provide an ability to re-examine this area for future growth and at that time there may be more certainty on the future of the corridor.</p>
STAT-21-390	November 29, 2021	Paul Brown President, Paul Brown & Associates Inc.	Submitted an employment conversion request on behalf of the landowner of 6981 and 6991 Millcreek Drive in the City of Mississauga. This conversion is intended to facilitate the redevelopment of their lands from the current industrial use to a mix of commercial/residential uses.	<p>The site at 6981 and 6991 Millcreek Drive has been recorded as employment conversion request M32. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas.</p> <p>For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-391	November 29, 2021	Lilli Da Silva Senior Executive Assistant, Orlando Corporation	<p>Provided comments on the draft recommended SABE. Pleas that staff, through the draft recommended SABE, has recognized some of the constraints of developing existing designated employment lands and have added additional employment lands to the SABE.</p> <p>Continue to advise the Region of the significant shortage of suitable employment lands within the Region and the need to accelerate the inclusion of new suitable employment lands in the urban boundary. The Region has not met its targets for employment growth for many years, partly due to the lack of available land in the Region, this has provided a boom for adjacent municipalities, where land is available. There is an opportunity for the Region to attract a higher share of employment growth if it increases its inventory of shovel ready employment lands.</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #58.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An additional 200ha of employment lands were added to the draft SABE from the December 2020 version to the September 2021 version to account for vacant or underutilized employment lands that have constraints to development.</p> <p>In the January 2022 draft SABE an additional 130 ha of employment lands are proposed to be included beyond the area recommended through the Land Needs Assessment as outlined in more detail in the covering report.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Orlando Development Corp. will have completely developed our designated land holdings in the Region by 2026 and have not been able to find suitable additional lands. As a result, they (along with other non-residential developers) assembled lands outside the Region to continue long-term growth.</p> <p>Supported the inclusion of lands in Caledon for future employment land growth, in particular on the east and west sides of Hurontario Street (Hwy 10) between Old School Road and King Side Road. These lands are able to be serviced from a water and wastewater standpoint as identified in Blue Plans SABE Water and Wastewater Servicing Analysis. From review of the Blue Plan Analysis, water service is very straightforward due to the existence of the Victoria reservoir. Wastewater servicing would require additional detailed study to determine potential phasing of lands without the need for the longer-term trunk sewer requirements.</p> <p>In addition, these particular lands can be serviced from a transportation perspective by the existing Highway 10 flowing into Highway 410 without the need for truck traffic to traverse through residential neighbourhoods. Clearly, the addition of Highway 413 would add an additional layer of transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>Support the addition of new employment lands throughout the Region as proposed on the recommended SABE mapping. Urged the Region to accelerate the development of employment lands in appropriate areas to 2031 to meet the continued demand for employment land development.</p>	
STAT-21-392	November 29, 2021	Adam Shipowick Urban and Regional Land Use Planner, BLG	<p>Provided comments on behalf Cedar City Developments Ltd. Related to 13070 Heart Lake Road in the Town of Caledon. The subject lands are identified as 2051 New Community Area shown on draft Schedule Z1 and as Draft Conceptual Settlement Area Boundary Expansion on draft Schedule Z2. The client supports the inclusion of their lands in the SABE.</p> <p>The subject lands are located within the C32a – Mayfield West Addition. Supported the direction of the SABE exercise, especially as it relates to identifying the subject lands as part of the SABE Community Area. Also supported the staging/sequencing to guide secondary plan area and block planning under the new Official Plan section called 2051 New Community Areas. SABE ID #67</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #68.</p> <p>Noted. However, for reasons outlined in the February 3, 2022 Planning and Growth Management Committee Report, the lands have been changed from Community to Employment in the latest SABE Mapping.</p> <p>See report here: https://peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/reading-room/#rc2022</p> <p>Comment has been further addressed in 2022 Public Comment Response Table (January 1, 2022 – March 28, 2022), see comment STAT-22-027.</p>
STAT-21-393	November 30, 2021	Lucia Sardellitti Dale & Lessmann LLP	<p>Provided comments on behalf of La Ferme H&S Limited Partnership regarding '0' Heart Lake Road (Part Lot 17, Concession 3, East of Hurontario Street, Parts 1, 2 & 3, Plan 43R-17849) in the City of Brampton. Acknowledged that Pound & Stewart Associates Limited provided a letter on behalf of the client dated November 3, 2021.</p> <p>The following comments were provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule SP48(a) of the City of Brampton Official Plan depicts significantly 	<p>As the Regional employment area on Schedule Y6 will be revised to be a “blanket” designation and in some places a “dual designation” with the greenlands system, this site is mapped within the Regional employment area. The development review process and local implementation will determine requirements for the protection, restoration and enhancement of the Greenlands System including the exact boundaries of the environmental features and developable area on site.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>more of the subject lands as Prestige Industrial than the current draft of Schedule Y6 depicts as Draft Employment Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 48(a) and Schedule SP48(a) of the City's Official Plan are the product of considerable detailed planning and investigation as to the delineation of the configuration of land uses, including the Terrestrial Features as depicted on the subject lands. Chapter 48(a), at Section 5.3.1.1 specifically provides that the schematic or symbolic depiction of Natural Heritage Systems "may be refined without further amendment to [the] plan" and Section 5.3.4.2 specifically provides that "the extent of a Terrestrial Feature shall be confirmed through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study... Terrestrial Features may be altered or the feature may be replaced, provided it is demonstrated that the current ecological function and integrity of the subwatershed is protected and enhanced. Any residual lands shall revert to the adjacent land use designation without the necessity of further amendment to this Chapter." The depiction of Draft Employment Areas on the subject lands on Schedule Y6 ignores the work that produced and is reflected in Schedule SP48(a) and effectively "down zones" the lands. The client recognizes that development of the subject lands will require preparation of an Environmental Impact Study, amongst other requirements, and will involve protection of the Provincially Significant Wetland and the Terrestrial Features as so refined. Submitted that the starting point for such exercise should be the certainty represented by Schedule SP48(a). 	<p>It is not recommended that refinements to the Greenlands System mapping of features or boundaries be made at this time. If refinements are determined to be appropriate through subsequent detailed environmental studies conducted in accordance with the policies of the Plan, the policies in Section 7.3.4 Interpretation provide that refinements may be made in a local official plan without the need to amend the Regional Plan.</p>
STAT-21-394	November 30, 2021	Maria Jones Project Planner, Candevcon Limited	<p>Provided a submission on behalf of the landowners of '0', 5137, 5193, and 5253 Countryside Drive in the City of Brampton. The subject lands are located on the south side of Countryside Drive, east of Clarkway Drive. Also located at the southwest corner of the planned Arterial Road A2 and Mayfield Road intersection. The draft ROPA designates the subject lands within the Draft Employment Area, as identified on Schedule Y6.</p> <p>Requested that the subject lands be included as a Node/Centre within the Region's Strategic Growth Areas set out by Schedule Z2 of the ROPA, with added higher density and mixed-use permissions within the Employment Area zone. Further requested that the Region revise Schedule Y6 to identify the subject lands within the Employment Area with added Mixed-Use permissions. Provided planning justification for these requests.</p> <p>Supported the request submitted by Humphries Planning Group Inc., as per the letter dated October 28, 2021, for consideration of their client's property (5171 Countryside Drive) as a Node/Centre with additional mixed use permissions to the Employment Area.</p>	<p>This site and general area has not been identified as a strategic growth area in the Regional Official Plan or on Schedule Z2. Based on the hierarchy of areas to accommodate density in the Region, the City of Brampton 2040 vision, and draft Brampton City Structure, this area has not been identified to accommodate high densities. The site will continue to be identified as within the mapped Regional employment area designation.</p> <p>Specific land use designations and densities will be identified at the local municipal level in keeping with the Region's employment area policies.</p>
STAT-21-395	November 30, 2021	Jason Afonso Senior Associate, GSAI	<p>GSAI represents landowners throughout all three area municipalities in the Region. Provided the following comments related to housing policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended that Section 5.9.1 should reflect a range a range of housing 	<p>References to Table 4 have been strengthened throughout the Plan. Housing targets are based on housing need and align with the Housing Strategy and the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>types, density size and tenure, including but not limited to affordable housing, as the Region’s objective for providing housing that will contribute to the creation of healthy, mixed-use, transit supportive and complete communities – more consistent with Provincial policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended that Section 5.9.5 be amended to direct readers to where information can be found regarding achieving annual minimum new housing targets for the Region (including affordable housing), or how such targets are determined by the Region and/or the local municipality. • Recognized that the Region incorporates progressive language in numerous policies in Section 5.9. • In Section 5.9.12, it is not clear from the draft ROPA policies whether the implications of annual minimum housing unit targets shown in Table 4 were considered from a market demand and cost perspective. • Requested that the Region provide a strategy involving federal, provincial and regional government to prevent the gap between market and affordable housing units from growing as a result of the proposed affordable housing policies. • Requested that the Region provide a strategy to address future DC shortages resulting from related policy changes through the ROPA. • Recommended that the policy be revised to use progressive language such as ‘encourage’ and ‘strive to protect’ in Section 5.9.12. • Requested clarification regarding the minimum housing targets in terms of affordability and density set out by Section 5.9.12 and Table 4. Recommended that the policy be revised to encourage builders to offer alternative designs for second units/garden suites. • An Official Plan Amendment should be required for the Region to review and update the annual minimum new housing unit targets, as per Section 5.9.13. • Recommended that Section 5.9.14 be deleted, as the policy for updating and monitoring housing units is already provided for in Section 5.9.13. • Recommended that the Region develop Terms of Reference for the Housing Assessment before Section 5.9.15 is applied. Concerned about forcing affordable housing on the ground, including IZ. • Section 5.9.36 does not contain any details as to what the Regional land banking system consist of, nor how the Region intends to secure or finance lands that are suitable for affordable housing. The acquisition of land for affordable housing projects cannot include the gratuitous dedication of serviced land of a suitable size for high density development to be conveyed through development applications. This system should include a series of financial and planning incentives for proponents of development proposals if this option is pursued. 	<p>Policies have been included that speak to advocating to the Provincial and Federal governments for increased investment to support the development of permanent affordable housing.</p> <p>Policy directions reflect Regional priorities and provincial requirements.</p> <p>The Region is exploring a land banking strategy and more details will be known as work progresses. We will continue to work with local municipalities, other public agencies, and the provincial and federal governments to identify lands that are suitable for affordable housing. In addition, land conveyance is one additional way for development applications to demonstrate a contribution towards the Plan’s Peel-wide housing target on affordability.</p>
STAT-21-396i	November 29, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	Submitted comments on behalf of Caledon Village Properties GP Inc., the registered owner of ‘O’ and 2785 Charleston Sideroad in the Town of Caledon. The client has requested to have the entirety of the subject lands included in the SABE, specifically	Policy 5.6.16 (now renumbered 5.7.18.9) would permit an expansion to the subject properties without the need for a Regional Official Plan Amendment, subject to the results of a local official plan amendment.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>part of the expanded Caledon Village Rural Settlement Area. Requested the opportunity to discuss with Regional staff the designation of the portion of the subject lands outside of the limits of the Caledon Village Rural Settlement Area for inclusion within the SABE. Provided planning justification for the inclusion of the subject lands within an expanded Caledon Village Rural Settlement Area Boundary.</p> <p>Acknowledged that the development of new residential dwelling lots on the west half of the subject lands would not be permitted by Section 2.12.12.2.5 as this portion of land is located within the Rural Lands Area. If the subject lands were included in the Caledon Village SABE, then this development would be considered appropriate.</p> <p>Attached context mapping; previous correspondence submitted to the Town of Caledon regarding the Regional Official Plan Review and MCR and the Aggregate Rehabilitation Master Plan; and a presentation provided by GWD.</p>	<p>It is noted that the Growth Plan includes limitations on the size of expansions into the Greenbelt (Policy 2.2.8.3 k)</p> <p>The Regional SABE study met the Growth Plan requirements for expansion in the whitebelt. Additional study is required to be undertaken to address land use compatibility and rehabilitation relating to the current aggregate use on the property in accordance with Provincial policy and the policies of the Regional Official Plan including the rural settlement expansion requirements as outlined in the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan. Reports and studies supporting the local official plan amendment must demonstrate that the proposed expansion would not preclude or hinder the expansion or continued use of adjacent mineral aggregate operations or the establishment of new operations within adjacent High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Area and would not be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety, or environmental impact.</p>
STAT-21-396ii	November 29, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<p>Provided comments regarding the draft Regional Official Plan Amendment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.6 references sustainability as an overarching theme of the ROPA, which will partially be accomplished by maximizing and optimizing the use of land, resources, and planned/existing infrastructure. • Recommended that the language used in Sections 2.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.6.5, 2.6.11, 2.6.20.13 c) be amended to qualify references to the ‘maintenance, protection, restoration, and enhancement of the natural environment’ with the phrase ‘as appropriate, reasonable and practical’, as can be supported with technical analysis. • In Section 2.6.20.9, we recommend that the phrase ‘strive to reduce and prevent’ increased risk of flooding be employed. • Progressive language is incorporated throughout the ROPA – i.e., ‘as appropriate’, ‘encourage’, ‘where possible’, etc. • Section 2.4.29 references Core Area woodlands and significant woodlands which have undergone changes in their character or ecological functions but may no longer exist on the landscape, according to the policy language. These woodlands should not be considered components of the Core Area woodlands and significant woodlands as they are not making a contribution. • Recommend revising Sections 2.14.35 a) and c) to allow for flexibility and discretion to be applied to the implementation of the Greenlands System. Recommend inserting the words ‘as appropriate’ following “...enhance” in Section 2.14.35 a). The suitable flexibility and discretion can be accomplished by inserting the words ‘or minimal/manageable’ following the word ‘...no’ in Section 2.14.25 c). • Recommend that Section 2.14.39.6 be revised to provide an exemption for plantations as defined in the draft ROPA. 	<p>The policy direction in Sections 2.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.6.5, 2.6.11 and 2.6.20.13 c) reflects provincial policy direction. Further qualification of the listed policies is not required or recommended.</p> <p>Section 2.6.20.9 will be revised as follows:</p> <p><u>2.6.20.9 Promote and implement stormwater management practices to maintain the natural hydrologic cycle, prevent an increased risk of flooding, reduce risks associated with flooding and stream erosion, replenish ground water resources, and protect, improve, or restore water quality and natural heritage system functions.</u></p> <p>Core Area woodlands and significant woodlands undergoing change due to natural processes should continue to be identified and protected in accordance with the Regional Official Plan direction. No changes are recommended.</p> <p>With respect to Section 2.14.35, the policies have been written to provide general direction to protect, restore and enhance the Greenlands System. No changes are recommended.</p> <p>The comment regarding direction to the local municipalities to implement policies for tree assessments and preservation plans is noted. Details regarding implementation at the local level are not prescribed in the Regional Plan. No changes are recommended.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-396iii	November 29, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported the inclusion of Section 5.7.16 	Noted.
STAT-21-396iiv	November 29, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.3.3 references changes to the text, tables, schedules, and glossary which will require an Amendment to the Plan (provided for a very limited list of specific exceptions). Table 4 – Peel Annual Minimum New Housing Unit Targets is not listed as one of the exceptions, however, in lieu of Sections 5.9.13 and 5.9.14, which direct that Table 4 be reviewed and updated annually, perhaps it should be exempt. Failure to do so will result in the need for the Region to advance a ROPA in accordance with direction provided by the Plan. 	<p>Targets are monitored annually, however updates to Table 4 will be undertaken based on updated based on the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan, Census of Canada results, Regional Housing Strategy, and other relevant sources and will require a Regional Official Plan amendment.</p> <p>Policies will be revised to clearly indicate that the table is not updated annually.</p>
STAT-21-397	November 30, 2021	Roman Tsap Development Manager, Edenshaw Developments Limited	<p>Edenshaw Developments Limited has reviewed the draft proposed Regional Official Plan and would like to formally express our concerns with the inclusionary zoning policies contained therein. Believe that the proposed IZ policies will not achieve the construction and delivery of affordable housing units. These proposed policies will instead result in increased costs for purchasers of market units and particularly first time homebuyers as they must subsidize the costs of the affordable units within a particular development.</p> <p>Encouraged the Region to direct local municipalities to explore what incentives can be offered to foster the construction of affordable units, which may include development charge credits as well height and density bonusing. Without incentives, the delivery of all housing units (whether market rate or affordable) will suffer, as there will not be an incentive to develop in areas where affordable housing is mandated.</p>	<p>There is a need in Peel Region to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents to increase the supply of affordable housing and better address local need. Inclusionary Zoning is one tool to support this objective. Ultimately, Inclusionary Zoning is a tool that must be implemented by local municipalities.</p> <p>To support the implementation of an IZ policy framework, the feasibility study undertaken by N. Barry Lyon Consultants (NBLC) was based on a model that did not include financial incentives (other than incentives already in place in Downtown Brampton) and without additional density than what is already planned. The study factored in hard and soft costs and required profit to determine the residual land value that the developer can afford to pay for land. NBLC's approach was undertaken based on a series of assumptions to assess the most onerous impacts, recognizing that municipalities could implement other implementation options, such as in PMTSAs where markets are not as strong. The study found that IZ may be feasible without financial incentives for residential condominium projects within Peel's stronger market areas, such as the Hurontario corridor from Port Credit to Uptown and Downtown Brampton. NBLC's analysis also accounted for public sector initiatives in PMTSAs including density increases, transit investment, land use change, and other investments. It is important that IZ be in place as these investments occur so that the value created by these investments is partially recaptured in the form of affordable housing contributions.</p>
STAT-21-398	November 30, 2021	Harjeet Gill	<p>Owens the 6520 Mayfield Road, located on the northeast intersection of Goreway and Mayfield Road. The subject lands are currently located within the draft SABE's community area. A legal non-conforming automotive repair facility exists on the subject lands, which is more indicative of an employment property. An existing repair facility and federal telecommunications tower is also located on the subject lands.</p> <p>The subject lands are more suitable for employment areas, as the property is located near a busy intersection and a large-drafted employment area is located to the west of the property. Other properties with agricultural uses have been proposed to be designated draft employment area. Attached a location map of the subject lands. SABE ID #81</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #81.</p> <p>As stated, the subject lands have been included within the draft SABE as community area. As we are planning for 2051, accommodating existing uses can not always be reflected, however if the use is legal non-conforming it can continue as such.</p> <p>Location of the proposed employment and residential areas were determined based on the results of the technical studies.</p>
STAT-21-399	November 30, 2021	Sarah Clark Planner, GSAI	Submitted comments on behalf of Avaton Developments Inc. in respect to 45 Avondale Boulevard in the City of Brampton, located on the south side of Avondale Road, west of	The request has been reviewed, and the requested property has not been added to the Bramalea GO (KIT-2) MTSA delineation. The MTSA has remained

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Bramalea Road which is peripheral to a Provincially Significant Employment Zone. Noted that the subject lands are adjacent or nearby active employment conversions. GSAI believes that the subject lands are appropriate for redevelopment based on observed potential future land use patterns. Encouraged the Region to employ flexibility in their policy directions when analyzing the future of existing employment areas and surrounding land uses.</p> <p>The Bramalea GO Station is approximately 770 metres south of the subject lands. GSAI feels it is appropriate that the Region consider including the subject site within the MTSA boundary in its entirety. Suggested that the Region consider more flexible land use policies or sites on the periphery of MTSA boundaries as they present a unique opportunity to act as transitional parcels and can be strategically utilized based on their locational attributes to assist in creating complete communities. Should be assigned land use policies that provide flexibility to evaluate on a case-by-case basis. Provided further justification for this request.</p>	consistent.
STAT-21-400	November 30, 2021	Keith MacKinnon Partner, KLM Planning Partners Inc.	<p>Submitted an employment conversion request on behalf of GD Group, which represents the owner of the lands at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southwest corner of Steeles Avenue West and Financial Drive; • The large block at the northeast corner of Steeles at Mississauga Road; and • The northeast corner of Mississauga Road and Wardsville Drive. <p>Requested that these lands near Steeles and Mississauga Rd be designated Primary Major Transit Station Area to allow a concept prepared by Quadrangle Architects to be developed. The proposed concept plan includes a mid-rise mixed-use development scheme for this parcel, which was included in this submission. Draft Schedule Y7 identifies the subject lands as being within 800-metres of a planned MTSA (HUB-3). Stated that the subject lands are better suited to accommodate a mix of uses as proposed.</p> <p>Draft Schedule Y6 designates these lands Employment. Provided planning justification for the employment conversion request as such.</p> <p>Altus Group Economic Consulting was retained to review the impacts of mixed use development, which was appended to KLM's comments.</p>	<p>At this time, there is no commitment or timing for the implementation of the transit hub that would inform the delineation of the Steeles at Mississauga Rd (HUB-3) MTSA. The classification of the MTSA continues to be "planned."</p> <p>The site at Steeles Avenue and Wardsville Drive has been recorded as employment conversion request B38. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>The sites at Steeles Ave and Mississauga Road and Financial Drive have been recorded as employment conversion request B32. An employment conversion and removal of the sites from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas.</p> <p>For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-401	November 30, 2021	Karen Bennett Senior Associate, GSAI	<p>Provided comments on behalf of Gold Humber Station Inc. related to approximately 50 acres of land they own south of King Street and along the west side of Humber Station Road in Caledon. The subject lands are located in the study area formerly known as Option 4 pursuant to the Town of Caledon and Region of Peel BRES process. These lands have been included in the Region's latest draft SABE map as Community Lands. Supported the proposal to include these lands in the Urban Area and specifically within the Community Lands through the MCR process. Provided planning justification for the</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #11.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			same.	
STAT-21-402	November 30, 2021	Lucrezia Chiappetta	<p>Provided comments on the Regional Official Plan Review and Municipal Comprehensive Review on behalf of ecoCaledon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported the Region for their new and updated policies regarding LID; green infrastructure; the protection of agricultural land; the building of energy efficient buildings with green tech; the creation of complete, compact communities; the protection and restoration of natural areas and water systems; the integrated and affordable transportation system; the support of active transportation; and the plan to enhance urban tree canopy cover. • Using Hamilton as an example, the Region should use housing demand through zoning reform – not sprawl. • The development of Highway 413 will lead to more sprawl and car-dependent subdivisions, pushing a way from our climate change targets. • Increased density will help attract public transportation that will help residents to become less car-dependent and reduce transportation-related emission. • The Region needs to be bold and innovative and need to act quickly. 	Noted.
STAT-21-403	November 30, 2021	Michael Vani Weston Consulting	<p>Submitted an employment conversion request on behalf of V!VA Retirement Communities who is the prospective purchaser with interest in 500 Wilton Drive in the Town of Caledon. The subject lands are currently owned by ELM Developments. Described the existing conditions and context of the subject lands, which are located at the edge and periphery of a Provincially Significant Employment Zone.</p> <p>Summarized the proposed development and policy context. Draft Schedule Y6 (Employment Areas) identifies the subject lands as being within a Draft Employment Area.</p> <p>Provided planning justification for the proposed employment conversion request, including policy analysis set out by the Growth Plan, the PPS, the Region of Peel Official Plan, draft ROPA policies, and the Town of Caledon Official Plan. Submitted a Preliminary Screening Level Assessment prepared by SLR Consulting and a Preliminary Development Concept prepared by RAW Design.</p>	<p>The site at 500 Wilton Drive has been recorded as employment conversion request C5. An employment conversion via removal of the site from the Regional employment area is supported. Local land use designations continue to apply and any development proposals on the site will require the standard development application review processes (such as official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments).</p> <p>For more information on the Region’s employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-404	November 30, 2021	Darrin Cohen Planner, Weston Consulting	<p>Submitted an addendum to the employment conversion request submitted on November 19, 2021 for 2025 – 2087 Dundas Street East in the City of Mississauga, on behalf of the owner of the subject lands. A meeting was held with Regional staff on November 22, 2021 to discuss the subject lands and employment conversion request. A meeting was also held with City of Mississauga staff on November 23, 2021.</p> <p>The subject lands are located within the Etobicoke Creek Focus Area by the City’s Dundas Connects Master Plan. The subject lands are further identified as Site 1 in the Dixie Employment Area and is subject to site-specific policies in accordance with Section 17.4.4 of the City of Mississauga’s Official Plan. The proposed request conforms to the Master Plan policies as this plan recommends mixed use, transit supportive intensification across the Dundas Corridor and specifically within the Etobicoke Creek</p>	<p>The site at 2025 – 2087 Dundas Street East has been recorded as employment conversion request M29. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>For more information on the Region’s employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region’s Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>SPA.</p> <p>Acknowledged that lands within the Etobicoke Creek Focus Area are associated with overland flooding risks. The landowner has been working with the TRCA to undertake flood analysis and review of the natural hazard area. Will continue to provide updates for this work.</p> <p>Provided further planning justification in support of the employment conversion request. Intend to provide a concept plan at a later date.</p>	
STAT-21-405	November 30, 2021	Darrin Cohen Planner, Weston Consulting	<p>Submitted an employment conversion request for 110 East Drive in the City of Brampton on behalf of the landowners. This request is intended to support future mixed use development on the subject lands, including residential uses. The subject lands are located east of the Bramalea Road and East Drive intersection, south of Dearborne Boulevard and at the edge of a Provincially Significant Employment Zone. Draft Schedule Y6 of the proposed ROPA identifies the subject property at the edge of a proposed Employment Area. Draft Schedule Y7 identifies the subject lands as being within close proximity of Bramalea GO draft MTSA.</p> <p>Provided a description of the subject lands and the applicable policy context. Provided planning justification for the proposed employment conversion request.</p>	<p>The site at 110 East Drive has been recorded as employment conversion request B35. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported, however the applicant is directed to review revised employment implementation policies in section 5.8 of the Regional Official Plan regarding the consideration of introducing non-employment land uses in employment areas which could enable consideration of this matter by the local municipality outside the MCR process.</p> <p>For more information on the Region's employment policy framework and assessment of employment conversion requests, please refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-406i	November 29, 2021	Michael Gagnon Managing Principal Planner, GWD	<p>Submitted comments on behalf of Centennial Mall Brampton Ltd. (Davpart Inc.), the registered owner of 227 Vodden Street East in the City of Brampton. Currently developed as 'Centennial Mall', Davpart Inc. is currently in the process of finalizing technical plans and reports in support of the proposed intensification of the subject lands for a multi-tower, mixed use, master planned community featuring 2,550 new residential units and new retail commercial. As the proposed redevelopment is phased, approximately 11,000 square metres of the existing mall will be retained in the interim. Formal Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications will be submitted to the City of Brampton before the end of 2021.</p> <p>The subject lands are located within 800 metres of the existing Kennedy Road BRT Station, which has been identified as MTSA QUE-2/Kennedy. As the subject lands are within this distance of the BRT station, they are a candidate for inclusion within the final MTSA boundary delineation, as per the Growth Plan. The Region has excluded the subject lands from the Region of Peel's draft MTSA Boundary Delineation. Including the subject lands in the MTSA would assist the Region in meeting the minimum density target of 160 ppj/ha. Provided further planning justification for including the subject lands in the boundary delineation for MTSA QUE-2/Kennedy.</p> <p>Attached context mapping; the draft MTSA profile of QUE-2/Kennedy; the proposed amendment to the draft MTSA profile of QUE-2/MTSA; and previous correspondence</p>	<p>Regional staff have worked with Brampton staff to review delineations on the Queen Street BRT corridor and the MTSA boundaries have been revised for a number of stations. Please see updates to the draft Schedule E-5 Major Transit Station Areas. The MTSA delineation for QUE-2 (Kennedy) now encompasses lands further north of the station, including the Centennial mall site at 227 Vodden Street East.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			regarding the Regional Official Plan and MCR.	
STAT-21-406ii	November 29, 2021	Michael Gagnon Managing Principal Planner, GWD	<p>Identified the following concerns with the draft ROPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference is made throughout the ROPA to “Strategic Growth Areas” which is not bolded in the ROPA text, thus indicating that the term is to be defined in the Glossary of the Regional Official Plan. However, Strategic Growth Areas is not defined in the Glossary of the ROPA. The term Strategic Growth Areas should either be included in the ROPA Glossary or bolded through the ROPA text to specify that the term is to be referenced in Provincial Plans. Modify the preamble to Section 5.6.17 and modifications to ‘Schedule Z2 – Strategic Growth Areas’ to conform to provincial policy to appropriately identify, and not exclude, all defined Strategic Growth Areas. 	<p>The definition of Strategic Growth Areas has been added to the ROP as per the Growth Plan definition (which outlines what <i>may be considered</i> an SGA).</p> <p>Section 5.6.17 describes what areas are specifically considered SGAs by Peel. The ROP mapping (schedule Z2) will only include SGAs as identified by the Region in section 5.6.17. The local municipalities can identify additional corridors for intensification beyond the Region’s identified SGAs.</p> <p>Some other suggested modifications have been made in section 5.6.19 (MTSAs) of the ROP.</p>
STAT-21-406iii	November 29, 2021	Michael Gagnon Managing Principal Planner, GWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft ROPA Policy 5.6.19.9 directs that local municipalities establish Official Plan policy to address minimum and maximum building heights and maximum densities within MTSAs. Maximum building height and/or density restrictions for lands located within MTSA’s should not be included in local municipal official plans. The determination of appropriate maximum building heights and/or densities within MTSAs should be determined based on the merits of site specific development applications and/or site and area based studies. Delete reference to establishment of maximum density within draft Policy 5.6.19.9(d) and delete draft Policy 5.6.19.9(e) in its entirety. Reference to the term “gentle” as it relates to intensification within an MTSA should be deleted from Policy 5.6.19.10 and replaced with the term “appropriate”. Unclear what qualifies as “gentle” intensification. Reference to the term “gentle” intensification lacks sufficient clarity for the purposes of the evaluation of development within MTSA’s and is contrary to the general objectives and policies of the ROPA which support the maximization of development within MTSA’s (Strategic Growth Areas). Modify Policies 5.6.19.13(a) and (b) to require that in the instance where local official plan amendments have yet to be enacted that development proposals within MTSA’s appropriately consider the planned minimum density prescribed in Table 5, and that development restrictions be deleted for any development proposals that do not immediately abut MTSA Stations stops. Draft Policy 5.6.19.13(b) inappropriately directs that the highest and most dense developments within MTSA’s be restricted to those locations located immediately adjacent to MTSA Station stops; if MTSA policy has yet to be formally established in local official plans. This policy would inappropriately and unfairly prejudice development proponents within MTSAs that may not immediately abut a major station until such time as local MTSA amendments are established in local official plans. Such a development cap would also provide an unnecessary constraint to the ability of MTSAs to fulfill their 	<p>Please note that MTSA policies have been revised and renumbered. Former policy 5.6.19.10 has been clarified to state that maximum heights “may be” established, provided minimum density across the MTSA can still be achieved.</p> <p>The policy referencing gentle intensification has been revised for clarification.</p> <p>Planning considerations for proposed developments in MTSA prior to local implementation planning shall have consideration to a range of objectives that need to be balanced including the implementation requirements of the local municipality and municipal initiatives and studies.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			planned densities.	
STAT-21-406iv	November 29, 2021	Michael Gagnon Managing Principal Planner, GWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify Policy 5.9.12 of the ROPA by replacing the term “implementing” to “encourage”. Table 4 also requires further assessment and modification to include more feasible and realistic targets for the provision of affordable housing and rental units within new housing developments. The proposed requirements that (i) 30-50% of all new housing units be affordable housing and (ii) 25% of all new housing units be rental tenure, are overly onerous on development proponents and will discourage the development of new housing within the Region thereby further decreasing housing affordability. Not clear if the suggested requirement that 50% of all affordable housing be affordable to low-income residents be a component of, or in addition to, the requirement that 30% of all new housing units are to be affordable housing. Further clarity is also necessary on the applicability of the affordable housing and rental targets of Table 4 and generally within the ROPA. Section 5.9.15 of the draft ROPA refers to a Housing Assessment being required for “large” developments but does not define what constitutes a “large” development. Are the affordability policies intended to only apply to whatever constitutes a “large” development? If so, is this a fair and equitable approach? 	<p>Regional housing targets reflect housing need and align with the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan, Regional Housing Strategy and other relevant sources.</p> <p>Housing targets are Peel-wide. Large developments are required to demonstrate a contribution towards these targets, meaning that some developments will exceed these targets while other developments may fall under these targets. The target on affordability is 30%, with the 50% target for lower income households being a component of and not in addition to the 30% target. Language has been revised to provide greater clarity.</p> <p>The housing assessment policy requirement has been revised to clarify that a large development is an application of 50 units or more. Requiring a housing assessment on large development applications provides an increased opportunity to provide a range and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability. Notwithstanding the above, development applications of all sizes should conform with Regional and Local Official Plan policies and contribute towards complete communities.</p>
STAT-21-407i	November 30, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL	<p>Provided comments on behalf of the Wildfield Village Landowner Group who own and control a significant portion of land in the concession block bound by Healy Road to the north, The Gore Road to the east, Mayfield Road to the south and Centreville Creek Road to the west (SABE ID #57). The draft Official Plan mapping includes these lands as part of the New 2051 Community Area. Previously noted support for inclusion of the lands as Community Lands through the SABE study in previous letters to the Region in March 2021 and September 2021. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the reference to SABE in policy 2.6.19.5, as the SABE has already been conducted at the Regional level and is included within the new Official Plan – the word ‘prior’ does not make sense in that context. Suggested that proposed policy 5.5.6 is problematic as land supply should not be limited simply to prolong agricultural uses within an urban area that may compromise meeting growth to 2051. Provided alternative language. Requested clearer direction in proposed policy 5.6.20.12 to differentiate what is completed at the block plan vs. secondary plan level, as well as whether these community or neighbourhood block plans are to be statutory or non-statutory plans. Took issue with proposed policies 5.6.20.14.10 and 5.6.20.14.12, which could hold up development in Caledon. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Reference to SABE in this instance would be related to applications for <40 ha settlement boundary expansions.</p> <p>Agricultural criteria will be one of several criteria considered when staging and phasing growth within the 2051 New Community Area. The policy relates to an existing policy of the Plan which is retained as Policy 3.3.12. Policy 5.5.6 will be amended to qualify the consideration of staging growth so that it aligns with the wording in Policy 3.3.12 as follows: “...prolonging agricultural uses as long as practical...”.</p> <p>Policies in section 5.6.20 have been clarified to better describe what is completed at the secondary plan or block plan stage.</p> <p>Strategic Growth Areas is defined in the Growth Plan as areas identified by municipalities or the province as the focus for accommodating intensification and higher densities in mixed use and compact built forms. SGAs are inclusive of Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, and may include other major opportunities.</p> <p>Regional staff worked with the local municipalities to ensure the strategic areas identified and/or delineated in the Regional plan reflect the emerging urban structures of the local municipalities with guiding policy to support</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While 'Schedule Z2 – Strategic Growth Areas' is included in the draft ROPA, the delineated Strategic Growth Areas do not conform to the definition as set out in the Growth Plan as a result of the fact that the Schedule fails to fully consider other Strategic Growth Areas outside of the Urban Growth Centre, MTSAs and lands adjacent to Regional/Local Intensification corridors. Pursuant to the Growth Plan, in addition to the Urban Growth Corridor and MTSAs, Strategic growth Areas shall also include other strategic major opportunities for infill and redevelopment and lands located along major roads, lands with frequent transit service and/or higher order transit service. 	<p>implementation and the achievement of intensification targets as per Section 2.2.2.3 of the Growth Plan.</p> <p>It is imperative that the new communities are planned with a framework for higher order transit and goods movement in place and that the jurisdiction and financing is established prior to development occurring without a sound plan.</p>
STAT-21-407ii	November 30, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with the feasibility of proposed policy 2.14.19 for wetlands. Uncertain whether water balance can be maintained in all small wetlands and some small flexibility should be considered. 	The policy will be revised to address the comment.
STAT-21-407iii	November 30, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with proposed policy 2.14.36. Requested that the statement on 'no negative impact' is removed. 	The reference to "will not result in negative impacts" reflects the minimum protection standard for significant natural heritage features protected in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-408i	November 30, 2021	Tom Dolson President, Peel Federation of Agriculture	<p>Provided the following comments on behalf of Peel Federation of Agriculture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support policies that allow a broader range of uses for rural lands beyond those permitted in the prime agricultural areas. Policies for designated Greenfield Development should encourage low density residential or employment land uses on lands that are abutting agricultural lands or the Greenbelt. Medium density residential development next to agricultural lands result in conflicts such as trespassing, dumping of garbage and complaints relating to farm equipment noise, farm odour and equipment on residential roads. These complaints persist even though minimum distance separation guidelines are adhered to. 	The comments are noted. Regarding land use compatibility of greenfield development adjacent to agricultural lands, policy direction for the planning of New Community Areas is included in the Official Plan and will require further agricultural impact assessments to support secondary planning to consider whether and how mitigation may be appropriate and recommended. The location, type and density of land uses abutting agricultural lands is a mitigation option that can be considered in the required AIA studies.
STAT-21-408ii	November 30, 2021	Tom Dolson President, Peel Federation of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woodland mapping is inaccurate and appears outdated. Policies pertaining to the schedules showing woodland mapping must allow flexibility for property owners who are impacted by these inaccuracies to address these issues with the Region of Peel. Landowners might also respond favorably to would be for the region of Peel to update mapping of the Greenlands system every six to twelve months. Woodland area definitions currently differ between the Town of Caledon and the Region of Peel - should be consistent with the PPS. 	Greenlands System mapping is regional scale and based on interpreted orthophotography and ecological land classification mapping. Mapped boundaries are not field verified. The interpretation policies in the Regional Plan in Section 7.3 provide that refinements to mapped boundaries made in accordance with the policies of the Plan through field studies do not require an amendment to the Regional Official Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-408iii	November 30, 2021	Tom Dolson President, Peel Federation of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directing 55% of residential use to the built-up area by 2051 will create a series of issues that Region of Peel has not fully evaluated (i.e., delay in final approvals, increase in impermeable surfaces/stormwater runoff, etc.). 	Comment noted.
STAT-21-408iv	November 30, 2021	Tom Dolson President, Peel Federation of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment projections will require a major adjustment due to the impacts of COVID-19 in the workplace. 	Comment noted.
STAT-21-408v	November 30, 2021	Tom Dolson President, Peel Federation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medium and high density residential development should be discouraged adjacent to farmland and the Greenbelt to minimize conflict with the rural 	Consideration will be given to adjacent farmland and Greenbelt lands. Policy direction to require agricultural impact assessments in the 2051 New

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		of Agriculture	<p>areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gated and partial condominium style communities that own and maintain their own road network and stormwater facilities should be encouraged by the region with discounts offered for development charges relating to infrastructure not built or maintained by the Region or Town. The Region of Peel and municipal partners should lobby the federal government and the necessary regulatory bodies to support the creation of municipal bonds. 	Community Area when undertaking secondary planning is included in the Regional Official Plan policies.
STAT-21-408vi	November 30, 2021	Tom Dolson President, Peel Federation of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Region of Peel will require clarity from the Province if the proposed 413 is to move forward – requested a prompt decision from the Province as to whether this highway will be built. If Highway 413 is cancelled, the Region of Peel will be faced with significant additional investment of Regional road infrastructure to facilitate goods movement. Major growth creates an increased need for consumer goods and with that comes increased goods movement and logistics companies. Goods movement is a critical issue for farmers in our Region – the 407 does little to service the needs of farmers. Trucks moving from Highway 401 to Highway 400 north often face the prospect of sitting in stop and go traffic for an hour or more to get through Vaughan. The Region must encourage its municipalities to increase the supply of M2 zoning to keep illegal truck parking from encroaching on rural communities. Transit in the Region of Peel is currently fragmented, costly and inefficient. The Region should consider a regional transit model prior to 2051. 	Noted.
STAT-21-408vii	November 30, 2021	Tom Dolson President, Peel Federation of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region of Peel proposes to prohibit the alteration of intermittent streams. We feel that more refinement of the definition of "intermittent streams" may be necessary. If streams are indeed intermittent then are they just not a watercourse? The integration of watershed planning and growth management needs to lead 	The Growth Plan requires municipal official plans to identify and protect “key hydrologic features” outside settlement areas which are defined to include “permanent and intermittent streams”. Within settlement areas, municipalities are required to implement necessary restrictions on development or site alteration to protect, restore or enhance sensitive surface water features and

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>to innovative stormwater management practices. Stormwater management studies continue to suggest that stormwater management ponds are the solution to mitigate flood control issues in designated greenfield areas of development. It should be noted that the City of Brampton is home to over 800 stormwater management ponds, more than any municipality in the country, and the projected cost for maintenance are exorbitant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our average annual rainfall from a roof covering a footprint of 1500 square feet equates to approximately 193,000 litres per year. With a 10% deduction for evaporation the amount is still over 173,000 litres per year. While rain barrels can help mitigate some stormwater runoff, they do little to accommodate those volumes of water. • The implementation of cisterns below garage floors or in basements to capture rainwater for either gardens and toilets, or for a measured release into the Region's stormwater network would and could be a viable alternative. • The builder would be faced with increased costs of construction relating to cisterns, plumbing installation and backflow protection but he would also be able to build more houses in his development with a reduction of stormwater management ponds. • The homeowner would be responsible for annual backflow inspections and filter and cistern maintenance. • The municipalities would require less flooding control measures and would incur lower maintenance costs. • Stormwater runoff is a by-product of climate change and climate change challenges us to change the way we look at urban development. We challenge the Region of Peel to be more innovative in their policies that affect our farmland, our growth and our urban development. 	<p>their hydrologic functions. A definition of “intermittent stream” is provided in the Growth Plan which the Regional Official Plan references. The proposed policies reflect the direction provided by the province and research and best practice guidance from the conservation authorities.</p> <p>The comments regarding stormwater are noted. In regard to stormwater management, the Region is introducing a new set of policies which promote effective stormwater management, low impact development and green infrastructure approaches. The policies require the use of stormwater management plans and master plans in order to determine context appropriate solutions.</p>
STAT-21-409	November 30, 2021	Raymond Ziemba Planner, SGL	<p>Provided comments on behalf of Mac Mor of Canada Ltd. with respect to 75 Bramalea Road, which is located generally north of Steeles Avenue, on the east side of Bramalea Road, between East Drive and Dearbourne Boulevard. Located within the Bramalea GO Station MTSA. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear whether the Region or the local of municipality will be responsible for identifying which of the MTSAs are to be "Protected", as per the Planning Act, in draft policy 5.6.19.7. • Unclear where gentle intensification within an MTSA is to apply in draft policy 5.6.19.10 – policy could be strengthened by providing clarity in this respect. 	<p>MTSA policies have been revised to clearly indicate that “primary” and “secondary” MTSAs are Planning Act protected MTSAs.</p> <p>The policy which previously referenced gentle intensification has been revised for clarity.</p>
STAT-21-410	November 30, 2021	Sarah Clark Planner, GSAI	<p>Provided a submission on behalf of Queenscorp (Erin Mills) Inc. with respect to 4099 Erin Mills Parkway in the City of Mississauga. Generally supported the Region’s draft policies and directives. Reiterated the importance that the Region use its delegated powers to provide strong, directive policy language that guides area municipalities to prioritize growth within the urban area, along corridors and other areas designated for intensification. Felt the subject lands are an example of an infill site, located along a Regional road, that is appropriate for redevelopment at a higher density. A broader spectrum of residential built form and density may be incorporated into the site.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please refer to ROP chapter 5 policies which guide and direct planning for intensification and transit-supportive development, particularly under the growth management (5.4) and urban system (5.6) sections.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-411	November 30, 2021	Tracy DaCamara	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn't need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067
STAT-21-412	December 2, 2021	Susan Dart	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-413i	November 30, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<p>Provided comments on behalf of the Mayfield East Landowners Group who collectively own and control approximately 513.93 hectares of land in south Caledon, generally bound on the west by the eastern limit of the existing Mayfield West Rural Service Centre and Campbells Cross Creek, on the east by Torbram Road and an unnamed tributary/natural heritage corridor, to the south of Mayfield Road, and to the northern limit coinciding with the northern limit of the Province of Ontario GTA West Transportation Corridor Study Limit.</p> <p>These clients’ common goal is to have all of their lands included in the expanded Mayfield West Rural Service Centre. Requested that the subject lands are identified as ‘priority’ Designated Greenfield Area for which secondary planning be undertaken. Provided planning justification for this expansion. SABE ID #37</p>	<p>This has been recorded as SABE request #37.</p> <p>Note that the majority of the Mayfield East Landowners Group lands are included within the draft SABE, with the exception of the lands north of the GTA West Corridor.</p> <p>Policies included in the draft Regional Official Plan Amendment require that development within the New 2051 Community Area be identified within Secondary Plans and staged and sequenced in accordance with logical phasing of development.</p> <p>Policies require that the Town of Caledon undertake staging and sequencing to guide secondary planning and block planning to the satisfaction in the Region and also provides criteria for prioritizing secondary plans.</p> <p>Staff do not recommend identifying the subject lands as a priority and phasing of growth would be through the process outlined in policy and summarized above.</p>
STAT-21-413ii	November 30, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<p>Provided comments regarding the draft Regional Official Plan Amendment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.6 references sustainability as an overarching theme of the ROPA, which will partially be accomplished by maximizing and optimizing the use of land, resources, and planned/existing infrastructure. • Recommended that the language used in Sections 2.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.6.5, 2.6.11, 2.6.20.13 c) be amended to qualify references to the ‘maintenance, protection, restoration, and enhancement of the natural environment’ with the phrase ‘as appropriate, reasonable and practical’, as can be supported with technical analysis. • Recommended that the phrase ‘strive to reduce and prevent’ increased risk of flooding be employed in Section 2.6.20.9. • Progressive language is incorporated throughout the ROPA – i.e., ‘as appropriate’, ‘encourage’, ‘where possible’, etc. • Recommend revising Sections 2.14.35 a) and c) to allow for flexibility and discretion to be applied to the implementation of the Greenlands System. Recommend inserting the words ‘as appropriate’ following “...enhance” in Section 2.14.35 a). In Section 2.14.35 c), the suitable flexibility and discretion can be accomplished by inserting the words ‘or minimal/manageable’ following 	See response to comment STAT-21-408ii.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			the word '...no'.	
STAT-21-413iii	November 29, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.8.10 directs that a diverse range of employment opportunities be provided near major infrastructure including 400-series highways, as well as current and planned transit. Clients support the designation of a portion of their lands for employment purposes. 	Noted.
STAT-21-413iv	November 29, 2021	Andrew Walker Principal Planner, GWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.3.3 references changes to the text, tables, schedules, and glossary which will require an Amendment to the Plan (provided for a very limited list of specific exceptions). Table 4 – Peel Annual Minimum New Housing Unit Targets is not listed as one of the exceptions, however, in lieu of Sections 5.9.13 and 5.9.14, which direct that Table 4 be reviewed and updated annually, perhaps it should be exempt. Failure to do so will result in the need for the Region to advance a ROPA in accordance with direction provided by the Plan. 	The intent of the policy is not to update the targets annually, but to monitor achievement towards the targets on an annual basis. The title of Table 4, Policy 5.9.13 and 5.9.14 will be updated to make this clear.
STAT-21-414	November 26, 2021	Stephanie Matveeva Planner, GSAI	<p>Provided comments on behalf of Augend Investments Limited, the landowner of 189 Dundas Street West in the City of Mississauga. The subject lands are located on the north side of Dundas Street East, west of Confederation Parkway. Provided an overview of the policy context of the subject lands. GSAI previously requested that the City of Mississauga's Official Plan be amended to include the subject lands into the Cooksville Community Node boundary. Provided planning justification for higher density, mixed-use redevelopment on the subject lands.</p> <p>The draft ROPA mapping identifies the subject lands as being located within the proposed Confederation Parkway MTSA (a Primary MTSA) and immediately adjacent to the planned Dundas MTSA.</p> <p>The draft ROPA did not state nor define what an applicable MTSA is, in the context of Sections 5.9.34 and 5.9.44 – requested clarity.</p> <p>GSAI disagreed with the draft inclusionary zoning policies as presented in the draft ROPA. The local municipalities have not completed the necessary Inclusionary Zoning Study. Requiring that affordable units be predominantly two or three bedroom or larger units is restrictive and may preclude developments from proceeding.</p>	<p>This site at 189 Dundas St W is within the DUN-10 Confederation Parkway "primary" MTSA delineated on Schedule E-2, which would be an applicable MTSA for Inclusionary Zoning. Previously numbered draft policy 5.9.43 has been reworded to provide greater clarity on where an Inclusionary Zoning by-law can be introduced: "in primary Major Transit Station Areas and secondary Major Transit Station Areas as per policy 5.6.19.6 and delineated on Schedule Y7, where deemed appropriate by the local municipality, and community planning permit system areas as ordered by the Minister". Consequently, the applicant should be conscious of the ongoing consultation process regarding the potential for Inclusionary Zoning.</p> <p>The Province mandates three requirements before local municipalities can put an Inclusionary Zoning by-law in place: a Housing Strategy Data Update, a feasibility study on inclusionary zoning, and a third-party peer review of the feasibility study. All three of these requirements have been met.</p> <p>Draft Inclusionary Zoning policies have been revised to reference previously numbered policy 5.9.20 and ensure that family-sized units (2 or more bedroom) are provided through Inclusionary Zoning.</p>
STAT-21-415	November 26, 2021	Stephanie Matveeva Planner, GSAI	<p>Provided comments on behalf Lightpoint (170 Lakeshore Road East Port Credit) Inc., the owners of 170 Lakeshore Road East in the City of Mississauga. The subject lands are located on the north side of Lakeshore Road East, west of Elmwood Avenue North, and east of Hurontario Street. Provided an overview of the location and policy context of the subject lands and planning justification for future redevelopment.</p> <p>The draft ROPA mapping identifies the subject lands as being located outside the Port Credit GO MTSA, despite the draft MTSA encompassing lands immediately south and lands situated within a Heritage Conservation Plan area. The draft ROPA does not recognize the planned Lakeshore BRT network to be provided along the entirety of the Lakeshore Road corridor, as outlined in the City of Mississauga Lakeshore Connecting</p>	<p>No change to the Port Credit GO (HLRT-1) MTSA is proposed as the delineation reflects the Port Credit community node in the City of Mississauga official plan, which continues to be supported as the basis of this delineation.</p> <p>Only the eastern segment (East Ave to Etobicoke Creek) of Lakeshore Rd is advancing through the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and preliminary design for the Lakeshore Bus Rapid Transit Project. This has informed the inclusion of only the eastern segment as "primary" MTSA's (LBRT-1 to 3), which also received funding approval under the Government of Canada's Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP).</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Communities Master Plan. GSAI argued that the Port Credit GO MTSA should be adjusted to include the subject lands. GSAI does not support the Port Credit GO MTSA delineation. GSAI does support the minimum density targets which are to be established for each MTSA and policies to encourage gentle intensification within MTSA and protect MTSA lands for transit supportive densities, uses, and active transportation connections.</p> <p>The draft ROPA did not state nor define what an applicable MTSA is, in the context of Sections 5.9.34 and 5.9.44 – requested clarity.</p> <p>GSAI disagreed with the draft inclusionary zoning policies as presented in the draft ROPA. The local municipalities have not completed the necessary Inclusionary Zoning Study. Requiring that affordable units be predominantly two or three bedroom or larger units is restrictive and may preclude developments from proceeding.</p>	<p>Previously numbered draft policy 5.9.43 has been reworded to provide greater clarity on where an Inclusionary Zoning by-law can be introduced: “in primary Major Transit Station Areas and secondary Major Transit Station Areas as per policy 5.6.19.X and delineated on Schedule Y7, where deemed appropriate by the local municipality, and community planning permit system areas as ordered by the Minister”. Consequently, this area would be applicable for Inclusionary Zoning and the applicant should be conscious of the ongoing consultation process regarding the potential for Inclusionary Zoning.</p> <p>The Province mandates three requirements before local municipalities can put an Inclusionary Zoning by-law in place: a Housing Strategy Data Update, a feasibility study on inclusionary zoning, and a third-party peer review of the feasibility study. All three of these requirements have been met.</p> <p>Draft Inclusionary Zoning policies have been revised to reference previously numbered policy 5.9.20 and ensure that family-sized units (2 or more bedroom) are provided through Inclusionary Zoning.</p>
STAT-21-416	November 26, 2021	Stephanie Matveeva Planner, GSAI	<p>Provided comments on behalf of City Park (Lakeshore) Inc., the owners of 1381 Lakeshore Road East in the City of Mississauga. The subject lands are located adjacent to and at the northeast corner of the Lakeshore Road East and Dixie Road intersection. The owners are currently pursuing development applications to permit a 12 to 15 story mixed-used building on the subject lands. Provided an overview of the policy context of the subject lands and justification for future redevelopment.</p> <p>The draft ROPA mapping identifies the subject lands as being located within the proposed Dixie Lakeshore MTSA, which is a Primary MTSA. GSAI supported the Region’s application of the Primary Station MTSA to the subject lands.</p> <p>Requested an increased minimum density of 300 persons and jobs per hectare be applied to the subject lands, consistent with the intent of the Primary Station MTSA. The lesser density target of 160 persons and jobs per hectare is currently contemplated. Noted that the subject lands are within a ten-minute walking distance of the Long Branch GO Station. Provided justification for the increased minimum density increase.</p> <p>Draft Schedule Y7 of the ROPA does not capture the Long Branch GO Station MTSA located in the adjacent municipality. The ROPA should disregard municipal boundaries and apply the Provincial MTSA delineation from the Long Branch GO Station over the subject lands and lands generally east of Dixie Road.</p> <p>GSAI agreed that more collaboration is required with municipal partners to examine the suitability of each MTSA for IZ. Requested that the Region specifically acknowledge that the planning applications related to the subject lands pre-date the consideration of IZ being applied to either the Lakeshore Dixie MTSA or the Long Branch GO Station</p>	<p>Support for the delineation of LBRT-1 (Dixie) as a “primary” MTSA is noted. The Region has proposed a separate delineation from the Long Branch GO station MTSA in Toronto as the neighbourhoods are separated by the Etobicoke Creek and to respect the unique land use contexts. As of September 2021, the City of Toronto proposed a lower alternative density of 80 people and jobs per hectare to reflect the land use character in their municipality, while the Region has proposed a minimum density of 160 people and jobs per hectare to meet the Growth Plan minimum density on the lands in the LBRT-1 delineation in Peel.</p> <p>Exemptions from local municipal Inclusionary Zoning by-laws are outlined in <i>O.Reg. 232/18</i>.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Region and local municipalities are committed to working with development applicants to maximize opportunities for affordable housing options that meet housing need. Applicants are required to demonstrate a contribution towards Peel-wide new housing unit targets on affordability, rental tenure, and density as detailed in Table 4 of the Plan.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>MTSA and should be exempt.</p> <p>GSAI generally supported the intent of the Dixie Lakeshore MTSA delineation and draft policies which require local municipalities to implement and reflect the MTSA at the local level and be established through the ROPA. The proposed MTSA mapping should reflect the MTSA in adjacent municipalities – in this case, the Long Branch GO Station MTSA.</p>	
STAT-21-417	November 29, 2021	Jonabelle Ceremuga Senior Associate Development Planner, Corbett Land Strategies	<p>On behalf of the Muzzo Group of Companies, CLS submitted the findings of the environmental investigation conducted by Beacon Environmental and R.J. Burnside. A previous submission presented preliminary findings from the engineering and technical studies prepared by retained consultants to encourage the Region to include the following properties into the SABE: 5450 Mayfield Road, 12729 Torbram Road, 14747 The Gore Road, and 14297 Mount Hope Road. The four requested properties are now included in the draft recommended SABE, except for 14297 Mount Hope Road, which is only partially included.</p> <p>Provided an overview of the findings of the Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment Results – Mount Hope Road prepared by Beacon Environmental, dated September 23, 2021. Appended this memorandum to the submission. Given these findings, CLS recommended that the Region reconsider the Mount Hope property for further inclusion within the SABE. SABE ID #24</p>	<p>This site been recorded as SABE request #24.</p> <p>The subject property has been reviewed and considered for inclusion within the 2051 New Community Area boundary and Regional Urban Boundary. The portion of the subject property outside the Greenbelt Plan Area is included in the 2051 New Community Area and Regional Urban Boundary. The portion of the subject property located within the Greenbelt Plan Area is not proposed to be included in the 2051 New Community Area or Regional Urban Boundary. In accordance with the Greenbelt Plan Policy 3.4.2.1, settlement areas outside the Greenbelt are not permitted to expand into the Greenbelt.</p> <p>The technical inventory of features prepared by Beacon Environmental is noted and will be listed as a technical inventory conducted on behalf of the landowner in the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Study Scoped Subwatershed Study report for future reference when conducting the detailed subwatershed study for this area.</p> <p>Comment addressed in 2022 Public Comment Response Table (March 29, 2022 – April 28, 2022), see comment STAT- 22-080.</p>
STAT-21-418	December 7, 2021	David Sylvester West Caledon Aggregate Group	<p>West Caledon Aggregate Group learned that the aggregate policies will not be completed in time for the July 1, 2022 deadline. As such, these policies will not be included in the Ministerial approval process and will therefore be appealable. Troubled by the implications of this news, as any proposed aggregate policies protecting water resources and natural heritage assets in the Region may be rendered ineffective.</p>	<p>The aggregate resources policy review is proceeding as a separate staged amendment within the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan review in accordance with Sections 17 and 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i>. Amendments that are undertaken as a component of a Section 26 official plan review and approved by the province are not subject to appeal.</p>
STAT-21-419	December 13, 2021	Balkaran Dhillon Partner, Turner Moore LLP	<p>Supportive of the proposed growth of the Town of Caledon, however, concerned with the ‘flip-flopping’ regarding the proposed employment reserve, which has caused confusion. Requested that the lands north of Healey Road, west of Innislake Road, and south of King Road be added as employment lands, instead of being held as reserve for future employment.</p> <p>Described logistics industry challenges in the Town of Caledon. The current SABE does not address transportation/logistics industries issues. Proposed a solution to these issues and requested that the Regional Council and staff increase the Sandhill employment area and extend the reserve to Castleridge Drive along Airport Road to eliminate truck parking and help manage the growth of employment.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment STAT-21-001</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-425	December 15, 2021	Saima Siddiqui	<p>Provided comments on the Draft Inclusionary Zoning Feasibility Study and Policy Directions. The comment letter suggests that the plan for inclusionary zoning does not go far enough and should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set a minimum of 20-30% of square footage, or gross floor area, of all new developments set aside as affordable rental housing. 2. Affordability period should be in perpetuity, or forever. 3. Apply inclusionary zoning to developments with 60 units or more. 4. Ensure that people earning \$20,000 to \$60,000 per year can afford affordable housing. 5. Need affordable housing in all parts of the Region. Inclusionary zoning requirements should not be lower in low-income neighbourhoods. 6. Require every development to include the maximum amount of affordable rental housing feasible, based on annual feasibility studies identifying the highest amount possible in every area of the city. 	See response to comment STAT-21-003.
STAT-21-427	December 22, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL (sent via Sierra Horton)	<p><u>Written Submission for February 3, 2022 PGMC Meeting:</u></p> <p>SGL represents the Humber Station Landowners Group, who own lands south of Healey Road, east of Humber Station Road, and north of Mayfield Road. The subject lands have been referred to as the Humber Station Village lands or Option 6 lands. The subject lands were added to the Bolton Rural Centre through the approval of ROPA 30.</p> <p>Confirmed their clients' support of the Region's identification of Employment Areas in existing Settlement Areas and the proposed Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Areas. Their client are also supportive of the Humber Station Village lands not being identified as being within an Employment Area.</p> <p>In the secondary plan study for the subject lands being prepared by the Humber Station Landowners Group, it is anticipated that employment lands will be provided adjacent to the proposed GTA West alignment, with the balance of the block to be designated for Community uses.</p>	Comment noted.
STAT-21-428	December 23, 2021	Maham Siddiqui Planner, Sajecki Planning	<p>Represents Manulife Investment Management, the owner of 1330 – 1350 Crestlawn Drive, 1330-44 Fewster Drive/4520-40 Dixie Road, 4500 Dixie Road/1310 Fewster Drive, and 4560 Dixie Road. Provided a planning justification letter in support of the employment conversion request for the subject lands, which was submitted to the Region on October 15, 2021. to convert the subject lands from Business Employment to Mixed-Use. Refer to STAT-21-009.</p> <p>Provided a revised preliminary draft concept based on feedback from the City of Mississauga. This revised concept features higher intensification of employment uses and lower residential density than the initial concept.</p>	<p>The sites at Dixie Road and Crestlawn Drive have been recorded as employment conversion request M24. An employment conversion and removal of the site from the Regional employment area is not supported.</p> <p>For more information refer to the Updated Employment Conversion Analysis on the Region's Peel 2051 Growth Management Focus Area webpage: https://www.peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/focus-areas/growth-management.asp.</p>
STAT-21-429	December 14, 2021	Paul Lowes Principal, SGL (sent via Sierra Horton)	Submitted a letter on behalf of the Wildfield Village Landowners Group included on the agenda of the December 14 th Town of Caledon Council meeting.	<p>This has been recorded as SABE request #57.</p> <p>For reasons outlined in the February 3, 2022 Planning and Growth</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>This letter spoke to Agenda Item 10.6 (December 6, 2021 Planning and Development Committee Report) on this agenda, specifically Staff Report 2021-0468: Proposed Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Concept for Region of Peel Official Plan.</p> <p>The Wildfield Village Landowners Group owns a significant portion of the land in the concession block south of Healey Road, west of The Gore Road, north of Mayfield Road, and east of Centreville Creek Road. The subject lands are identified as Community Area by the Peel 2051 Draft Recommended SABE. Expressed support for the Region's work.</p> <p>Town of Caledon Staff Report 2021-0468 recommends changes to the Region's draft SABE, which SGL is concerned about as it relates to the proposed changes to the allocation of residential and employment lands. The amount of Community Area and Employment Area was determined by the Region in conformity with the Province's LNA methodology and involved extensive analysis by the Region and its consultations. SGL is of the opinion that Town Staff's proposed decrease in residential land supply ignores this work and will impact land supply for ground-related housing, resulting in implications for housing affordability. An LNA in accordance with the Province's methodology was not provided in the Town Staff Report which would support the departure from the Region's results and the recommended reduction in residential land. SABE ID #57</p>	<p>Management Committee report, three changes have with respect to the locations of some community/employment within the SABE. This report can be reviewed here: https://peelregion.ca/officialplan/review/reading-room/#rc</p> <p>No changes have been recommended to the subject site in the SABE mapping as part of this Feb 3, 2022 report.</p>
STAT-21-430	December 22, 2021	L. Jhajj	<p>Against mixed denser community subdivisions. Would prefer if Peel stick to condo towns subdivision and separate detached subdivision, not mix them. This will not solve affordability issues we face today but rather just give developers and builders chance to increase the prices of condos townhomes ever higher so it looks like that is all Peel region residents can afford. There is no reason for a detached home to cost three times more than it was in 2015. Nothing changed as an economy or Region, so then why are prices so high? Because builders sell limited lots when the City approved whole subdivision. This way they keep demand always higher than supply. They control supply so they can charge more.</p> <p>Peel Region and the City of Brampton needs to mandate these greedy developers/builders to 'use it or loose it' if they do not develop all lots that are approved by the City within a set timeframe.</p> <p>If a builder increase prices in an area resale market follows that too. Hence it becomes a vicious cycle.</p> <p>Recently DiGreen launched only 20 lots and still they price gouged Bramptonians by increasing up to \$200k prices within few lots. They started selling at \$1.7M but finished at \$2.1M. Why? What changed within a few hours or days? Did their land suddenly cost more, or their trades went on strike asking for up to \$200k per house more? Pure greed.</p> <p>City councillors need to wake up and come out of their comfort zones and mandate</p>	<p>The Region of Peel understands the need to provide a range and mix of housing options for residents, including types, densities and ownership and rental tenure, and increase the supply of affordable housing. Mixed density housing options, which includes condominiums and detached homes but also includes other housing types such as townhomes, meet housing need and support density and intensification goals and the goal of creating complete communities.</p> <p>Peel-wide new housing unit targets (Table 4) on affordability (30% of all new housing units are affordable housing, of which 50% of all affordable housing units are encouraged to be affordable to low-income households), rental (25% of all new units are rental), and density (50% of all new units are a housing type other than detached or semi-detached) support housing objectives of creating more housing options and densities that are affordable and meet local need.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>these builders, otherwise your own kids will not be able to buy and live in Peel while these builders got millions and billions, so they are not worried about their next generations.</p> <p>Think and wake up, Peel Region Policy and Planning Division.</p>	
STAT-21-431i	December 28, 2021	Suzanne Thomas	<p>Received Councillor Martin Medeiros' Winter 2021 newsletter and wanted to provide feedback in regard to Peel 2051 growth and development. Attempted to access the Peel 2051 Community Survey but received notification that the survey is closed.</p> <p><u>Pedestrian Safety Between Main Street South/Queen Street West and Main Street South/Steeles Avenue West</u></p> <p>Described personal experiences as a pedestrian living between the Main Street South/Queen Street West and Main Street South/Steeles Avenue West intersections. Considers it dangerous to be a pedestrian in the area, primarily due to traffic utilising the streets to avoid congestion from the surrounding busier streets. The most dangerous situation is the use of the Shoppers World Brampton parking lot to avoid Main Street South/Steeles Avenue West congestion.</p> <p>There are frequent occurrences of speeding, vehicles coming to a rolling stop at stop signs, vehicles not stopping or slowing down at stop signs, pedestrian crossings being ignored, and aggressiveness from drivers if pedestrians attempt to draw attention to stop signs and pedestrian crossings.</p> <p><u>Centennial Senior Public School</u></p> <p>Described the danger and disruption caused by vehicle drivers not utilising the area designated to drop students off at and pick students up from Centennial Senior Public School.</p> <p>Provided collision details retrieved from the Peel Region Police Twitter as reported to the public between September 28 and December 24, 2021. Recommended that Peel Region would consider adopting a program similar to RIDE.</p>	Comment has been passed along to the Region's Traffic Safety group for investigation.
STAT-21-431ii	December 28, 2021	Suzanne Thomas	<p>While housing is important, continuing to build in Peel without extensive changes to the infrastructure is putting residents at risk.</p> <p><u>Replacement of Shoppers World Brampton Concerns</u></p> <p>The area surrounding Shoppers World Brampton is highly populated with vulnerable residents who rely on Shoppers World Brampton to enable them to live independently. Replacing this centre would limit the ability of the vulnerable population to live independently, limit options available to those wishing to leave unsafe living situations and increase congestion in an already suffering area.</p>	<p>Regional staff have provided comments on the proposed development and emphasized the need for a range and mix of housing units, including rental and affordable housing, to create a transit-oriented mixed-use complete community.</p> <p>The redevelopment is being designed as a mixed use community with an indoor mall that has pedestrian access on the street grid.</p>
STAT-21-	November 17,	Anne Margaret Sylvester	We are concerned about protecting our water resources in Caledon. Can you create	The aggregate resources policy review is proceeding as a separate staged

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
432	2021		policies to ensure aggregate will not create any adverse impacts on surface and ground water resources?	amendment within the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan review in accordance with Sections 17 and 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i> .
STAT-21-433	November 17, 2021	David Sylvester	Hoping for more detail on aggregate policies and protection of water resources. I realize that these policies are still to be drafted. Aggregate in Caledon has created significant land use conflict. I would suggest a reciprocally applied minimum separation distance of 500-1,000m for pits and quarries and sensitive receptors would be enormously helpful in minimizing these conflicts.	The aggregate resources policy review is proceeding as a separate staged amendment within the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan review in accordance with Sections 17 and 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i> .
STAT-21-434	November 17, 2021	Margaret Shier	<p>1. I am gobsmacked by the projected population of Caledon! Transportation hubs do not reflect what will be required as housing in the proposed development areas of Caledon will have to be very high density.</p> <p>2. How is transportation (public) tied with neighbouring communities (I.e., TTC subway)?</p> <p>3. Very disappointed that aggregate is not reflected in any of the maps (and I mean existing and proposed gravel pits).</p>	<p>The Region of Peel undertakes a regular review of transportation needs based on planned future population and employment growth to ensure adequate transportation infrastructure is in place to support future growth.</p> <p>The Region of Peel is working with the Town of Caledon to advocate to the Province for the advancement of commuter GO Rail Service to Caledon to connect to the Metrolinx GO Rail Network. The existing transit system in the Town of Caledon is comprised of a combination of Town of Caledon, Brampton Transit and GO Bus Routes, connecting the Town to the City of Brampton, City of Mississauga, and Town of Orangeville.</p> <p>The aggregate resources policy review is proceeding as a separate staged amendment within the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan review in accordance with Sections 17 and 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>
STAT-21-435	November 17, 2021	Naval Gupta	Region of Peel should focus more on transit system/goods and services as truckers are all over the roads which is a serious risk for everyone else sharing the road.	The Region of Peel works with local municipal transit agencies and Metrolinx to advance and strengthen the rapid transit system in the Region of Peel. The Region has also developed a Goods Movement Strategic Plan and Strategic Goods Movement Network which identifies primary goods movement corridors and works closely with the
STAT-21-436	November 24, 2021	Heather Read-Crossley	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region's new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region's Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region's natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell's Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments
Public Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	
STAT-21-437	November 26, 2021	Tithi Choksi	<p>Asked Peel Regional Council to reject the Draft Recommended Settlement Area Boundary Expansion and policies, and any SABE, and to instead direct staff to prepare a growth concept which accommodates the next 30 years of Peel Region’s new homes and workplaces within its existing Settlement Area Boundaries.</p> <p>Expanding Peel Region’s Settlement Area Boundary even further would be an unmitigated disaster for the Region’s natural heritage and our farmland, because it would commit us, for 30 years, to roughly double the rate at which we are already bulldozing green space. While Peel Region used about 482 acres per year 2001 and 2019 the new plans would see the Region burn through roughly 27,500 more acres by 2051. This would destroy the fragile ecology of the Campbell’s Cross Creek and other upper tributaries of West Humber River, which provide some of the last remaining habitat for the endangered Redside Dace, and would destroy quality farmland that Ontario and Canada simply cannot spare.</p> <p>Squandering the next 30 years of new residents and jobs on more sprawl would abandon our climate change obligations and betray the vast majority of existing Peel Region residents, because that growth is needed to complete existing neighborhoods and make alternatives to driving viable. When surveyed, 64% of Peel Region’s residents said they would “much prefer” to live in a neighborhood where they “didn’t need to use a car to do [their] shopping, recreation, entertainment, or commutes to work or school.”</p> <p>Peel must use the next 30 years to fix its 20th century planning mistakes, not to double down on them. Vote no to settlement area boundary expansion.</p>	Please see response to comment STAT-21-067.