

**Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing**

Municipal Services Office
Central Ontario
777 Bay Street, 13th Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2J3
Tel.: 416-585-6226
Facsimile: 416-585-6882
Toll-Free: 1-800-668-0230

**Ministère des
Affaires municipales
et du Logement**

Bureau des services aux municipalités
du Centre de L'Ontario
777, rue Bay, 13^e étage
Toronto ON M7A 2J3
Téléphone : 416-585-6226
Télécopieur : 416-585-6882
Sans frais : 1-800-668-0230



August 10, 2021

Sent via email only

Duran Wedderburn, Principal Planner
Policy Development – Regional Planning and Growth Management
Region of Peel
10 Peel Centre Drive, 6th Floor, Suite A
Brampton, ON L6T 4B9

Dear Duran Wedderburn,

**RE: Provincial Review Comments
Region of Peel Draft Major Transit Station Area Official Plan Amendment
MMAH File No. 21-OP-215826**

Thank you for providing the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (“MMAH”) with the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Region’s draft Major Transit Station Area (“MTSA”) Official Plan Amendment (“ROPA”). MMAH staff understand that the draft ROPA is being brought forward as part of the Peel 2041+ Regional Official Plan (“ROP”) Review and proposes to establish a policy framework for MTSAs that includes delineations and minimum density targets.

As part of the One Window Provincial Planning Service, the draft ROPA was reviewed by staff at the Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade (“MEDJCT”); the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (“MECP”); and the Ministry of Transportation (“MTO”). The following comments relate to conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019 (“Growth Plan”) and consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (“PPS”).

The Growth Plan places significant emphasis on ensuring that MTSA’s along priority transit corridors, as identified by the Province, are prioritized for future growth and development to support the optimization of transit investments. With this goal in mind, MMAH staff note the following key comments with the draft ROPA, in addition to more detailed comments provided in *Attachments 1 and 2*:

- **MTSA delineations on priority transit corridors do not appear to include the maximum number of potential transit users, as per the Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.2.**
Growth Plan policies provide direction for development in MTSAs to include a diverse mix of uses to support existing and planned transit service levels. These uses could

include low-density uses (i.e. employment areas and residential neighbourhoods, including those with additional residential units), provincially significant employment zones, and areas determined to be inaccessible due to infrastructure rights-of way from MTSAs delineations. Please see more detailed comments regarding opportunities to broaden delineations in *Attachment 1*.

- **Additional information is requested to help rationalize requests for alternative minimum density targets for MTSAs on priority transit corridors, as per Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.4.** It appears that delineations are not capturing the maximum number of potential transit users and therefore it is unclear if alternative minimum density targets are required. The Region is encouraged to broaden delineations and re-examine the need and rationale for an alternative minimum density target. Please see comments in *Attachment 1* regarding opportunities to broaden delineations, in addition to feedback regarding the Region's rationale for alternative targets.
- **Protected MTSAs, undertaken in accordance with subsection 16 (16) of the Planning Act, must be clearly identified and differentiated.** It appears, based on the draft ROPA (policy 5.6.1.6), that "Planned" MTSAs are being classified as Protected MTSAs, however these station areas do not meet the requirements of subsection 16(16) of the *Planning Act*, including that they be delineated, have a minimum density target and be located on a high order transit corridor. Please see *Attachment 1* for recommended policy language.

Please note that both the Growth Plan (policies 5.2.3.4 and 5.2.3.7) and PPS (policy 1.2.2), require planning authorities to coordinate planning matters with Indigenous communities. First Nations and Metis communities, whose interests may be impacted by planning decisions, are to be engaged to ensure that they have adequate opportunity to participate fully in the process. Should the Region adopt this draft ROPA, it is requested that information respecting any municipal engagement process be provided to MMAH, including any submissions.

We look forward to continuing to work with Peel Region staff on this draft ROPA. Should you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at Loralea.Tulloch@ontario.ca or Jennifer Le, Planner, at Jennifer.Le@ontario.ca.

Sincerely,



Loralea Tulloch
Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development (West)

cc. Joy Simms, Principal Planner (A) – Policy Development, Peel Region
OGS
MEDJCT
MECP
MTO

Attachment 1 – Detailed Provincial Comments on Peel Region’s draft MTSA ROPA

Example – Text highlighted in grey are recommended additions to the proposed policy

Example – Text in red with strikethrough are recommended deletions to the proposed policy

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
MTSAs on Priority Transit Corridors – Targets and Delineations				
1.	Schedule Y7	The draft ROPA does not appear to map priority transit corridors.	Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.1	<p>Priority transit corridors, as shown in Schedule 5, are required to be identified.</p> <p>Although the draft ROPA lists the priority transit corridors in Table Y1, they should also be identified on Schedule Y7 for clarity and to better align with the Growth Plan.</p>
2.	Schedule Y7 and Table Y1	<p>According to the Region’s supplemental information package, provided May 6, 2021 (“supplemental information package”), lands within the 800 metre radius of stations, to which an alternative minimum density target is being requested, are largely restricted from development or built form with single-detached low density residential.</p> <p>More broadly, according to the Preamble for the draft ROPA, some key assumptions applied to the process of establishing all delineations was to manage the inclusion of low-density residential areas and consider areas with established character and intensification policies by the local municipalities.</p>	Growth Plan policies 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.9 and 2.2.6	<p>The Region should consider including established low-density residential areas in all MTSA delineations located on a priority transit corridor, recognizing opportunities for gentle intensification over time.</p> <p>It is understood that these areas will likely not see a significant increase in density; however, a broader range of low-rise housing types (i.e. semi-detached, duplex, triplex, townhomes and additional residential units) should be considered as infill opportunities to support a modest increase in density, while maintaining the existing character in these areas.</p> <p>In 2019 the <i>Planning Act</i> was amended through More Homes, More Choice: Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan (Bill 108) to require municipalities to adopt official plan policies and pass zoning by-laws that authorize additional residential units (previously known as second units), in primary residential units (i.e., detached, semi-detached and row house) and in other buildings on the same property (i.e. ancillary buildings or structures) such as above garages or in coach houses). Additionally, in 2019, <u>Ontario Regulation 299/19</u> came into effect to remove barriers to the creation of additional residential units.</p> <p>The full range of housing types permitted for additional residential units should be factored into the delineation and minimum density target calculation.</p>

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
3.	Schedule Y7	According to the Preamble for the draft ROPA, a key assumption applied to the process of establishing all MTSA delineations was to minimize the inclusion of provincially significant employment zones (PSEZ).	Growth Plan policies 2.2.4.8, 2.2.4.5.10 c), 2.2.5.14 and 7 (PSEZ definition)	<p>The Growth Plan allows the Minister to identify PSEZs as areas that consist of both employment areas and mixed-use areas that contain a significant number of jobs. While not designated in the Growth Plan, PSEZs are intended to protect employment areas from conversion without provincial approval, unless the employment area is located within a MTSA. This approach provides flexibility to municipalities who wish to support mixed use development within MTSAs while maintaining a significant number of jobs.</p> <p>MMAH staff understand that PSEZs containing an employment area may not see a significant increase in density due to more traditional low-density employment uses being most prevalent (e.g. manufacturing, warehousing, etc.).</p> <p>The Growth Plan recognizes that there are lands which accommodate a wide variety of employment uses that are outside of employment areas and provides policy direction to support the retention of jobs as these lands are redeveloped.</p> <p>The Region should reconsider excluding PSEZs within MTSA delineations given their potential to contribute to job creation. The MTSA density target may be met by exclusively residential development, exclusively employment-related development, or a combination of residential and employment-related development (e.g. mixed-use development).</p>
4.	Schedule Y7 and Table Y1	<p>According to the Region's supplemental information package, alternative density targets are being sought because development is prohibited or restricted on a significant portion of the MTSA's 800 metre radius due to the Highway 403 right-of-way and/or environmental features, for the following stations or stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winston Churchill • Creditview • Central Parkway • Cawthra 	Growth Plan policies 2.2.4.4.b), 2.2.4.8 and 2.2.4.9	<p>Infrastructure rights-of-way and environmental features should only act as a barrier to including lands within the delineated area if pedestrian access across (e.g. sidewalks, trails) does not exist. There appears to be access across the infrastructure rights-of-way (e.g. Highway 403 right-of way, rail corridors) via north-south arterial/collector roads for all of the aforementioned stations or stops. In the case for Malton GO, a trail, in addition to Airport Road, also provide pedestrian access across the environmental feature to lands north of the station.</p> <p>Environmental features and infrastructure rights-of-way, where development is severely restricted, can be included within the MTSA delineation. The Growth Plan clarifies that development on lands within a delineated area is still subject to relevant provincial and municipal land use planning policies and approval</p>

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tomken • Dixie • Malton GO 		<p>processes. Additionally, the Growth Plan states that the minimum intensification and density targets do not require or permit development that is not permitted by the PPS, such as hazardous lands.</p> <p>MTSA delineations should therefore be broadened to include lands with access across infrastructure rights-of-way and environmental features.</p> <p>Lastly, MMAH staff note that for Dixie Station, the Highway 403 right-of-way is well outside of the station's 800 metre radius and only a small portion of lands within the 800-metre radius of Tomken Station appear to contain the Highway 403 right-of-way. Additional information is needed to understand how the Highway 403 right-of-way would be severely restricting a significant portion of the lands within these delineated areas.</p>
5.	Table Y7	<p>According to the Region's supplemental information package, alternative density targets are being sought given most passenger activity is from a larger population base than the MTSA itself, for the following stations or stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winston Churchill • Creditview • Central Parkway • Cawthra • Tomken • Dixie • Malton • Mineola <p>In many instances, the Region appears to suggest that some MTSAs are considered major trip generators due to elementary and secondary schools located within the 800-metre radius from the station or stop.</p>	Growth Plan policies 2.2.4.4.b), 2.2.4.8, 2.2.4.9 and 5.2.3.1	<p>In accordance with Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.4 b), the Minister may approve an alternative MTSA minimum density target where it has been demonstrated that there are a limited number of residents and jobs associated with the built form, but a major trip generator or feeder service will sustain high ridership at the station or stop.</p> <p>Further information is needed to understand how major trip generators (i.e. elementary and secondary schools located within the 800-metre radius from the station or stop) and feeder services (i.e. networks of shorter public transit routes, like bus services, which connect to stations or stops on main transit lines and provide service integration within and across municipal boundaries) may sustain high ridership in cases where alternative MTSA minimum density targets are being requested.</p> <p>Additional information is also requested to understand how the inclusion of parking areas would support the achievement of transit-supportive densities within a MTSA, as per policy 2.2.4.9 c) of the Growth Plan.</p>

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
		The Region also appears to suggest that high ridership will be sustained at stations or stops by the presence of drop off areas and parking lots adjacent to stations or stops which encourage passenger use from developments outside of the MTSA boundary. Information is also provided regarding corridor performance statistics for the priority corridors to which these stations/stops are located on.		
Hierarchy of MTSAs				
6.	5.6.1.6, Table Y1 and Schedule Y7	<p>MMAH staff have concerns that the draft ROPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appears to be placing higher priority on MTSAs located on priority transit corridors to which an alternative density target would not apply (referred to in the draft ROPA as “primary” MTSAs); • is not clear as to which MTSAs the <i>Planning Act’s Protected MTSA</i> framework applies to. Based on policy 5.6.1.6, it appears that “planned” MTSA, which are not delineated and do not have a minimum density target, are being categorized as a Protected MTSA; and • states that “planned” MTSAs will have transit infrastructure which may be misleading since some of these areas are currently unfunded and without a commitment for funding. 	Growth Plan policies 2.2.4.1 and 2.2.1	<p>It is recommended that the draft ROPA be revised to indicate that all MTSAs along a priority transit corridor are considered “primary” stations to which planning will be prioritized, regardless of whether they have an alternative density target, as per the Growth Plan. For MTSAs not on a priority transit corridor, it is recommended that these stations be referred to as “secondary” MTSAs.</p> <p>MTSA’s being implemented under subsection 16(16) of the <i>Planning Act</i> should be clearly identified and differentiated from those not and to which appeal protections would not apply. Only MTSAs that meet criteria under <i>Planning Act</i> subsection 16(16) can be considered a Protected MTSA, including, but not limited to, requirements that they be located on a higher order transit corridor, be delineated and have a minimum density target.</p> <p>To improve transparency and manage expectations, it is recommended that the draft ROPA indicate that transit services, stations or stops within planned MTSAs are at various stages of planning and development and that some stations may be currently unfunded and without a commitment for funding. While MTO and Metrolinx recognize that the Region is proactively undertaking early comprehensive planning work in these areas, any planning work undertaken for unfunded stations or stops will not influence any formal funding commitment by MTO or Metrolinx.</p>

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
				<p>It is recommended that policy 5.6.1.6 be revised as follows (and that Table Y1 and Schedule Y7 be updated accordingly):</p> <p>“5.6.1.6 Each Protected Major Transit Station Area shall reflect one of the station classifications outlined below and shown on Schedule Y7 to support transit-oriented development and increased ridership. This will be based on the form and function of the station to be established in the official plan of the local municipality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Primary Major Transit Station Area – Areas delineated in this plan, located on priority transit corridors and where planning will be prioritized, including zoning, in a manner that implements the policies of this plan that have existing or planned transit supportive built forms and can meet or exceed the minimum transit supportive density target. Primary Major Transit Station Areas are Protected in accordance with subsection 16(16) of the <i>Planning Act</i>. b) Secondary Major Transit Station Area – Areas delineated in this plan that are not located on priority transit corridors but have been identified as Regionally significant areas for accommodating intensification and higher-density mixed uses in a more compact built form 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 with a mix of uses that support increased transit ridership. Secondary Major Transit Station Areas are Protected in accordance with subsection 16(16) of the <i>Planning Act</i>. c) Planned Major Transit Station Area – Areas identified in the Regional Official Plan which are intended to become Major Transit Station Areas that are not yet delineated but will be when infrastructure planning and investment and/or land use changes unlock potential. Transit infrastructure may be existing and operational, however, in some of these areas transit infrastructure may still be in delivery or currently unfunded and without a commitment for funding.”

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
7.	5.6.1.6 and Table Y1	MMAH staff have concerns that draft policy 5.6.1.6 c) states that “planned” MTSAs will have transit infrastructure, which may be misleading since some of these areas are currently unfunded and without a commitment for funding.	Growth Plan policy 5.2.3.1	In addition to the recommended policy revision to policy 5.6.1.6 c) in Item 6, the Region should consider adding a column to Table Y1 which indicates the current status of transportation infrastructure within all MTSAs to improve transparency and ensure a co-ordinated approach is taken regarding transit infrastructure planning between the province, Metrolinx and municipalities. Please see Attachment 2 for station status as provided by MTO/Metrolinx.
Ensuring MTSAs are Transit-Supportive, Achieve Multi-modal Access and Connect to Major Trip Generators (Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.8)				
8.	5.6.1.4 and 5.6.2.3	These draft policies could be strengthened to ensure proper planning and implementation of active transportation infrastructure.	Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.8	<p>For clarity, it is recommended that the Region identify forms of active transportation infrastructure, including sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and bicycle parking, to better align with the Growth Plan.</p> <p>“5.6.1.4 Enhance active transportation connections and infrastructure (including sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and secure bicycle parking) to transit stations and stops to support complete communities, improve multi-modal station access, and to support the Region’s modal split target by increasing transit ridership in Peel.”</p> <p>It is also recommended that active transportation infrastructure be considered through the development of phasing plans or strategies, as follows:</p> <p>“5.6.2.3 j) a phasing plan or strategy to ensure soft and hard infrastructure is delivered in a manner that supports complete communities, including open space, and-accessible public amenities, and active transportation infrastructure;”</p>
9.	5.6.2.3	The draft ROPA appears to be missing policy which speaks to ensuring all MTSAs will contain connections to local and regional transit services in support of transit service integration.	Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.8 a) and section 7	<p>It is recommended that this policy be revised to provide clarity that connections to both local and regional transit services will be planned for and to better align with the Growth Plan.</p> <p>It is recommended that this policy be revised as follows:</p> <p>“5.6.2.3 k) strategies to support increased multi-modal access and connectivity to local and regional transit services in support of transit service integration;”</p>

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
				For clarity, it is also recommended that the Region add the term “transit service integration” to its official plan glossary and provide a definition which conforms to that found in section 7 of the Growth Plan.
Ensuring Provincial Approval for Future Changes to Protected MTSAs (<i>Planning Act Section 16</i>)				
10.	7.2.2.9	This draft policy allows for minor corrections to a MTSAs delineation to occur without an amendment to the Region's official plan, provided that the purpose, effect, intent, meaning and substance of the official plan is maintained.	Planning Act subsection 16(18)	<p>Any changes to the boundaries of a PMTSA delineation, even if minor, would be subject to the Minister's approval.</p> <p>It is recommended that this policy be revised as follows:</p> <p>“7.2.2.9 f) a Major Transit Station Area station or stop location or delineation to reflect the actual built infrastructure or applicable information regarding location from technical studies.”</p>
Supporting and Co-ordinating Development within all MTSAs (Growth Plan policies 2.2.4.9 and 5.2.3.1)				
11.	5.6.1.5	This draft policy uses the term “second units”, which is outdated.	Planning Act subsection 16(3); and Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.9 a)	<p>The term “secondary units” was replaced in the <i>Planning Act</i> with “additional residential units” in 2019 through the More Homes, More Choice: Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan (Bill 108).</p> <p>It is recommended that this policy be revised as follows:</p> <p>“5.6.1.5 Where appropriate, support a mix of multi-unit housing, including affordable housing, rental housing, and additional residential units second units.”</p>
12.	5.6.2.3 (new policy)	The draft ROPA does not appear to contain policy which speaks to the importance of fostering collaboration and co-ordination with public and private sectors to support development within MTSAs, as per the Growth Plan.	Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.9 b), and 5.2.3.1	<p>It is recommended that the Region add the following new policy:</p> <p>“5.6.2.3 p) fostered collaboration between public and private sectors to support development within all Major Transit Station Areas, such as <i>joint development projects</i>.”</p>
13.	5.6.2.3 (new policy)	The draft ROPA does not appear to contain policy which states that development within MTSAs will be supported by providing alternative development standards, as per the Growth Plan.	Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.9 c)	<p>It is recommended that the Region add the following new policy:</p> <p>“5.6.2.3 q) alternative development standards to support development within all Major Transit Station Areas, such as reduced parking standards.”</p>

Item No.	OP Section	Provincial Comment	Policy Reference	Requests for Additional Information and Recommended Policy Modifications
Identifying and Protecting Lands Adjacent to or near Higher Order Transit Corridors and Facilities (Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.11)				
14.	5.6.2.3	This draft policy speaks to the need to protect lands for future transit infrastructure, however, is missing reference the need to also identify these lands, as per the Growth Plan.	Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.11	<p>It is recommended that this policy be revised to better align with the Growth Plan.</p> <p>“5.6.2.3 g) protect and identify lands that may be required for future enhancement or expansion of transit infrastructure in collaboration with municipal and provincial transit authorities”</p>
Technical Comments				
15.	Table Y1 – Hurontario LRT	The draft ROPA references “Sir Lou” station, which does not reflect the station’s name in public documents.	N/A	<p>It is recommended that the station name “Sir Lou” be changed to “County Court”. Please see <i>Attachment 2</i>.</p>
16.	Table Y1 – 407 BRT	<p>MMAH staff note the following technical comments on the draft ROPA regarding the 407 BRT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the 407 BRT heading does not reflect anticipated light rail transit service • Winston Churchill, Mavis and Bramalea/Torbram stations were not included in the approved 407 Transitway EA/TPAP final designs 	N/A	<p>It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “407 BRT” be re-labeled as “407 Transitway (BRT/LRT)” • Within the 407 BRT, Winston Churchill, Mavis and Bramalea/Torbram stations should be deleted as these stations will not exist • Winston Churchill Station on the 407 BRT should be replaced with “Lisgar GO”, as the 407 Transitway will connect directly to Lisgar GO station. <p>Please see <i>Attachment 2</i>.</p>

Attachment 2: Proposed Amendments to Peel Region draft MTSA Table Y1 - Station Status

Further to items 7, 15 and 16 in *Attachment 1*, please see below for the status of each station identified in the Peel draft MTSA ROPA as well as additional technical changes.

Example – Text highlighted in grey are recommended additions to the proposed policy

Example – Text in red with strikethrough are recommended deletions to the proposed policy

Stations Status Description:

1. Existing: Transit infrastructure projects that are built and operational.
2. In Delivery: Transit infrastructure projects that are actively being implemented; includes all stages of delivery once funding has been confirmed and publicly announced (detailed design work, procurement, construction).
3. Unfunded: Transit infrastructure projects that have been identified in planning documents as future potential transit investments, but are not yet in delivery.

Table Y1 – Minimum Densities for Major Transit Station Areas								
	Code	Stop/Station Name	Municipality	Classification	Additional Policy Area	Minimum Density	Provincial Designation	Stop/Station Status (As of May 2021)
Hurontario LRT	HLRT - 1 *	Port Credit GO	Mississauga	Primary	-	200	PTC	In delivery ¹
	HLRT - 2 *	Mineola	Mississauga	Secondary	-	50	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 3 *	North Service	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	300	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 4 *	Queensway	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	300	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 5 *	Dundas	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	300	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 6 *	Cooksville GO	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	300	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 7 *	Fairview (Central Parkway)	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	300	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 8 *	Burnhamthorpe (Matthews Gate)	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	400	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 9	Main	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	400		Unfunded
	HLRT - 10	Duke of York	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	400		Unfunded
	HLRT - 11 *	City Centre	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	400	PTC	In delivery

¹ Note that the Port Credit GO station exists, but the connection to the Hurontario LRT does not – as a result this station is labelled as “In Delivery” and further down the GO station itself is labelled “Existing”.

	HLRT - 12 *	Robert Speck	Mississauga	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	400	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 13 *	Eglinton	Mississauga	Primary	-	300	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 14 *	Bristol	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 15 *	Matheson	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 16 *	Britannia	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 17 *	Courtney Park	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 18 *	Derry	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 19 *	Highway 407	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	Unfunded
	HLRT - 20 *	Ray Lawson	Brampton	Primary	-	160	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 21 *	Sir Lou County Court	Combined; See HLRT - 20				PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 22 *	Gateway Terminal	Brampton	Primary	-	160	PTC	In delivery
	HLRT - 23	Charolais	Combined; See HLRT - 22					Unfunded
	HLRT - 24	Nanwood	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	HLRT - 25	Queen at Wellington	Combined; See KIT - 3					Unfunded
Milton GO	MIL - 1	Lisgar GO	Mississauga	Planned	-	N/A		Existing
	MIL - 2	Meadowvale GO	Mississauga	Planned	-	N/A		Existing
	MIL - 3	Streetsville GO	Mississauga	Planned	-	N/A		Existing
	MIL - 4	Erindale GO	Mississauga	Planned	-	N/A		Existing
	MIL - 5	Cooksville GO	Combined; See HLRT - 6					Existing
	MIL - 6		Combined; See DUN - 16					Existing
Kitchener GO	KIT - 1 *	Malton GO	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100	PTC	Existing
	KIT - 2 *	Bramalea GO	Brampton	Primary	-	150	PTC	Existing
	KIT - 3 *	Brampton GO	Brampton	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	200	PTC	Existing
	KIT - 4 *	Mount Pleasant GO	Brampton	Primary	Designated Greenfield Area	150	PTC	Existing
Lakeshore West GO	LWGO - 1 *	Port Credit GO	Combined; See HLRT - 1				PTC	Existing
	LWGO - 2 *	Clarkson GO	Mississauga	Primary	-	150	PTC	Existing
403 BRT (Mississauga Transitway)	403 - 1	Ridgeway	Mississauga	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	403 - 2 *	Winston Churchill	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100	PTC	Existing

	403 - 3 *	Erin Mills	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	Existing
	403 - 4 *	Creditview	Mississauga	Secondary	-	50	PTC	Unfunded
	403 - 5 *	City Centre	Combined; See HLRT - 11				PTC	Existing
	403 - 6 *	Central Parkway	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100	PTC	Existing
	403 - 7 *	Cawthra	Mississauga	Secondary	-	50	PTC	Existing
	403 - 8 *	Tomken	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100	PTC	Existing
	403 - 9 *	Dixie	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100	PTC	Existing
	403 - 10 *	Tahoe	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	Existing
	403 - 11 *	Etobicoke Creek	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	Existing
	403 - 12 *	Spectrum	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	Existing
	403 - 13 *	Orbitor	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	Existing
	403 - 14 *	Renforth	Mississauga	Primary	-	160	PTC	Existing
	DUN - 1	Ridgeway	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		Unfunded
	DUN - 2	Winston Churchill	Mississauga	Primary		160		Unfunded
	DUN - 3	Glen Erin	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		Unfunded
Dundas BRT ²	DUN - 4	Erin Mills	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100		Unfunded
	DUN - 5	UTM	Mississauga	Secondary	-	50		Unfunded
	DUN - 6	Credit Woodlands	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100		Unfunded
	DUN - 7	Erindale Station	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		Unfunded
	DUN - 8	Wolfedale	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		Unfunded
	DUN - 9	Clayhill	Mississauga	Secondary	-	100		Unfunded
	DUN - 10	Confederation Parkway	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
	DUN - 11	Hurontario	Combined; See HLRT - 5					In delivery
	DUN - 12	Kirwin/Camilla	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
	DUN - 13	Grenville	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
	DUN - 14	Cawthra	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
	DUN - 15	Tomken	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery

² Mississauga has received ICIP funding for this 7.2km section of the Dundas BRT.

	DUN - 16	Dixie GO ³	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
	DUN - 17	Wharton	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
Queen Street BRT	QUE - 1	Centre St.	Brampton	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	160		Unfunded
	QUE - 2	Kennedy	Brampton	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	160		Unfunded
	QUE - 3	Rutherford	Brampton	Primary	Urban Growth Centre	160		Unfunded
	QUE - 4	Laurelcrest	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 5	Dixie	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 6	Central Park (Bramalea Terminal)	Brampton	Primary	-	160		Unfunded
	QUE - 7	Bramalea	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 8	Glenvale-Finchgate	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 9	Torbram	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 10	Chrysler-Gateway	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 11	Airport	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 12	Goreway	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 13	McVean	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 14	The Gore	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	QUE - 15	Highway 50	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
407 Transitway BRT/ LRT	407 - 1	Britannia	Mississauga	Primary	Designated Greenfield Area	160		Unfunded
	407 - 2	Derry	Mississauga	Primary	Designated Greenfield Area	160		Unfunded
	407 - 3	Winston Churchill	Brampton	Planned	Designated Greenfield Area	N/A		N/A
		Lisgar GO	Combined; See MIL- 1	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	407 - 4	Mississauga Rd.	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	407 - 5	Mavis	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		N/A
	407 - 6	Hurontario	Combined; See HLRT - 19					Unfunded
	407 - 7	Dixie	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	407 - 8	Bramalea + Torbram	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		N/A

³ The Mississauga ICIP project includes a stop at Dixie, on the Dundas corridor, and protects for a future stop at Dixie GO, which would require a veer off the corridor.

	407 - 9	Airport Rd.	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	407 – 10	Goreway	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
Lakeshore BRT ⁴	LBRT - 1	Dixie	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
	LBRT - 2	Haig (Lakeview Waterfront)	Mississauga	Primary	-	300		In delivery
	LBRT - 3	Lakefront Promenade/ Alexandra Ave	Mississauga	Primary	-	160		In delivery
Transit Hub	HUB - 1	Bolton GO	Caledon	Planned	-	N/A		Unfunded
	HUB - 2	Mayfield West	Caledon	Planned	-	N/A		Existing ⁵
	HUB - 3	Steeles at Mississauga	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Existing ⁶
	HUB - 4	Trinity Common Terminal	Brampton	Planned	-	N/A		Existing ⁷
	HUB - 5	Bramalea Terminal	Combined; See QUE - 6					Existing ⁸

* Major Transit Station Areas identified as priority transit corridors on Schedule 5 of the Growth Plan, 2019.

⁴ Mississauga has received ICIP funding for this section of the Lakeshore BRT.

⁵ This stops/stations qualify as MTSAs on a “major bus depots in an urban core”, even though they are not on any existing or planned higher order transit. While the stop currently exists, it relies on municipally-run bus service and the City may have plans to expand this stop/station in the future.

⁶ Same as above.

⁷ Same as above.

⁸ Same as above.