

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

Note: This table contains all comments received by the Region since October 6, 2021 related to the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review and MCR from agencies/prescribed bodies.

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
Provincial Agencies				
STAT-21-053i	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	As part of the One Window Provincial Planning Service, the draft ROPA was reviewed by staff at the MTO, ENERGY, NDMNRF, MECP, OMAFRA, MHSTCI, and the MEDJCT. High-level comments provided included: MMAH staff continue to have concerns that there are a number of policies in the draft ROPA that direct lower-tier municipalities to implement key provincial policies (e.g., Agricultural System and Growth Plan Natural Heritage System). These provincial policies generally include language such as “shall” or “will”. It is recommended that the Region incorporate key provincial policies at the upper-tier level to ensure a consistent approach across the Region and to coordinate effective implementation of Provincial policies.	The comment regarding policies providing direction to the local municipalities is noted. Appropriate revisions will be made to incorporate key provincial policies at the upper-tier level to ensure a consistent approach recognizing the Five Principles of the Regional Official Plan (e.g., in some cases where provincial policies contain “will” or “shall” directive language). Consistent with the framework of the Regional Official Plan, direction to the local municipalities will be retained in policies that more directly involve local land use planning matters.
STAT-21-053ii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Comments regarding the Greenlands System policies were previously provided in a One Window Comment Letter (dated November 27, 2020) on the Region’s draft Greenlands System policies and Growth Plan natural heritage system policies. MMAH staff continue to have concerns that it is unclear what and where the features comprising the Greenlands System are located in relation to the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan.	The Core Areas of the Greenlands System are shown on Schedule Y1 (now Schedule C-2) in the Regional Plan and key features comprising Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors are shown conceptually on Figure Y2. For the purpose of clarifying where the Greenlands System policies apply, it is recommended that the Greenlands System be mapped as an integrated system in the Regional Plan and shown on a new Schedule (now new Schedule C-1) as an overlay with appropriate policy to interpret the overlay designation supported by accompanying policy as follows: 2.14.6 Identify the Greenlands System as an overlay designation on Schedule C-1. 2.14.7 Only permit development and site alteration within the Greenlands System in accordance with the policies of this Plan subject to provincial legislation, policies, and applicable provincial plans. 2.14.8 Maintain, restore and improve the diversity and connectivity of natural heritage features and areas within the Greenlands System’s components and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of the Greenlands System, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features. 2.14.9 Permit the continuation of the full range of existing and new agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses, and normal farm practices within the Greenlands System subject to the policies of this Plan, provincial legislation, policies and applicable provincial plans. 2.14.10 Refinements to the boundaries of the Greenlands System shown on Schedule C-1 made

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				<p><u>in accordance with the policies of this Plan and the applicable provincial plans will not require an amendment to this Plan. Local official plans may incorporate refinements to the Greenlands System Core Area, Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors in accordance with the interpretation policies of Section 7.3, to reflect existing local natural heritage systems and refinements made through approved development applications.</u></p> <p><u>2.14.11 The Greenlands System Core Areas, Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural areas and Corridors policy framework establishes protection standards and implements provincial and Regional policy direction and objectives in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement. The Core Areas, Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors policy framework applies throughout the Region of Peel and may be more restrictive than provincial plans and the Provincial Policy Statement, unless otherwise stated in provincial policy. In the event of a conflict, the provincial plans take precedence over this Plan.</u></p>
STAT-21-053iii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>The LNA establishes a total land need of 4,524 hectares to 2051, including 3,052 hectares of community area land and 1,490 hectares of employment area land. MMAH staff noted that the conceptual settlement area boundary expansion identified in Schedule Z1 of the draft ROPA, submitted as part of the Region’s June 29, 2021 submission, is approximately 8,000 hectares. MMAH understands that the Region is also considering an option to expand up to approximately 9,000 hectares, as of September 2, 2021. As the LNA only identifies a need for 4,524 hectares, it is unclear how consideration of expansions beyond this land need conform to Growth Plan policies 2.2.1.5 and 2.2.8.2.</p> <p>Additionally, MMAH staff understand that the Region is proposing to convert 273.4 hectares of employment lands to non-employment uses. MMAH noted that demonstration of how each of the proposed employment conversions meet the criteria in Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.9 is required.</p>	<p>The Focus Study Area (FSA) for the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion study is approximately 8,000 hectares. This area was identified as an area to form the basis of technical studies, and not the lands required for expansions.</p> <p>The Land Needs Assessment undertaken by the Region identifies a need for an additional 4,400 hectares of land through boundary expansion to accommodate future growth to 2051.</p> <p>A detailed evaluation of all employment conversions received by the Region can be found in the Employment Planning Implementation Report (January 2022).</p>
STAT-21-053iv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>MMAH staff noted that the conceptual settlement area boundary expansion in Schedule Z1 is creating settlement areas that are not connected to the existing settlement area due to the Greenbelt Protected Countryside. MMAH staff note that this may result in new infrastructure, such as stormwater management facilities, in the Greenbelt. Any such infrastructure would be required to satisfy sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Greenbelt Plan. If possible, the Region should provide continuous connections between areas proposed for expansion (i.e., lands between the Brampton Flying Club and Mayfield West) to avoid/ minimize impacts to the Greenbelt.</p>	<p>Taking into account the recommendations of the SABE technical studies, which informed the identification of the recommended SABE boundary, and the amount of SABE land required, it is not possible to completely avoid settlement expansion adjacent to Greenbelt fingers. This may require locating some infrastructure within Greenbelt locations in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan (e.g., stormwater). Mapping and policy requirements included in the Plan will ensure the long-term protection of the Greenbelt. Policies in the Plan will implement recommendations in the Scoped Subwatershed Study to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts accordingly.</p>
STAT-21-053v	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Noted 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</p>	<p>The Region has been engaging with Indigenous Communities since the onset of the review. Details on the engagement that’s taken place will be submitted with the final package for Province approval.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			requested that information respecting any municipal engagement process be provided to MMAH, including any submissions.	
STAT-21-053vi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Detailed comments provided in Appendix A of the MMAH letter included:</p> <p>Section 2.4.2: This draft policy is recommended to be revised to include reference to active transportation to better align with the objectives of the PPS and Growth Plan in supporting and promoting a range of transportation options, including active transportation.</p> <p>It is recommended that this draft policy be revised as follows: 2.4.2 To support the development of sustainable, low-carbon, compact, mixed-use, and <i>transit supportive</i> communities which reduce greenhouse gas emissions and support active transportation, <i>protect</i> natural systems, features, and functions, and promote renewable energy, energy conservation and efficient design.</p>	Regional staff agree with the proposed revision. ROP Objective 2.4.2 will be revised to include the reference to “and support active transportation” as requested.
STAT-21-053vii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 2.6.20.7 d): This draft policy is recommended to be revised to include identification of appropriate mitigation strategies, in addition to adaptation strategies, to better align with PPS and Growth Plan policies regarding the mitigations of risks to human health, safety, property and the environment through stormwater management planning.</p> <p>It is recommended that this policy be revised as follows: 2.6.20.7 d) examine the cumulative environmental impacts of stormwater from existing and planned <i>development</i>, including an assessment of how climate change and extreme weather events will exacerbate these impacts and the identification of appropriate <i>mitigation and</i> adaptation strategies;</p>	<p>Regional staff agree with the proposed recommendation. Policy 2.6.20.7 will be amended as follows:</p> <p>d) examine the cumulative environmental impacts of stormwater from existing and planned development, including an assessment of how climate change and extreme weather events will exacerbate these impacts and the identification of appropriate <i>mitigation and</i> adaptation strategies;</p>
STAT-21-053viii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 2.6.20.7 g): To better align with the Growth Plan, this draft policy is recommended to include reference to identifying maintenance costs as part of calculating the full life cycle costs of stormwater infrastructure.</p> <p>It is recommended that this policy be revised as follows: 2.6.20.7 g) identify the full life cycle costs of the stormwater <i>infrastructure, including maintenance costs</i>, and options to finance costs over the long-term; and</p>	Regional staff agree with the proposed recommendation. Policy 2.6.20.7 will be amended as requested.
STAT-21-053ix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 2.9: Since the area covered by the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (“LSPP”) overlaps with the ORMCP, draft section 2.9 of the ROPA would benefit from clarity that if there is a conflict between the two provincial plans, the provision that gives the greatest protection to the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe watershed will prevail.</p> <p>It is recommended that an additional policy be added to provide direction on the policies that would apply when there is conflict between the LSPP and the ORMCP.</p>	<p>Regional staff agree with the recommendation. A policy will be added as follows:</p> <p>“2.9.7 In the event of a conflict between the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan policies in Section 2.9 of this Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan policies, with respect to a matter that affects or has the potential to affect the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe watershed, the provision that provides the greatest protection to the ecological health of the Lake Simcoe watershed prevails.”</p>
STAT-21-	November 3,	Jennifer Le	Section 2.11.10 and 2.11.16: Draft policy 2.11.10 a) refers to lawfully	Regional staff agree with the request to clarify the policy for lawfully permitted uses. It is

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
053x	2021	Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	permitted uses in the context of residential uses, however, this specificity is indicated prior to a general statement made about lawfully existing uses in draft policy 2.11.16. It is recommended that the policy regarding lawfully permitted uses be moved from draft policy 2.11.16 to the 'Policies' section of draft policy section 2.11 and reflect the wording in the ORMCP 6(1).	recommended that draft Policy 2.11.16 be deleted and replaced with a new Policy 2.11.10 a) to reflect the general permissions for lawfully existing uses in accordance with the ORMCP. "2.11.10 Direct the Town of Caledon, when it amends its official plan and zoning by-law to bring them into conformity with the ORMCP to: a) permit the use of land, buildings or structures for a purpose prohibited by the ORMCPA, if the land, building or structure was lawfully used for that purpose on November 15, 2001 and continues to be used for that purpose;"
STAT-21-053xi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.11.14 a): "Key hydrologic features" is misspelled as "key hydrolic features".	The misspelling of "hydrologic" has been corrected.
STAT-21-053xii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.11.14 c): The draft ROPA does not clearly identify that the Agricultural System, in particular the agricultural land base mapping, extends beyond the ORM Countryside area and can exist within the Natural Core and Natural Linkage designations. It is recommended that the draft ROPA clearly establishes the Agricultural System across the ORMCP, which could be achieved by introducing the Agricultural System concept in the beginning of the ROPA or, similar to the Greenbelt Section 2.12, outline the Agricultural System within the ORMCP Section 2.11 of the ROPA.	A preamble description of the Agricultural System within the ORMCP is recommended to be added to Section 2.11 as follows: "The Oak Ridges Moraine also contains and supports the Agricultural System comprised of Prime Agricultural Areas, Rural Lands and an agri-food network of infrastructure, services and assets that support the agricultural and rural economy. The agri-food network and agricultural land base of Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Lands as identified and designated in this Plan extends across the ORMCP's Countryside Area, Natural Core Area and Natural Linkage Area designations and provides linkages to the Agricultural System outside the ORMCP Area. Permitted uses within the Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Lands are supported in accordance with the policies of the ORMCP and this Plan."
STAT-21-053xiii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.11.22: Draft policy 2.11.22 does not appear to reflect the ability for agricultural uses, other than associated buildings or structures, to continue in the minimum vegetation protection zone, but not in the feature itself. It is recommended that an additional policy be added to clarify that agricultural uses, other than associated buildings and structures, are permitted only with respect to land in the minimum vegetation protection zone and not in the feature itself.	For clarity, draft Policy 2.11.22 (now renumbered 2.11.21) will be revised to add the following new sentence at the end of the policy: "Agricultural uses, other than associated on-farm buildings and structures, are permitted within the associated minimum vegetation protection zone, but not in the feature itself."
STAT-21-053xiv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.11.50 and 2.11.52: These draft policies provide that in the case of a conflict between the policies of the Official Plan and the ORMCP, the policies of the ORMCP shall apply to the extent that they are less restrictive. These draft policies should be revised to clarify that in the case of a conflict with the Official Plan, the policies of the ORMCP prevail with respect to agricultural uses, mineral aggregate operations, and wayside pits. Further, zoning by-laws shall not be more restrictive than the ORMCP with respect to these matters.	Policies 2.11.50 and 2.11.52 (now renumbered 2.11.49 and 2.11.51) will be revised to reflect the conflict provisions in the ORMCP as follows: 2.11.49 Direct that within the ORMCPA, in the case of conflict between the policies of Section 3.3 of this Plan and Section 33 of the ORMCP, the policies of the ORMCP prevail with respect to agricultural uses and shall apply to the extent that they are less restrictive. 2.11.51 Direct that within the ORMCPA, in the case of conflict between the policies of Section 3.4 of this Plan and Section 33 of the ORMCP, the policies of the ORMCP prevail with respect to mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits and shall apply to the extent that they are less restrictive.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Alternatively, these policies can be removed and consolidated with policies 2.11.6 and 2.11.11 of the draft ROPA in accordance with section 33 of the ORMCP.	
STAT-21-053xv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.11.51: The current draft policy does not appear to address the inability for small-scale commercial, industrial, and institutional uses to be established in the prime agricultural area of the ORMCP. It is recommended that the policy be revised to ensure that the appropriate non-agricultural use policies are reflected in ROPA.	General direction regarding permitted uses in ORMCP land use designations to the Town of Caledon is already provided in Policy 2.11.14 in keeping with the five principles of the Regional Official Plan. The addition of detailed land use policies as suggested is not recommended. Alternatively, it is recommended that that Policy 2.11.51 (now renumbered 2.11.50) be revised to indicate that non-agricultural uses must be permitted in accordance with the ORMCP by adding “, where permitted in accordance with the policies of this Plan and the ORMCP.” after “to require that proponents of non-agricultural uses within the Natural Core, Natural Linkage and Countryside Area designations”.
STAT-21-053xvi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.11.56: This draft policy is recommended to be revised to state “in accordance with the ORMCP” instead of “in accordance to the ORMCP”. It is recommended that the draft policy be revised to the following: 2.11.56 ...in accordance to with the ORMCP.	This policy was corrected as requested.
STAT-21-053xvii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.12.14.1: Within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan, this draft policy encourages local municipalities to develop strategies to guide adequate provision of parkland, open space, and trails. It is recommended that this policy be revised, or additional policies be added in the ROPA to better align with the language used in the Greenbelt Plan promoting the connectivity of the natural heritage system and when planning for parkland, open space, and trails.	Regional staff agree and recommend that Policy 2.12.14.1 be revised as follows: “Encourage the area-local municipalities to develop strategies to guide the adequate provision development of a system of publicly accessible recreation facilities, parkland, open space areas and trails that are support the connectivity of the Natural Heritage System and achievement of complete communities in keeping with environmental plans and strategies and that consider the impacts to agriculture when planning these initiatives. ”
STAT-21-053xviii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.12.12.1.1: This draft policy could be clarified by directing permitted uses in the Greenbelt Plan to be based on the Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas. It is recommended that the policy text be modified as follows: 2.12.12.1.1 ...and <i>on-farm diversified uses</i> within the <i>Prime Agricultural Area</i> of the Protected Countryside in accordance with provincial g Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas.	Regional staff agree. Policy 2.12.12.1.1 will be revised as requested.
STAT-21-053xix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.12.13.2.11: Draft policy 2.12.13.2.11 defers details regarding vegetation protection zone requirements and natural heritage evaluation and hydrologic evaluation requirements to the Greenbelt Plan. It is recommended that additional subsections be added to this policy to include the vegetation protection zone requirements and natural heritage and hydrologic evaluation requirements in the ROPA, rather than deferring to the Greenbelt Plan on these matters for clarity and ease of reference.	Regional staff agree that draft policy 2.12.13.2.11 be clarified as follows: “ Direct the City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon to include policies in their official plans for to prohibit development and site alteration for in key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features in their official plans and in any associated vegetation protection zone in accordance with the policies of the Greenbelt Plan and this Plan, including policies for any associated vegetation protection zone and the requirements for preparing a natural heritage evaluation or hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the Greenbelt Plan. A natural heritage evaluation is not required if the only key natural heritage feature is a habitat of endangered and threatened species including policies that require: ”

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				<p>a) the vegetation protection zone to be a minimum of 30 metres measured from the outside boundary of wetlands, seepage areas and springs, fish habitat, permanent and intermittent streams, lakes and significant woodlands; and</p> <p>b) that applications for new development or site alteration within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature within the Natural Heritage System or a key hydrologic feature anywhere within the Protected Countryside Area include the submission of a natural heritage evaluation or hydrologic evaluation in accordance with the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan.”</p>
STAT-21-053xx	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule X8: Schedule X8 proposes adjustments to Minor Urban Centre designations for Belfountain, Cataract, Cheltenham, Inglewood, Mono Mills and Terra Cotta. As contemplated by the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act, a boundary amendment to the Minor Urban Centre would have to be considered during the review of the Niagara Escarpment Plan.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Minor Urban Centre boundaries in Schedule X8 are to be consistent with the existing identified boundaries in the Niagara Escarpment Plan, as currently mapped.</p>	The mapping of the Minor Urban Centre boundaries has been revised to be consistent with the existing identified boundaries in the Niagara Escarpment Plan as currently mapped.
STAT-21-053xxi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule X9: The boundaries of land use designations under the ORMCP are shown in Schedule X9. Schedule X9 additionally identifies lands in black hatching, however this is not defined in the legend.</p> <p>The boundaries of the land use designation shown in Schedule X9 are to be mapped in accordance with the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan Land Use Designation Map.</p> <p>It is unclear what the black hatching symbolizes as it is not defined in the legend. It is recommended that the Region provide clarification on the intent of identifying lands in black hatching and how it conforms with the Oak Ridges Moraine Land Use Map.</p>	<p>Regional staff have reviewed the land use designation boundaries for the Palgrave Estate Residential Community and recommend the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the area within the Palgrave Estate Residential Community designation in the Town of Caledon Official Plan east of Highway 50 abutting the south side of Palgrave Village be designated as “Palgrave Estate Residential Community (Component of the Protected Countryside)” to recognize the existing approved estate residential development and designation within the Town of Caledon Official Plan in accordance with Section 14 (1) of the ORMCP; • That the legend include a legend symbol to identify the ‘black hatch’ area shown on the schedule as the “Palgrave Estate Residential Community (Refer to Town of Caledon Official Plan)”; • That the “Palgrave Estate Residential Community (Refer to Town of Caledon Official Plan)” boundary be adjusted to include the portion of the Glen Eagle Golf Club that is currently outside the boundary to align with the “Palgrave Estate Residential Community (Component of the Protected Countryside)” boundary as designated in the ORMCP Land Use Designation Map.
STAT-21-053xxii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule X9: The southeastern portion of lands municipally known as 15731 Highway 50 is proposed to be amended from ‘Countryside’ to the ‘Palgrave Estate Residential Community’ in Schedule X9, which is consistent with the Oak Ridges Moraine Land Use Map of the ORMCP. These lands are located outside the black hatched area referenced in Comment #16.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Region provide clarification on whether these lands are intended to be located outside of the black hatching.</p>	The lands are intended to be included within the “Palgrave Estate Residential Community (Component of the Protected Countryside)” boundary.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-053xxiii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 2.14.7: This draft policy permits the continuation of agricultural uses within the Greenlands System, however, it is unclear if the full range of new agricultural uses (as well as agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses, where permitted) and existing agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses are permitted.</p> <p>It is recommended that further clarity be provided to ensure appropriate uses are permitted within the Region's Greenlands System.</p>	<p>Regional staff agree and recommend the following policy modifications to provide greater clarity:</p> <p>Revise Policy 2.14.7 (now renumbered 2.14.9) as follows:</p> <p><u>Permit the continuation of agricultural uses in accordance with normal farm practices the full range of existing and new agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses, and normal farm practices within the Greenlands System subject to the policies of this Plan, Provincial legislation, policies and applicable provincial plans.</u></p> <p>Revise Policy 2.14.11 (now renumbered 2.14.15) as follows: g) expansions <u>or alterations</u> to existing buildings or structures;</p> <p>Add the following provision to Policy 2.14.35 (now renumbered 2.14.39): d) <u>Notwithstanding Policy 2.14.39 c), directing the local municipalities to include policies in their official plans permitting expansions or alterations to existing buildings and structures for agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, or on-farm diversified uses within or on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified as Core Areas of the Greenlands System, Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors if it is demonstrated that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>there is no alternative, and the expansion or alteration in the feature is minimized and, in the vegetation protection zone, is directed away from the feature to the maximum extent possible; and</u> ii. <u>the impact of the expansion or alteration on the feature and its functions is minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent possible.</u>
STAT-21-053xxiv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 2.14.9: As this policy relates to 4.3.2.10 of the Greenbelt Plan, it cannot supersede directions in other Provincial Plans. As such, the draft policy should identify that it applies within the Greenbelt Plan area in Peel Region.</p> <p>For clarity, it is also recommended that this draft policy be revised to identify whether Core Area woodlands subject to aggregate resource extraction use in the Rural System applies to woodlands within a licensed property or within an identified area of high potential.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy be revised to the following:</p> <p>2.14.9 For the purposes of defining the Core Areas of the Greenlands System for mineral aggregate resource extraction uses within the Rural System of the Greenbelt Plan, define Core Area woodlands as all woodlands that are a minimum of 30 hectares in size and exclude as Core Area valley and stream corridors all valley and stream corridors that have a drainage area of less than 125 hectares, subject to policy 4.3.2.10 of the Greenbelt Plan."</p>	<p>Policy 2.14.9 should not be revised as suggested as this policy applies throughout the Region of Peel including areas outside Provincial Greenbelt Plans. The policy does not supersede the policies of other Provincial Plans and is included only for the purpose of defining what is a Core Area Woodland and Core Valleyland for new aggregate extraction uses. The policy was previously approved by MMAH and is subject to minutes of settlement with the Province.</p> <p>The mineral aggregate resources policies of the Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Niagara Escarpment Plan and Growth Plan continue to apply to mineral aggregate uses. The prohibitions and restrictions applying to new or expanded mineral aggregate extraction uses within key natural heritage and key hydrologic features in the respective Provincial Plans continue to apply to mineral aggregate resources uses and have been recognized in the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>The provincial plan sections in the Regional Official Plan address conformity requirements for mineral aggregate uses. In-effect, Policy 3.3.2.3 in the ROP addresses conformity specifically relating to protected key natural heritage features and areas and aggregate extraction uses. Policy 3.3.2.3 will be reviewed and amended to address conformity with new policies in the 2017 Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2017 Greenbelt Plan, 2017 ORMCP and 2019 Growth Plan as part of the mineral aggregate component of Peel 2051.</p>
STAT-21-	November 3,	Jennifer Le	Section 2.14.12: It is recommended the Region revise policies for natural	It is not recommended that the Region weaken the current protection standard afforded to the

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
053xxv	2021	Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>heritage features and areas outside of the Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System to meet no negative impact requirements. This policy outlines criteria for permitted uses which is not consistent with PPS policy 2.1.5.</p> <p>For conformity with PPS 2.1.5, it is recommended that the Region remove draft policy 2.3.2.8 b) in its entirety: “b) the policies of the area municipal official plan permitting the exceptions require demonstration that: i) there is no reasonable alternative location outside of the Core Area and the use, development or site alteration is directed away from the Core Area to the greatest extent possible; ii) if avoidance of the Core Area is not possible, the impact to the Core Area feature is minimized; and Page 8 of 11 iii) any impact to the Core Area or its functions is mitigated through restoration or enhancement to the greatest extent possible;”</p> <p>and replace with “b) Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in natural features unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features</p>	<p>Core Areas of the Greenlands System as suggested. The “no development and site alteration” protection standard in the Regional Official Plan applying to Core Areas of the Greenlands System was established in the initial adoption of the Plan in 1996 and was previously approved by MMAH to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, most recently in the Minister’s decision on Regional Official Plan Amendment 21B (ROPA 21B) in accordance with policy wording in the 2005 PPS that is identical to the 2020 PPS. Part III of the PPS clarifies that the policies of the PPS represent minimum standards and that planning authorities may go beyond the minimum standards, unless doing so would conflict with any policy of the PPS. The policies in the Regional Plan applying to Core Areas of the Greenlands System do not conflict with the PPS and provide an appropriate protection standard to natural features that are considered provincially and regionally significant including significant wetlands.</p> <p>The definition of “negative impacts” in the PPS is a generic definition that does not provide clear guidance on its own to ensure that the limited exceptions permitted in the Core Areas of the Greenlands System will result in a high protection standard for Core Areas. The wording in 2.14.12 (now renumbered 2.14.16) provides improved guidance for the implementation of the very limited exceptions and is not recommended to be modified to a more generic protection standard.</p> <p>It is recommended that the provisions in renumbered 2.14.16 b) be retained with added reference to a “no negative impacts” protection standard, as indicated below, so that the policy retains some guidance on how the protection standard might be achieved.</p> <p>“b) the policies of the area municipal official plan permitting the exceptions require demonstration that any development and site alteration will not be permitted unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions and that:</p> <p>i) there is no reasonable alternative location outside of the Core Area and the use, development or site alteration is directed away from the Core Area to the greatest extent possible; ii) if avoidance of the Core Area is not possible, the impact to the Core Area feature is minimized; and iii) any impact to the Core Area or its functions is mitigated through restoration or enhancement to the greatest extent possible;” iv) where ecosystem compensation is determined to be appropriate and feasible, including for essential infrastructure, it may be considered as a mitigation option in accordance with local municipal or conservation authority ecosystem compensation guidelines.</p>
STAT-21-053xxvi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 2.14.27 a): Draft policy 2.14.27 a) identifies certain types of uses that are not considered as Core Area woodlands and significant woodlands/plantations, specifically those that are managed for the production of fruits, nuts, Christmas trees or nursery stock.</p> <p>It is recommended that clarity be provided that agro-forestry uses are not considered or defined as Core woodlands and/or significant woodlands.</p>	<p>Regional staff agree. Policy 2.14.27 a) will be revised as requested (now renumbered 2.14.31).</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			2.14.27 managed for production of fruits, nuts, Christmas tree, nursery stock, or other similar agro-forestry-type uses.	
STAT-21-053xxvii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 2.3.2.5 (former): This draft policy stating that local municipalities may define local core areas and policies in their Official Plans have been removed. Clarification is needed to allow MMAH staff to understand why this policy has been removed from the draft ROPA.	The policy was considered redundant as Policies 2.14.14, 2.14.20 and 2.14.39 provide direction to the local municipalities to implement the Regional Official Plan Greenlands System policies for Core, NAC and PNAC features and areas in accordance with Regional and Provincial policy requirements.
STAT-21-053xxviii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Schedule Z1 and Figure X5: Schedule Z1 and Figure X5 currently identify “Special Policy Areas” as areas where certain non-typical policies apply (e.g., Parkway Belt West Plan area). However, the term “Special Policy Area”, under section 3.1 (Natural Hazards) of the PPS refers to specific areas within communities which have historically existed in the floodplain and where site specific policies approved by NDMNRF and MMAH apply. It is recommended that Schedule Z1 and Figure X5 be revised to reserve the term Special Policy Area for areas meeting the PPS definition.	Agreed. The references to “Special Policy Areas” on Schedule Z1 (now Schedule E-1) and Figure X5 (now Figure 9) will be revised to “Areas Subject to Provincial Plans”.
STAT-21-053xxix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.3.13 a): The draft ROPA includes consideration for both agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses within the same policy. Although on-farm diversified uses are subject to size restrictions, agriculture-related uses do not have to be restricted in size. The Region may want to consider an approach which achieves consistency with the Guideline on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Area. For example, a policy could be added to recognize that on-farm diversified uses will be limited in size (e.g., 1-hectare).	The comment is noted. It is not recommended that the Regional Official Plan prescribe land use planning matters that are more appropriately addressed in the local official plans in accordance with the five principles of the Regional Official Plan. Policy 3.3.13 includes the following policy that references that criteria be based on provincial guidelines or municipal approaches that achieve the same objectives. <u>“The Town of Caledon shall incorporate in its official plan criteria to be met by these uses. These criteria may be based on guidelines developed by the Province or on municipal approaches that achieve the same objective.”</u> Policy 3.3.13 c) will be revised to also reference the applicable policies of the “Greenbelt Plan”. <u>“c) meet the applicable requirements of the Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, the Niagara Escarpment Plan and the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan.”</u>
STAT-21-053xxx	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.3.13 b): The Minimum Distance Separation (“MDS”) Guidelines outlines that MDS setbacks will not be required for agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses. It is generally recommended that agriculture-related uses not be subject to MDS, but it may be appropriate for certain types of on-farm diversified uses. It is recommended that greater clarity be provided to this draft policy to ensure it is clear which uses will be subject to MDS, with considerations made to not restrict permitted uses.	The level of detail involved in specifying which uses will be subject to MDS is more appropriately addressed in local official plans and zoning by-laws. Staff recommend that Policy 3.3.9 be revised as follows to direct the local municipalities to clarify MDS requirements for local matters: <u>3.3.9 Require that, within the Prime Agricultural Area, new land uses, including the creation of lots, and new or expanding livestock operations, comply with the minimum distance separation formulae. The local municipalities are directed to provide policy direction in their official plans addressing the application of minimum distance separation requirements including for buildings and structures on existing lots of record, agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses.</u> The corresponding policy in Section 3.3.13 b) will be amended as follows to recognize that MDS

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				requirements may not apply to all agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses. <u>b) be compatible with, and not hinder, surrounding agricultural uses and, where required, comply with the minimum distance separation formulae; and</u>
STAT-21-053xxxix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.3.13: This draft policy indicates that official plan criteria for agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses in the Prime Agricultural Area in the Town of Caledon will be based on guidelines developed by the Province or on municipal approaches. It should be noted that within the Greenbelt Plan, permitted uses will be permitted based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Areas. It is recommended that the draft policy be revised to indicate that permitted uses within the Greenbelt Plan Area will be based on the Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Area, such as the following: 3.3.13. ...These criteria may be based on guidelines developed by the Province or on municipal approaches that achieve the same objectives. Within the Greenbelt Plan Area, permitted uses will be based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario's Prime Agricultural Area.	Regional staff agree with the recommended revision. Policy 3.3.13 will be revised as requested.
STAT-21-053xxxix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.3.16 a): Draft policy 3.3.16 a) permits lot creation and lot adjustments in the Prime Agricultural Area for agricultural uses, provided that the lots are of an appropriate size. It is recommended that the Region consider adding a minimum farm parcel size to address lot creation for agricultural uses.	In keeping with the five principles of the Regional Official Plan, the specification of minimum lot size standards for permitted uses in land use designations is deferred to the local municipalities to establish in their official plans and zoning by-laws. It is not recommended that the Regional Official Plan specify a minimum farm parcel size for agricultural uses. Direction regarding lot creation for agricultural uses is provided in the Town of Caledon Official Plan and Zoning By-law.
STAT-21-053xxxix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.3.16 e): Greenbelt policy must be reflected in lot creation policies to ensure appropriate implementation. It is recommended that the policy be revised as follows: e) Within the Greenbelt Plan, consents to enable the securement of lands for natural heritage conservation purposes by a public authority or a non-government conservation organization, provided it does not create a separate lot for a residential dwelling in Prime Agricultural Areas.	The recommendation to limit Policy 3.3.16 e) to just apply within the Greenbelt Plan Area is not supported as suggested. The retention of the proposed wording is important as this policy clarifies that consents for natural heritage conservation purposes may be considered in Prime Agricultural Areas everywhere. In order to address the further restriction in the Greenbelt Plan Area as noted, the policy will be revised to include a separate reference to the Greenbelt Plan restriction at the end of the clause as follows: <u>"Within the Greenbelt Plan Area, consents for natural heritage conservation purposes may be considered provided it does not create a separate lot for a residential dwelling in the Prime Agricultural Area."</u>
STAT-21-053xxxix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.3.17: This draft policy provides a cross-reference to policy 3.2.5.12 c), however it does not appear that policy 3.2.5.12 c) is in the draft ROPA. It is recommended that the Region update the policy reference.	The policy cross-reference has been corrected.
STAT-21-	November 3,	Jennifer Le	Section 3.3.21.2: It appears that the applicability of the Agricultural	Staff recommend that this objective be revised as follows:

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
053xxxv	2021	Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	System is focused on the Town of Caledon in the draft ROPA, however it should be noted that the agri-food network – a component of the Agricultural System – would extend beyond the municipal boundaries of Caledon and into other municipalities in the Region’s Urban System. The agri-food network includes elements important to the viability of the agri-food network, such as food processing and farmers’ markets. It is recommended that draft policies regarding the Agricultural System be broadened to include reference to other municipalities in the Region’s Urban System.	To work in cooperation with farmers and agricultural organizations, the Town of Caledon local municipalities , other public agencies, and stakeholders to promote and enhance the <i>Agricultural System</i> .
STAT-21-053xxxvi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.4.14 h): Aggregate activity is permitted as an interim use within prime agricultural areas. This policy should be addressed so that it acknowledges the interim nature of aggregate activity.	The focus of this policy is on how post-extraction uses will be permitted in or on lands adjacent to Prime Agricultural Areas. The further clarification requested is not required in this specific policy clause. Policy 3.3.14 clarifies that extraction of mineral aggregate resources may be permitted in Prime Agricultural Areas. Recognition that aggregates extraction is intended to be an interim land use will be addressed in the Aggregates Policy Review which is proceeding as a separate amendment to the Regional Official Plan. “h) policies requiring applicants proposing the redesignation of permitted non-agricultural uses on rehabilitated mineral aggregate extraction sites in or abutting designated Prime Agricultural Areas to demonstrate that the proposed development will be compatible with the adjacent agricultural area or be designed to minimize and mitigate impacts to adjacent agricultural operations to the greatest extent feasible.”
STAT-21-053xxxvii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Preamble 3.6, paragraph 4: The term “built heritage” is italicized in the preamble, indicating it is defined in the Official Plan’s glossary. The glossary and the PPS use the term “built heritage resources”, thus the preamble should be updated for consistency and clarity. It is recommended that this sentence be revised to the following for consistency with the ROP’s glossary and the PPS: 3.6 ...conservation and interpretation of <i>cultural heritage resources</i> , including but not limited to the <i>built heritage resources</i> , cultural heritage features, structures, archaeological resources, and <i>cultural heritage landscapes</i> in Peel...	Regional staff agree and this change has been made.
STAT-21-053xxxviii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 3.7.20: This draft policy is recommended to be revised to include reference to ground-mounted solar facilities in prime agricultural areas as on-farm diversified uses to better align with the PPS. 3.7.20. ...should be designed to minimize disturbance to agricultural soils and operations. Ground-mounted solar facilities are permitted in <i>prime agricultural areas</i> , including <i>specialty crop areas</i> , only as <i>on-farm diversified uses</i> .	Regional staff agree with the additional clarification to be consistent with the PPS. Policy 3.7.20 will be revised as requested with the exception that the policy will not reference specialty crop areas as there are no specialty crop areas designated in Peel.
STAT-21-	November 3,	Jennifer Le	Section 3.7.4, 3.7.23 and Schedule Z1: Draft policies 3.7.4 and 3.7.23	Since the draft Regional Official Plan Office Consolidation (October 1, 2021) the SISA has been

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
053xxxix	2021	Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>provide that the planned Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor is identified in Schedule Z1.</p> <p>Schedule Z1 identifies a Conceptual Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (“SISA”) which, according to section 5.7 of the ROP, illustrates the conceptual GTA West Transportation Corridor. MMAH staff note that the policies of section 5.7 on the SISA and the term “SISA” have been crossed out, and hence appear to have been removed from the ROP.</p> <p>It is unclear if the intent of the Conceptual SISA on Schedule Z1 is to continue to identify the conceptual GTA West Transportation Corridor, as previously provided for in former section 5.7, as well as the conceptual Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor as indicated in draft policies 3.7.4 and 3.7.23.</p> <p>As section 5.7 on the Conceptual SISA appears to have been deleted from the ROP, MMAH staff have concerns that it may be unclear for readers to understand what the Conceptual SISA on Schedule Z1 is depicting.</p> <p>Both the GTA West Transportation Corridor and the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor should be clearly identified on Schedule Z1. Should the intent of the Conceptual SISA on Schedule Z1 be to identify the conceptual GTA West Transportation Corridor and the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor, it is recommended that the Region consider revising the term “Conceptual SISA” to reflect the names of the two planned corridors.</p>	<p>deleted from Schedule Z1 and continues to be removed in the current version.</p> <p>Other Schedules/Figures make reference to the GTA West Corridor.</p> <p>Reference to the Northwest GTA Transportation Corridor has been included on Figure X1 and added to Schedule Y2 and stating that the alignment of the corridor will be subject to the results of the Environmental Assessment.</p>
STAT-21-053xli	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>LNA: The features identified as designated greenfield area exclusions in the LNA generally conform to policy 2.2.7.3 of the Growth Plan. However, transportation rights-of-way such as the ‘Ninth Line Transitway’ may not be excluded from the designated greenfield area if they are not identified as a freeway in the Ontario Road Network (issued by Land Information Ontario).</p> <p>Lands not within the freeway corridor are not eligible to be excluded for the purpose of calculating the designated greenfield area density target. Therefore, it is recommended that the Region confirm if the specified transit ROW falls within the Highway 407 envelope.</p>	<p>The latest Ninth Line Transitway ROW will be revised to reflect the most recent plan. The Transit ROW shapefile and other takeouts shapefiles have been send to the Province on Dec 14, 2021.</p> <p>The Transit ROW will be removed from a ‘non-environmental’ takeouts and captured as “undevelopable land” in the adjustment section of the Land Needs Assessment report.</p>
STAT-21-053xli	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>LNA: It is not clear if the GTA West Transportation Corridor has been excluded from the existing settlement area in order to account for recent refinements to the study area. They do not appear to be mapped or otherwise accounted for across all of the LNA materials submitted to MMAH.</p> <p>The Region proposes to exclude 339 hectares from the designated greenfield area on account of the lands being within the GTA West</p>	<p>GTAW Transportation Corridor will be excluded from the non-environmental take outs. The corridor will be captured as “undevelopable land” in the adjustment section of the Land Needs Assessment report.</p> <p>Supporting information package, including a memo has been sent out to the Province on Dec 14, 2021.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Transportation Corridor study area. Policy 2.2.7.3 specifies that only freeways may be excluded for the purposes of defining the designated greenfield area. The GTA West Transportation Corridor is not yet mapped in the Ontario Road Network and therefore may not be excluded on that basis.</p> <p>The GTA West Transportation Corridor is not a freeway as part of the Ontario Road Network at this time and therefore the lands cannot be excluded on this basis. The Region may consider conducting further analysis as part of the LNA, and provide additional documentation for review by the Ministry, to account for any lands that could be identified as ‘undevelopable’ to 2051 as per the LNA methodology.</p>	
STAT-21-053xlii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.3.1, 5.4.1 and 5.4.10: Draft policy 5.3.1 does not specify that growth is to be directed to settlement areas that have a delineated built boundary, whereas draft policies 5.4.1 and 5.4.10 direct growth to the delineated built-up area.</p> <p>For additional clarity and consistency, it is recommended that draft policy 5.3.1 include reference to growth being directed to settlement areas that have a delineated built boundary as follows:</p> <p>5.3.1 Direct the majority of new population and employment growth to the Urban System, being lands within the <i>Delineated Built-Up Areas</i>, with a focus on <i>Strategic Growth Areas</i> and other areas that leverage existing and planned <i>infrastructure</i> investments.</p>	Policy updated to reflect Growth Plan direction to direct the majority of growth to areas within the delineated built-up-area.
STAT-21-053xlili	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.4.12: This draft policy prohibits the establishment of new settlement areas outside of a municipal comprehensive review.</p> <p>It should be noted that the creation of new settlement areas is prohibited under Growth Plan policy 2.2.1.2 f). Where it is demonstrated, through an LNA, that there is insufficient land to accommodate forecasted growth to 2051, the feasibility and most appropriate location for a settlement area boundary expansion will be identified in accordance with Growth Plan policy 2.2.8.3.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy be revised to remove reference to “outside of a municipal comprehensive review”, to the following: 5.4.12 Prohibit the establishment of new <i>settlement areas</i> outside of a municipal comprehensive review.</p>	<p>Agreed – policy has been revised as suggested.</p> <p>Note - Policy 5.4.13 says SABE may only occur through an MCR.</p>
STAT-21-053xliv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Preamble 5.4.17, paragraph 1: The preamble for draft section 5.4.17 notes that the Growth Plan requires a minimum of 40% of all residential development occurring annually in Peel to be within the built-up area by the year 2015 and for each year thereafter. MMAH staff would like to note that this provision was provided in the Growth Plan, 2006, whereas the Growth Plan, 2019</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Note - this has been updated on the Oct 2021 version on the web already.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>requires a minimum of 50% by the time the next municipal comprehensive review is approved and in effect, and for each year thereafter.</p> <p>It is recommended that the 40% intensification target identified in the preamble be revised to 50% to reflect the intensification target provided in the Growth Plan.</p>	
STAT-21-053xlv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.4.17.6, 5.6.17.7, 5.6.17.12 and Schedule Z2: Draft policy 5.4.17.6 requires local municipalities to delineate and establish minimum density targets for Strategic Growth Areas (“SGAs”), which may include Urban Growth Centres (“UGCs”), MTSAs, Nodes/Centres and Intensification Corridors. Additionally, draft policy 5.6.17.7 requires lower-tier municipalities to delineate and establish minimum density targets for Strategic Growth Areas identified on Schedule Z2 of the ROP.</p> <p>While delineations and density targets have been established for UGCs and MTSAs, Nodes/Centres and Intensification Corridors do not appear to be delineated nor have a density target in the draft ROPA.</p> <p>Should minimum density targets be established for strategic growth areas to which targets, and delineations are not required under the Growth Plan, they must first be established in the Region’s official plan, along with delineations. To implement the minimum density targets applicable to the delineated areas, lower-tier municipalities would then undertake more detailed planning, such as secondary plans, to establish permitted uses and identify densities, heights, and other elements of site design.</p> <p>Where the Region has not delineated nor established a minimum density target for a strategic growth area, lower-tier municipalities are able to delineate boundaries and undertake more detailed planning work, although minimum density targets cannot be established.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Region remove policies in the draft ROPA which allow lower-tier municipalities to delineate and set minimum density targets for strategic growth areas ahead of the Region.</p>	Regional policy updated to differentiate the Strategic Growth Areas (SGA) that are delineated in the Regional Official Plan (ROP) and subject to a minimum density set by the Region and the SGA that are shown conceptually in the ROP that will require further implementation planning by the local municipalities.
STAT-21-053xlvii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.6.20.13.16.6 and 5.6.20.13.14 a): These draft policies include references to planning to the 2031 planning horizon.</p> <p>These draft policies should be revised to identify the 2051 planning horizon of the Growth Plan.</p>	<p>Ninth Line policy states it is to be developed within the 2031 Population, Household and Employment Forecasts for the City of Mississauga in Table 3, but Table 3 no longer references 2031 pop (2041 and 2051) This policy is amended.</p> <p>Mayfield west policy referencing 2031 was already removed in draft Oct. 2021 version.</p>
STAT-21-053xlviii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development	<p>Schedule Z1 and 5.6.20.13.14: Draft section 5.6.20.13.14 provides that the need and most appropriate location for a settlement area boundary expansion will be studied and considered for lands in Mayfield West and</p>	<p>Regional staff agree.</p> <p>Note – Reference to the study area boundary has been removed from the policies and Z1 in the</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Bolton, identified in Schedule Z1 as being lands within the 'Study Area Boundary' and 'Areas Assessed in the Bolton Residential Expansion Study' respectively.</p> <p>Schedule Z1 identifies lands that are within the conceptual settlement area boundary expansion for Mayfield West and Bolton in the 'Study Area Boundary' and 'Areas Assessed in the Bolton Residential Expansion Study'.</p> <p>While it is understood that at this time the settlement area boundary expansion is still conceptual, and hence subject to change, clarification is required to understand whether the final settlement area boundary expansion will continue to identify those lands as being within the 'Study Area Boundary' and 'Areas Assessed in the Bolton Residential Expansion Study' for Mayfield West and Bolton, respectively.</p>	Oct. 2021 version.
STAT-21-053xlvi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule Z2 and Z3: It appears that the Village of Caledon delineated built-up area is not identified or delineated on Schedules Z2 and Z3.</p> <p>The Village of Caledon is to be identified and delineated as a Delineated Built-up Area as appropriate.</p>	A correction has been made to Schedule Z3 (Growth Plan Policy Areas) to recognize the existing status of Caledon Village settlement area as "built-up area" as per the Growth Plan. As Caledon Village is to remain as a settlement area in the Rural System, it is not going to be identified on Schedule Z2 (Strategic Growth Areas), as the strategic growth areas on that schedule are in the Regional Urban Boundary and Urban System of Peel, where different policies apply.
STAT-21-053xlix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.6.19.9: This draft policy directs local municipalities to establish policies in their official plan and other implementation documents for each MTSA delineated on Schedule Y7 of the ROP, in accordance with criteria set out in draft policy 5.6.19.9. MMAH staff understand that the delineated MTSA's (i.e., 'primary' and 'secondary' MTSA's), for which density targets have been established in the draft ROPA, are being advanced under the <i>Planning Act</i> Protected MTSA framework.</p> <p>Subsection 16(16) of the <i>Planning Act</i> outlines requirements for policies to be included in an upper-tier official plan, including the identification of the minimum number of residents and jobs combined per hectare that are planned to be accommodated within the area, and the requirement that the official plans of relevant lower-tier municipalities include policies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify the authorized uses of land in the area and of buildings or structures on lands in the area; and • identify the minimum densities that are authorized with respect to buildings and structures on lands in the area. <p>The Region, as the approval authority for lower-tier official plan PMTSA policies, would want to ensure that it is clear in the ROP that lower-tier municipalities are to establish policies which identify the authorized uses and minimum densities with respect to the buildings and structures on lands in the area, in accordance with subsection 16(16)(b) of the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>	Policy updated to reflect comments and Section 16(16) of the <i>Planning Act</i> .

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p><i>Act.</i></p> <p>Currently, this draft policy appears to direct local municipalities to establish policies setting out the land uses and minimum densities that would apply to the entire MTSA. It is recommended that draft policy 5.6.19.9 be revised to provide more specificity directing the lower tiers to establish policies which speak to the authorized uses and minimum densities at a more granular scale, specifically with respect to the buildings and structures on lands in the area, in accordance with subsection 16(16)(b) of the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>	
STAT-21-053I	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.6.20.4 and 5.6.20.14.3: The term “built heritage” is italicized, indicating it is defined in the Official Plan’s glossary. The glossary and the PPS use the term “built heritage resources”, thus the draft policies should be updated for consistency and clarity.</p> <p>The term “archaeological resources” should be italicized, as it is a defined term in the glossary and in the PPS.</p> <p>Further, the term “cultural heritage resources” should be revised to “cultural heritage landscapes” as it is a defined term in the PPS.</p> <p>It is recommended that draft policies 5.6.20.4 and 5.6.20.14.3 be revised to use terms that are consistent with the PPS, such as the following:</p> <p>5.6.20.4 To ensure that planning for <i>Designated Greenfield Areas</i> is undertaken in a manner that provides direction for a natural heritage and water resource management system and recognizes the importance of protecting and conserving the archaeological resources <i>archaeological resources, cultural heritage landscapes resources, built heritage resources</i> and agricultural resources of Peel.</p> <p>5.6.20.14.3 To ensure that planning for 2051 New Community Areas is undertaken in a manner that provides for the robust protection and management of natural heritage and water resources and recognizes the importance of conserving and enriching the <i>cultural heritage landscapes resources, archaeological resources</i> and <i>built heritage resources</i> and agricultural resources of Peel.</p>	<p>Change made to reflect built heritage resources.</p> <p>Change made to reflect defined term archaeological resources.</p> <p>Policy is referencing the broader term ‘cultural heritage resources’ which includes landscapes. Policy will be revised to list all subsets.</p> <p>All changes made. Policy is intended to capture broader cultural heritage resources and not just landscapes. Policy will be revised to list all subsets.</p> <p>All changes made. Policy is intended to capture broader cultural heritage resources and not just landscapes. Policy will be revised to list all subsets.</p>
STAT-21-053li	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.6.20.13.16.10 and 5.6.20.13.17: These policies provide that for lands within the Ninth Line Lands and Mayfield West Phase 2 Settlement Area, development will not predetermine or preclude the planning and/or implementation of the GTA West Transportation Corridor.</p> <p>The PPS and Growth Plan state that planning authorities shall plan for and protect corridors and rights-of-way for infrastructure, including for</p>	<p>Regional staff agree and have changes the policy to reflect the correct terminology.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>electricity generation facilities and transmission systems. Development shall not be permitted in planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purposes for which it was identified.</p> <p>These policies are recommended to be revised to include reference to the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Study in order to be consistent with the provincial policies regarding planning and protecting for planned transportation and infrastructure corridors.</p>	
STAT-21-053lii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.7.18.1 and 5.7.19.1: These draft policies use the term “cultural attributes” which is undefined but appear to have a proximal relationship to the term “heritage attribute” which is a defined term in the glossary. MMAH staff have concerns that this may cause issues with interpretation.</p> <p>It is recommended that the draft policies are updated to refer to the character of rural lands more generally, as well as cultural heritage resources. This will help clarify that the policies are not only referring to heritage conservation, but that it is one option for protecting rural character.</p> <p>It is recommended that the draft policies be revised to the following:</p> <p>5.7.18.1 To protect and enhance the distinct character, cultural attributes, and historical heritage of <i>Rural Settlement Areas</i>, including the conservation of <i>cultural heritage resources</i>.</p> <p>5.7.19.1 To protect and enhance the distinct character, cultural attributes, and historical heritage of <i>Rural Lands</i>, including the conservation of <i>cultural heritage resources</i>.</p>	Policies 5.7.18.1 and 5.7.19.1 will be revised as requested.
STAT-21-053liii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Preamble 5.7.19: The preamble states that rural lands contain existing agricultural uses. MMAH staff would like to note that existing, as well as new, uses are permitted on rural lands.</p> <p>It is recommended that the preamble be revised to indicate that new agricultural uses are also permitted in order to be consistent with the PPS.</p> <p>The preamble is recommended to be revised to the following:</p> <p><i>Rural Lands</i> contain existing, and support new, agricultural operations and provide...</p>	Preamble 5.7.19 will be revised as requested.
STAT-21-053liv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section X12: A portion of rural settlements Victoria and Tullamore are shown as being part of the Urban System and the Designated Greenfield Area on Schedules Z1 and Z3, respectively. However, Schedule X12 continues to identify Victoria and Tullamore as rural settlements.</p>	Schedule X12 (now Schedule D-1) has been revised to no longer map the portions of Victoria and Tullamore outside the Greenbelt as Rural Settlement Areas. The portions of Victoria and Tullamore outside the Greenbelt are now included in the Urban System on Schedule Z1 (now Schedule E-1).

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Should it be the Region's intent to identify certain lands in Victoria and Tullamore as being part of the Urban System, it is recommended that the Region consider revising Schedule X12 such that those lands are no longer identified as rural settlements and in the Urban System.	Note this change has been made on the Oct 2021 version of X12.
STAT-21-053lv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Preamble 5.8, paragraph 1: The first paragraph in the preamble to draft section 5.8 references achieving employment forecasts by the 2041 planning horizon. It is recommended that the preamble be revised to identify a 2051 planning horizon.	Regional staff agree. Note this change has been made on the Oct. 2021 version of policies
STAT-21-053lvi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 5.8: Although the draft ROP makes several references to "protecting" employment areas, it does not fully satisfy the requirement that the development of sensitive land uses will avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts on industrial and other land uses that are vulnerable to encroachment. It is recommended that policy direction be provided to state the importance of ensuring the long-term viability of employment areas more clearly by avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating the adverse impacts of residential development and other sensitive land uses on employment areas.	Regional staff agree. Policy updated to include direction to avoid, mitigate, and manage the impacts of sensitive land uses in employment areas.
STAT-21-053lvii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 5.8.21: This draft policy provides direction on protecting existing and future employment areas to meet long-term market demands and locational requirements of diverse employment sectors and uses. It is recommended that this draft policy expand on the locational requirements to include reference to protecting employment areas adjacent to or near major goods movement facilities and corridors to better align with the PPS and Growth Plan. It is recommended that the draft policy be revised as follows: 5.8.21 Protect existing and future <i>Employment Areas</i> to meet the long-term market demands and locational requirements of a diverse range of employment sectors and uses, including <i>Employment Areas</i> in adjacent and proximity to major goods movement facilities and corridors."	Regional staff agree. Policy has been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-053lviii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	Section 5.8.30: The draft policy specifies that major retail, residential and other non-ancillary uses are not considered employment uses, "unless already permitted". Under the Growth Plan, residential and major retail uses, or major retail uses that are permitted but exceed an established size or scale threshold, are not permitted in employment areas. It is recommended that reference to major retail, residential and non-ancillary uses be removed. If major retail uses are permitted, it is recommended that the draft policy be expanded to establish a size	Conversion policy 5.8.30 recognizes existing legal non-conforming uses in employment areas, and that additional major retail, residential, and non-ancillary uses would, in fact, require a conversion. It is recognized that the text may be unclear of what thresholds are, or if expansions on existing uses would be permitted. Policy will be updated to provide additional clarification and establish a size and/or scale threshold for Major Retail uses.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			and/or scale threshold for permitted major retail uses and prohibit any major retail use in employment areas that would exceed the threshold.	
STAT-21-053lix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.8.31 and 5.8.35: These policies make reference to retail and commercial uses, however, do not appear to expressly prohibit major retail uses in employment areas nor specify the size of permitted major retail uses. The Growth Plan requires that major retail uses exceeding an established size or scale threshold for major retail uses be prohibited from employment areas.</p> <p>For clarity, it is recommended that the draft policies be expanded to establish a size and/or scale threshold for permitted major retail uses and prohibit any major retail use in employment areas that would exceed the threshold.</p>	See response to STAT-21-053liii.
STAT-21-053lx	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.8.32: This draft policy provides that employment areas within delineated MTSAs shown on Schedule Y6 may permit retail, residential, commercial, and non-ancillary uses without an amendment to the ROP. It appears that these employment areas are within Provincially Significant Employment Zones (“PSEZ”).</p> <p>PSEZs are areas that consist of both employment areas and mixed-use areas that contain a significant number of jobs. PSEZs do not confer land use designations, however, are instead intended to protect employment areas from conversion without provincial approval, unless the employment area is located within a MTSA. Under the Growth Plan, residential and major retail uses, or major retail uses that are permitted but exceed an established size or scale threshold, are not permitted in employment areas.</p> <p>It is unclear how this draft policy conforms to policy 2.2.5.7 of the Growth Plan with respect to prohibiting residential uses in employment areas. Should the Region seek to permit residential uses as described in draft policy 5.8.32 of the draft ROPA, an employment conversion would be required in accordance with Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.9 if undertaken as part of the MCR; or Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.10 if undertaken prior to an MCR.</p>	The policy will be updated to provide additional clarification on the requirements for employment conversions outside of an MCR in accordance with Growth Plan requirements and clarify the policy only applies in specific MTSA’s as determined appropriate through the comprehensive analysis undertaken as part of this MCR.
STAT-21-053lxi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.8.37 and 5.8.39: In planning for employment, no reference is made to minimizing surface parking. It is recommended that draft policies 5.8.37 and 5.8.39 be revised to encourage new developments to minimize the amount of surface parking in order to better align with the Growth Plan.</p> <p>The draft policies may be revised to the following:</p> <p>5.8.37 Encourage new <i>development</i> in existing office parks that enhances transit and <i>active transportation</i> connectivity and provides for an</p>	These changes are incorporated into the ROP policies.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>appropriate mix of amenities and open space. In planning for employment, surface parking will be minimized.</p> <p>5.8.30 <i>Employment Areas</i> shall be planned and designed to minimize surface parking and be easily accessible by a range of transportation modes including transit and <i>active transportation</i>.</p>	
STAT-21-053lxii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule Y6: According to the Region’s Land Needs Assessment Report to the Planning and Growth Management Committee meeting on June 17, 2021, the Region is supporting the conversion of 273.4 hectares of employment lands to non-employment uses. It appears that the lands supported for employment conversion are identified on Schedule Y6 as converted lands.</p> <p>Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.9 states that employment conversions are permitted through a municipal comprehensive review, subject to criteria in policy 2.2.5.9 being met. It appears that lands supported for employment conversion identified as B8, M1 and M3 of the Region’s Land Needs Assessment Report do not meet all the criteria outlined in policy 2.2.5.9.</p> <p>Further, the Region’s Land Needs Assessment Report identifies, at a very high level, whether and how each of the proposed employment land conversions meets the criteria in Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.9. It is recommended that the Region provide more fulsome and detailed rationale to better allow MMAH staff understand how policy 2.2.5.9 is being satisfied.</p>	<p>Staff have prepared updated detailed assessments of employment conversion requests in the January 2022 Employment Planning Implementation Report.</p> <p>As additional employment conversion requests were received during statutory consultation period and some were supported for conversion, the “Peel 2051 Land Needs Assessment Report” (January 2022) has accounted for these changes.</p>
STAT-21-053lxiii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule Y6: The Heritage Heights Employment Area (west side of Brampton) is not designated and has no boundary but is marked as “to be planned” through the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Per Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.6, upper-and single-tier municipalities are required to designate all employment areas in official plans and protect them for appropriate employment uses over the long-term.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Heritage Heights Employment Area be identified on Schedule Y6 and accounted for as part of assessing land needs to 2051.</p>	The lands identified for Employment Area land uses in Heritage Heights have been added to Schedule Y6.
STAT-21-053lxiv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.9.16 a): This draft policy speaks to maintaining the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 15 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and lands which are designated and available for residential development.</p> <p>It is recommended that the conditional “if necessary” be added to align with the PPS:</p>	Policy has been revised accordingly.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			5.9.16 maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth a minimum of 15 years through residential <i>intensification</i> and <i>redevelopment</i> and, if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential <i>development</i> ; and	
STAT-21-053lxv	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.10: The draft ROPA prioritizes and promotes the development of a sustainable, multi-modal transportation system that facilitates the movement of movement of people and goods in a safe and efficient manner, rather than the movement of single occupancy vehicles. This has the effect of placing transportation via private vehicles (other than single occupancy) at the same priority level as public transit.</p> <p>The Growth Plan requires that public transit be the first priority for transportation infrastructure planning and major transportation investments.</p> <p>To better align with the Growth Plan, it is recommended that the Region consider adding a new objective:</p> <p>5.10.9 To ensure that public transit will be the first priority for transportation infrastructure planning and major transportation investments.</p>	As transit is not within the Region’s jurisdiction, use of “ensure” is not appropriate. Intent of Province’s comment addressed elsewhere in the plan.
STAT-21-053lxvi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.10.2: This draft objective seeks to promote sustainable modes of transportation, barrier (environmental or physical) free mobility, and improved mobility choices for people of all ages and abilities.</p> <p>According to Growth Plan policy 2.2.1.4 b), complete communities support and offer opportunities for people of all ages, abilities, and incomes. To better align with the Growth Plan, it is recommended that the Region consider income as part of transportation equity.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Region consider the following:</p> <p>5.10.2 To promote <i>sustainable</i> modes of transportation, barrier (environmental or physical) free mobility, and improved mobility choices for people of all ages, and abilities and income.</p>	Policy has been updated accordingly.
STAT-21-053lxvii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.10.22: Draft policy 5.10.22 provides for the pursuit of improved connections to the Toronto Pearson International Airport from the GTHA, and particularly from Peel Region. It is recommended that the Region consider revising the draft policy to include reference to the planned Toronto Pearson Airport Connection from Renforth station.</p> <p>It is recommended that the draft policy be revised as follows:</p> <p>5.10.22 Pursue, in cooperation with the appropriate agencies, the improvement of connections to Toronto Pearson International Airport</p>	Policy will be revised accordingly.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			from all parts of the <i>GTHA</i> and particularly from Peel, including the planned connection of the Eglinton Crosstown West Expansion (ECWE) from Renforth Station to Pearson International Airport.	
STAT-21-053lxviii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.10.32.22: This draft policy references the implementation and regular updating of the Peel Region Sustainable Transportation Strategy, which builds on local municipal pedestrian and cycling plans.</p> <p>The Region should consider making reference to the Province-wide Cycling Network in draft policy 5.10.32.22 in order to support the improvement of interjurisdictional connectivity and intergovernmental collaboration on active transportation.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy be revised to the following:</p> <p>5.10.32.22 Work with the Province, the local municipalities, adjacent municipalities, and stakeholders to implement and regularly update the Sustainable Transportation Strategy for Peel that builds on local municipal pedestrian and cycling plans, and cross jurisdictional networks such as the Province-wide Cycling Network identified in 2018.</p>	<p>Policy will be updated as follows:</p> <p>5.10.32.22 Work with the Province, the local municipalities, adjacent municipalities, and stakeholders to implement and regularly update the Sustainable Transportation Strategy for Peel that builds on local municipal pedestrian and cycling plans, and cross-jurisdictional networks such as the Province-wide cycling Network.</p>
STAT-21-053lxix	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.10.32.36 g): This draft policy references the “Eglinton Crosstown West LRT Extension”, which does not reflect the project’s name in public documents.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy be revised to the following:</p> <p>5.10.32.36 g) implement the Eglinton Crosstown West LRT Extension from Mount Dennis Station to Renforth Station, and further to Toronto Pearson International Airport; and</p>	Policy has been revised accordingly.
STAT-21-053lxx	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.10.32.41: It is recommended that the policy be revised to the following:</p> <p>5.10.32.36 g) implement the Eglinton Crosstown West LRT Extension from Mount Dennis Station to Renforth Station, and further to Toronto Pearson International Airport; and</p> <p>It is recommended that the Region add the following policy:</p> <p>5.10.32.41 e) supporting transit service integration within and across municipal boundaries</p>	Policy will be revised accordingly.
STAT-21-053lxxi	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Preamble 5.10.33, paragraph 2: The preamble states that the Conceptual GTA West Transportation Corridor and the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor are shown on Schedule Y2, whereas MMAH staff note that the legend and annotation in Schedule Y2 only identify the Conceptual GTA Transportation Corridor.</p> <p>It is recommended that Schedule Y2 be revised to clearly identify both the</p>	Schedule Y2 has been updated accordingly.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Conceptual GTA West Transportation Corridor and the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor.	
STAT-21-053lxxii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Glossary: The draft ROPA’s definition of significant needs clarification to ensure that NDMNRF’s criteria for identifying woodlands and other features and area are met.</p> <p>It is recommended that the following concluding sentences be added:</p> <p>b) in regard to woodlands... The Province (Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry) identifies criteria related to the foregoing.</p> <p>d) in regard to other features and areas... The Province (Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry) identifies criteria related to the foregoing.</p> <p>This should be followed with an overall conclusion that:</p> <p>While some significant resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, the significance of others can only be determined after evaluation.</p>	Regional staff will revise these definitions as recommended.
STAT-21-053lxxiii	November 3, 2021	Jennifer Le Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH Jennifer.le@ontario.ca	<p>Glossary: The draft ROPA’s definition of <i>planned corridors</i> is recommended to be revised to include reference to ministries and entities mentioned in the PPS and Growth Plan definition of “planned corridors”.</p> <p>It is recommended that the definition be revised as follows in order to align with the PPS and Growth Plan:</p> <p>Planned Corridors: Corridors or future corridors which are required to meeting projected needs, and are identified through provincial plans or preferred alignment(s) determined through the Environmental Assessment Act process or identified through planning studies where the Ontario Ministry of Transportation, Metrolinx, Ontario Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines or Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) or any successor to those ministries or entities is actively pursuing the identification of a corridor.</p>	Definition has been revised accordingly.
STAT-21-422i	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>The draft ROPA was reviewed by staff at the MMAH, MEDJCT, MECP, and the MTO and provided the following detailed comments as ‘Attachment 1’:</p> <p>Schedule Y7: The draft ROPA does not appear to map priority transit corridors.</p> <p>Priority transit corridors, as shown in Schedule 5, are required to be</p>	Growth Plan Priority Transit Corridors have been identified in updates to the Schedule.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>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>	
STAT-21-422ii	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule Y7 and Table Y1: 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> <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 Planning Act 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, Ontario Regulation 299/19 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>	<p>Further detailed analysis has led to expanded delineations and adjusted minimum densities for some MTSA along Growth Plan priority transit corridors.</p> <p>Further consideration of the unique MTSA contexts and development potential informed how some non-developable land or low-density residential built forms were added into the expanded delineations, particularly where accessible by active transportation in an approximate 10-minute walkshed. In turn, the alternative minimum densities were adjusted to best reflect achievable densities each MTSA.</p> <p>Please see changes to 403–2 Winston Churchill, 403–6 Central Parkway, 403-7 Cawthra, 403-8 Tomken, 403-9 Dixie, and KIT-1 Malton GO.</p>
STAT-21-422iii	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH	<p>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).</p>	<p>The Region does recognize the benefits beyond minimum densities/intensification requirements to MTSA and higher order transit being located within employment areas and PSEZ. On each identified MTSA corridor (other than select standalone transit hubs) there are MTSA which encompass employment lands and PSEZ in their proposed delineations or 800 m</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<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 MTSA 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>	<p>radii.</p> <p>It is agreed that including PSEZ in MTSA does not predetermine the inclusion of mixed uses. Employment uses can continue, while only a limited number of MTSA have been identified to be the basis of flexible policies that will allow for additional mixed uses to be contemplated based on specified criteria (i.e., land use compatibility) through local municipal implementation planning – see employment policies in section 5.8.</p> <p>Please also see the response to comment STAT-21-053lv.</p>
STAT-21-422iv	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>Schedule Y7 and Table Y1: 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: Winston Churchill, Creditview, Central Parkway, Cawthra, Tomken, Dixie, and Malton GO.</p> <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</p>	<p>Further detailed analysis has led to expanded delineations and adjusted minimum densities for five stations along the 403 BRT/Mississauga Transitway corridor.</p> <p>Further consideration of the unique MTSA contexts and development potential informed how some non-developable land or low-density residential built forms were added into the expanded delineations, particularly where accessible by active transportation in an approximate 10-minute walkshed. In turn, the alternative minimum densities were adjusted to best reflect achievable densities each MTSA.</p> <p>Please see changes to 403–2 Winston Churchill, 403–6 Central Parkway, 403-7 Cawthra, 403-8 Tomken, and 403-9 Dixie, and KIT-1 Malton GO.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>delineated area is still subject to relevant provincial and municipal land use planning policies and approval 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. 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>	
STAT-21-422v	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>Table Y7: 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: Winston Churchill, Creditview, Central Parkway, Cawthra, Tomken, Dixie, Malton, and Mineola.</p> <p>In many instances, the Region appears to suggest that some MTSA's are considered major trip generators due to elementary and secondary schools located within the 800-metre radius from the station or stop.</p> <p>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.</p> <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>In the identified MTSA's, various factors including highway infrastructure, low density residential or employment built forms, Pearson airport building height restrictions contribute to limitations on densities to be achieved. While the lands immediately accessible by active transportation or within an approximate 10-minute walk face limitations on intensification, the MTSA's are part of larger corridors which move passengers from trip generators like nearby schools on longer trips.</p> <p>Along the Highway 403 Bus Rapid Transit Corridor, a number of stations have been expanded. The 403 – 2 Winston Churchill, 403 – 6 Central Parkway, 403 – 7 Cawthra, 403 – 8 Tomken, 403 – 9 Dixie, and KIT-1 Malton GO delineations have been expanded to include more of the surrounding neighbourhoods and therefore encompass more potential ridership within the MTSA's. The minimum densities have been adjusted accordingly to reflect development potential in these enlarged MTSA's, and in one case the proposed minimum density has been increased for 403-9 Dixie (while still being under the Growth Plan minimum).</p> <p>Generally, surface parking is to be minimized in MTSA's. Parking lots have been included in MTSA delineations in recognition that as these areas develop and mature, it may be feasible and supported by the market for parking lots to be redeveloped and support intensification in MTSA's. With regards to Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.9.c, local municipalities will update zoning as part of required implementation of MTSA's. Policy 5.6.17.14 (under Strategic Growth Areas) encourages local municipalities to adopt alternative development standards to promote the use of active transportation and public transit.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			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.	
STAT-21-422vi	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>Section 5.6.1.6, Table Y1 and Schedule Y7: MMAH staff have concerns that the draft ROPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to be placing higher priority on MTSA's located on priority transit corridors to which an alternative density target would not apply (referred to in the draft ROPA as "primary" MTSA's); • Not clear as to which MTSA's the <i>Planning Act's</i> Protected MTSA 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 • Not clear as to which MTSA's the Planning Act's Protected MTSA 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 <p>It is recommended that the draft ROPA be revised to indicate that all MTSA's 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 MTSA's not on a priority transit corridor, it is recommended that these stations be referred to as "secondary" MTSA's.</p> <p>MTSA's being implemented under subsection 16(16) of the Planning Act should be clearly identified and differentiated from those not and to which appeal protections would not apply. Only MTSA's that meet criteria under Planning Act 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 MTSA's 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>	<p>Schedule Y7 and Table 5 have been revised to more clearly map and indicate which stations are Growth Plan Priority Transit Corridors.</p> <p>The "primary" MTSA classification is considered an additional layer at the regional level to indicate where Growth Plan minimum densities are being met, versus "secondary" MTSA's which are classified accordingly due to their need for a lower alternative density. There are some MTSA's which are on Growth Plan Priority Transit Corridors that are also classified as "secondary" MTSA's because their unique context limits development potential and requires a lower alternative minimum density. Policy 5.6.19.6 describes these classifications. This policy was also revised to express more clearly that "primary" and "secondary" MTSA's, which are delineated in the ROP with minimum densities applied, are Planning Act protected MTSA's. Planned MTSA's are not protected MTSA's, as they are not delineated in the ROP and do not have minimum densities established.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<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> <p>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>.</p> <p>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>.</p> <p>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.”</p>	
STAT-21-422vii	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>Section 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.</p> <p>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</p>	Policy text has been revised accordingly, and a new Figure 11 - Major Transit Station Area Status has been proposed. Figure 11 is a table which indicates the provided station status from Metrolinx/MTO. As figures can be revised without an amendment to the ROP, this table can more easily be updated in accordance with new information provided from the Province on transit infrastructure funding and delivery.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			MTSAs to improve transparency and ensure a co-ordinated approach is taken regarding transit infrastructure planning between the province, Metrolinx, and municipalities. Please see <i>Attachment 2</i> for station status as provided by MTO/Metrolinx.	
STAT-21-422viii	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>Section 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.</p> <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>	Policies have been revised accordingly, with a minor modification to reflect Peel’s approach to providing multi-use paths on Regional Roads.
STAT-21-422ix	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	<p>Section 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.</p> <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. 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> <p>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.</p>	Policy revised, and the Growth Plan definition has been added to the ROP glossary as a defined term.
STAT-21-422x	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development	<p>Section 7.2.2.9: This draft policy allows for minor corrections to a MTSA delineation to occur without an amendment to the Region’s official plan, provided that the purpose, effect, intent, meaning and substance of the</p>	Policy revised accordingly.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	official plan is maintained. Any changes to the boundaries of a PMTSA delineation, even if minor, would be subject to the Minister's approval. It is recommended that this policy be revised as follows: "7.2.2.9 f) a Major Transit Station Area station or stop location of delineation to reflect the actual built infrastructure or applicable information regarding location from technical studies."	
STAT-21-422xi	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	Section 5.6.1.5: This draft policy uses the term "second units", which is outdated. 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). It is recommended that this policy be revised as follows: "5.6.1.5 Where appropriate, support a mix of multi-unit housing, including affordable housing, rental housing, and additional residential units second units ."	Policy was revised to replace second units with "additional residential units."
STAT-21-422xii	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	Section 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 MTSA's, as per the Growth Plan. It is recommended that the Region add the following new policy: "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> ."	Policy will be revised accordingly.
STAT-21-422xiii	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	Section 5.6.2.3 (new policy): The draft ROPA does not appear to contain policy which states that development within MTSA's will be supported by providing alternative development standards, as per the Growth Plan. It is recommended that the Region add the following new policy: "5.6.2.3 q) alternative development standards to support development within all Major Transit Station Areas, such as reduced parking standards."	Policy 5.6.17.14 (under Strategic Growth Areas) encourages local municipalities to adopt alternative development standards to promote the use of active transportation and public transit, such as reduced parking standards. 5.6.19.11 references that surface parking should be encouraged to be redeveloped.
STAT-21-422xiv	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH	Section 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.	The policy has been revised accordingly (now in section 5.6.19).

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	It is recommended that this policy be revised to better align with the Growth Plan. "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"	
STAT-21-422xv	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	Table Y1 – Hurontario LRT: The draft ROPA references "Sir Lou" station, which does not reflect the station's name in public documents. It is recommended that the station name "Sir Lou" be changed to "County Court".	MTSA naming has been revised.
STAT-21-422xvi	August 10, 2021	Loralea Tulloch Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development MMAH loralea.tulloch@ontario.ca	Table Y1 – 407 BRT: MMAH staff note the following technical comments on the draft ROPA regarding the 407 BRT: <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 It is recommended that: <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. 	The corridor name and MTSA's have been updated to reflect the approved EA and recommended changes on Table 5 and Schedule Y7.
City of Brampton				
STAT-21-073i	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Throughout the document, Delineated Built-up Area and Built-up Area are used interchangeably.	Staff have reviewed and updated as appropriate. The term Delineated Built-up-Area is defined as per the Growth Plan and the term 'built up areas' refers to areas with a concentration of development.
STAT-21-073ii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	To reduce redundancy, engagement policies could be consolidated to not repeat engaging levels of government on implementing climate change actions, solving housing challenges, etc. It also helps for ease of reference.	These are advocacy policies in staff's opinion continue to be appropriate to be included within the respective policy sections.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-073iii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Glossary: A definition of Protected Major Transit Station Area may be needed.	All major transit station areas delineated in the Regional Official Plan will be 'protected' Major Transit Station Areas. This will be clarified through policy revisions.
STAT-21-073iv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Schedule Z3: Schedule Z3 does not mention the "Delineated" as per proposed terminology - Delineated Built-up Area.	Agreed – change made to legend in Z3.
STAT-21-073v	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 1.2: It would be great to understand how the land acknowledgement was drafted and how Communities were involved in the drafting of this section.	This is based on the corporate land acknowledgement with input from the Peel Aboriginal Network and other Indigenous groups (not done within Planning).
STAT-21-073vi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.5.9: Is this policy just continued from before? Was it not implemented yet - maybe tie clearer deliverable (e.g., Climate Action Plan to identify targets and how to get there)?	This policy direction continues to be relevant as corporate targets may need to be reviewed and updated periodically over time.
STAT-21-073vii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.6: Water Resource System - this background could identify the defined features (ground water, surface water and hydrologic features) of the Peel Water Resource System more up front in the background section. Is this also considering the one water approach? Was any thought identified of using that as a part of defining the WRS? This section could also identify the importance of water resources to Indigenous Communities, depending on feedback you have received from Communities. With the scale of growth/planning horizon to 2051, identifying in a background section like this the importance of managing water resources in a manner that protects the quality/quantity for the years to come.	The definition in the introduction is based on the Growth Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement. The introductory section is intended to provide the reader with background and context to understand the policies. While the "one water approach" is reflected in the policy direction, a definition is not needed. The policies for water resources have been updated to conform with provincial direction that municipalities implement a water resource systems approach, identify water resource systems and their components, and provide policies for their protection, restoration, and improvement. Acknowledgement of the importance of water resources and the environment generally to Indigenous communities is provided more broadly in the introduction to Chapter 2. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-073viii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and	Section 2.6.19.3: How would this monitoring work take place? Would this be through the watershed plans? If this is the intent, be clear on how to conduct this work?	As noted in policy 2.6.19.5 g) recommendations for environmental monitoring will be provided through watershed plans.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073ix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.6.20.7: Wouldn't the ROP being an ideal place to identify a hierarchy of stormwater management practices? What policy direction are you providing on hierarchy through the ROP?	Policy 2.6.20.10 provides direction related to hierarchy of stormwater management practices: "Promote and implement a hierarchy of stormwater management practices including at source, conveyance and end of pipe solutions." The policy is intended to be broad and not specify detailed stormwater practices that would be more appropriate to identify in local policies and/or program guidelines and standards.
STAT-21-073x	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.12.13.2.6: Full Greenbelt Plan policy subsections could be included in this policy (a, b, and c).	The policy refers back to the Greenbelt Plan for detailed direction. For clarity, the policy will be revised to qualify the direction to municipalities to permit major development as the direction does not require major development to be permitted. Changes to the policy are recommended as follows: 2.12.13.2.6 Direct the City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon to include policies in their official plans to only permit major development ...where it has been demonstrated...".
STAT-21-073xi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.12.13.2.12: Could this policy be merged with policy 2.6.13? Please review - seems duplicative.	The policies for agricultural, agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses in the different provincial plan sections provide similar but not identical policy direction. The avoidance of some overlap with similar or related Natural Heritage System policies in the Greenbelt Plans sections (NEP, ORMCP, Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan NHS) was considered. The NHS and key feature policies were not centralized into a separate section to align with the current structure of the Regional Plan which sets out separate policy sections for the provincial plans.
STAT-21-073xii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.12.14.1: In considering the impacts to agriculture - is it the impact to the overall ag system or is this referring to ensuring this does not impact prime ag lands or all ag system lands (prime ag/specialty crop/rural lands). As impact to agriculture could mean a couple of things, clarity would be great.	The reference to "and that consider the impacts to agriculture" when planning parkland, open space and trails simply recognizes the potential for conflicts and farm trespass issues and the opportunity to avoid impacts when undertaking planning for these uses. No changes recommended.
STAT-21-073xiii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.12.15.3: This policy focuses on Caledon, but Brampton has Agricultural system lands as well, correct? Mapping would help to discuss this conversation.	The Agricultural System land base mapping was reviewed and updated in the City of Brampton in the narrow Greenbelt finger that is part of the Region's Rural System. The area is designated as Rural Lands in the Regional Official Plan on Schedule X12 (now Schedule D-1). Mapping is available from the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan Review project website.
STAT-21-073xiv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.12.16.14: Propose for ease of use consolidating stormwater management policies to support readability - are they just separate because of organization of the greenbelt plan (e.g., stormwater management and resilient infrastructure is its own section in 4.2.3)?	Policy 2.12.16.14 is a policy specific to the Greenbelt Plan and included in the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside policy section along with other similar policies for infrastructure in the Greenbelt. No changes are recommended.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-073xv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.12.16.24: For policies like this, it may be easier to spell out the full Greenbelt policies that must be complied with rather than just referencing the relevant provincial policy. Where possible, it helps readability to not require staff to have to open ROP and Provincial plans as well.	The Greenbelt Plan policy sections provide a balance of detailed policy direction and general references to the Greenbelt Plan to include sufficient guidance for the reader and avoid duplicating every policy.
STAT-21-073xvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.12.17: In the background text, this section could further identify the important role that Urban River Valley policies have in integrating the protected countryside into the broader landscape and *URBAN* areas. Key to showing an integrated built/natural system that is connected- "To integrate the Greenbelt into urban areas that were not part of the Greenbelt's initial boundaries, by promoting the following matters within the Urban River Valley designation".	The Preamble to the Regional Greenlands Section in Section 2.14 provides a broader context explaining the role of its various components including the Greenbelt Plan's Urban River Valleys. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-073xvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 2.14: Overall mapping/Greenlands system mapping is needed to understand policies and implementation. This section in my mind should be moved up in the sequence of Chapter 2 in order to support readability of this Chapter. Greenlands system objectives spells out connection across different sections and is a more general guiding policy section.	A new map Schedule Z4 (now Schedule C-1) identifying the Greenlands System as an overlay in the Regional Official Plan is recommended to be added to the Plan to identify where the Greenlands System policies apply in Peel along with policies in Section 2.14 that further clarify and explain the intent of the Greenlands System Core, NAC and PNAC policy framework and the relationship of the policy framework to the Provincial Natural Heritage Systems and Plans in areas where they overlap. The policy direction for Greenlands System protection, restoration and enhancement in Section 2.14.39 provides further direction to the local municipalities to identify natural heritage systems and implement the Core Area, NAC and PNAC policy framework that precedes it. It is providing further implementation guidance to the local municipalities and follows in that logical sequence.
STAT-21-073xviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 3.4: Section 3.4 Mineral Aggregate Resources is still being reviewed/updated by the Region. Would like to understand timing.	The Region is proposing to provide a discussion paper, High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resources Area mapping methodology and draft policies in early 2022. Public consultation will also be undertaken at that time.
STAT-21-073xix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 3.4.11: "Conduct such studies...." - identify relevant studies required explicitly.	The policy is intentionally broad to allow for flexibility in determining the appropriate study.
STAT-21-073xx	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development	Section 3.6.7: Will the Region provide any guidance for consideration of archaeological assessment protocols/engagement protocols of Indigenous Communities?	The Region will be reinitiating work on internal guidelines for Indigenous engagement after ROP policies come into effect, and these are not currently planned to be released publicly. No additional guidance is expected from the Province. Ongoing efforts to coordinate official plan policy engagement on matters that affect the Region and local municipalities will continue.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073xxi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 3.7: Background text - "reducing the need to travel by single-occupant vehicle, while, and improving access to sustainable modes of transportation " --> could expand to include sustainable modes of transportation and movement, including the promotion of active transportation.	Detailed policy direction addressing sustainable modes of transportation and active transportation are provided in Section 5.10.32 of the Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-073xxii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.4.8: A significant part of managing growth is to manage and mitigate impact to natural systems to promote ecological health.	The comment is noted and addressed in the Regional Official Plan.
STAT-21-073xxiii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.4.13: Is this something that should be done collaboratively with the lower-tier municipality?	In instances where there is a Regional responsibility as part of a Municipal Comprehensive Review, staff undertake collaboration with local municipalities.
STAT-21-073xxiv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.4.16: Define "infrastructure corridors" in definitions section.	Infrastructure is a defined term, and an infrastructure corridor would include instances where infrastructure is provided in a corridor. No change recommended.
STAT-21-073xxv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.4.9: PPS language would be beneficial here to identify integration of key planning principles to achieve complete communities that are healthy, safe, and liveable - "promoting the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs".	Section 5.4.9 supports the Growth Plan policies that define 'complete communities'. While other policy objectives in Section 5.4 touch upon the PPS objectives related to integrated planning, Regional staff support the inclusion of this wording as an overall objective.
STAT-21-073xxvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Sections 5.4.9 and 5.4.11: Would encourage additional terminology that relates to transit feasibility in addition to transit oriented – not all communities in greenfield areas may not have the opportunity to develop around a major transit system but creating transit feasible development may allow for later implementation of successful, more fiscally responsible transit systems. Alternatively, transit-supportive that includes a definition that mentions	Regional staff will use the term 'transit-supportive' to be consistent with the definition in the PPS, Growth Plan, and ROP.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			transit feasibility. Potential to explore advantages of using transit-feasible vs. transit-supportive.	
STAT-21-073xxvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.4.18: Complete communities that are compact, transit-supportive, and make effective use of investments in infrastructure and public service facilities. At the same time, A Place to Grow will continue to ensure protection of our agricultural and natural areas and support climate change mitigation and adaptation as Ontario moves towards the goal of environmentally sustainable communities.</p> <p>Would encourage more consistent language with the GGH to inform the preamble and objectives of this section:</p> <p>Compact greenfield communities reduce the rate at which land is consumed. Communities in larger urban centres need to grow at transit supportive densities, with walkable street configurations. Compact built form and intensification efforts go together with more effective transit and active transportation networks and are fundamental to where and how we grow. They are necessary to ensure the viability of transit; connect people to homes, jobs, and other aspects of daily living for people of all ages; and meet climate change mitigation and adaptation objectives. Moreover, an increased modal share for active transportation and transit, including convenient, multimodal options for intra- and inter-municipal travel, supports reduced air pollution and improved public health outcomes.</p>	The Growth Plan provides for a robust definition of ‘complete communities’ that recognizes the context and scale complete communities can be planned for. Regional staff will reference complete communities as a defined term in this section.
STAT-21-073xxviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.4.18.2: It’s important to recognize that the viability of transit service does not only rely on density, but also a mix of uses, as per the Province’s Transit Supportive Guidelines (Section 1.1.9: 9. Plan to locate multiple functions such as a mix of employment, retail and residential uses along transit routes and corridors to increase transit destinations and support the viability of the transit network.)</p> <p>1.1.7 Land uses should be coordinated alongside existing and proposed transit investments to ensure that appropriate densities and a mix of uses are provided in proximity to transit service. Similarly, planned transit investments should aim to support existing and planned land use patterns by providing greater levels of service to denser areas.</p> <p>This policy is especially relevant to discourage segregating uses and ensure viability of transit especially in employment areas where employees may rely on transit as a primary means of travel.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy 5.4.18.1 and 5.4.18.3 refer to Designated Greenfield Areas contributing to complete communities and achieving a compatible and diverse mix of land uses.</p>
STAT-21-073xxix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development	Section 5.4.18.5: Should be consistent with the “protect and enhance” direction of the GHG.	Agreed – revision made.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073xxx	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.4.18.6: The policies contained within this section do not reflect this objective.</p> <p>The Region is experiencing a dramatic economic change. Traditional industries, such as manufacturing and agri-food businesses, continue to play an important role, but globalization and technology are also transforming the GGH’s economy. There has been a shift towards knowledge-intensive, high value-added activities that is increasing the significance of the service and knowledge-based sectors and spurring innovation in other segments of the economy. This change is providing opportunities for a variety of types of businesses to locate and grow in the GGH, which is fundamental to ensuring a more prosperous economic future. Therefore, it is important to ensure an adequate supply of land within employment areas – both for traditional industries and for service sector and knowledge-based businesses that warrant such locations – and sites for a broad range of other employment uses.</p>	Peel’s economy is diverse, and the changing nature of employment is impacting both traditional industries and the service/knowledge-based sectors. Greenfield growth in both community and employment areas will need to be managed to support existing and future business and the labour force as new trends emerge.
STAT-21-073xxxi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.5.4.2.5 (original): Why is this being deleted?	<p>The minimum transit-supportive densities prescribed in the Growth Plan for Major Transit Station Areas are above the minimum referenced in policy 5.5.4.2.5 and are not applicable to specific policy areas (i.e., greenfield areas).</p> <p>Refer to section 5.6.19 for more details on Major Transit Station Areas.</p>
STAT-21-073xxxii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.4.18.11: Should be consistent with the language of the GGH.</p> <p>Section 2.1 states: “Complete communities support quality of life and human health by encouraging the use of active transportation and providing high quality public open space, adequate parkland, opportunities for recreation, and access to local and healthy food.”</p> <p>And/or Policy 5.2.5.6.6. In planning to achieve the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan, municipalities will develop and implement urban design and site design official plan policies and other supporting documents that direct the development of a high-quality public realm and compact built form.</p> <p>Public Realm Definition: All spaces to which the public has unrestricted access, such as streets, parks, and sidewalks.</p>	Policy updated to reference ‘complete communities’ as a defined term and additional text provided on high quality public realm and compact built forms.
STAT-21-073xxxiii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development	Section 5.5.6: Does this refer to proximity of residential and employment uses or the housing typology “live-work”?	Live-work refers to the proximity of residential and employment uses.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073xxxvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.5.7 c): Is this policy referring to Regional water and wastewater and SWM master plans and suggesting a required submission of an Infrastructure Servicing Study? Is there an opportunity to contextualize the policy to the Regional context?	Terminology is as per the Growth Plan. To support a settlement area boundary expansion, a high-level infrastructure assessment needs to be undertaken to confirm the appropriateness of the location of the proposed settlement area boundary. Detailed infrastructure servicing studies would be undertaken by the local municipality through secondary plans and subsequent development applications. No change recommended.
STAT-21-073xxxv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.5.7 d): Is this policy should be clearer as to expectations of submissions – it is unclear if the applicant is submitting something informed by Regional Studies or if the expectation is of the applicant. If it is that the applicant is required to submit a study (Subwatershed Study or Environmental Impact Study, etc.), this should be clear and completed to the satisfaction of Region, local municipalities, and relevant conservation authorities.	Private applications for settlement area boundary expansions are not permitted, with the exception of applications for <40 ha settlement expansions. The requirements outlined in this section would be undertaken by the Region, at a Regional scale, similar to the approach currently being taken through the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion study.
STAT-21-073xxxvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.5.7(e): Should a policy be established to encourage the development of SWM facilities that support the ecological function of planned natural heritage?	Same comment as above. The requirements in this section are as per the policies in the Growth Plan for a settlement area boundary expansion.
STAT-21-073xxxvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.15: Principles of equity could be expanded on for subsection d) - design of communities with an equity lens and minimize crime/protection of vulnerable communities.	Draft Regional policies direct staff to conduct research on equity and inclusion in land use planning. Addition of equity principles would be appropriate after the draft policy below is implemented. Draft policy. 7.4.10.5 Conduct research on equity and inclusivity related to public engagement and consultation, land use policy and infrastructure distribution to inform decision making in the planning process.
STAT-21-073xxxviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.17.13: Would encourage there to be more specificity in “Educational Institutions” - Brampton sees a number of for profit technical, beauty and driving schools that may or may not be appropriate for growth areas. Propose adding "...other major institutional uses".	Suggest local implementation could provide more specificity on uses that would be considered educational institutions. No change recommended.
STAT-21-073xxxix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.17: It would be beneficial to the local municipalities to include a policy directing seniors housing, assisted and supportive housing within growth areas to ensure these residents have adequate provision of resources, amenities, and mobility options. Encouraging local housing targets would also be a beneficial direction.	Housing policies support innovative and alternative housing types and arrangements and shared, special needs or supportive housing, which could include housing for seniors. Peel-wide needs-based housing targets in Table 4 are baseline. Local municipalities can choose to develop other targets or go beyond these minimum targets.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-073xl	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.17.14: What was the intent of this policy and the inter-relationship of parking specific to AT and Public Transit? The policy should speak at a higher level to Travel Demand Management Strategies that include parking, AT, and Public Transit, as well as land use patterns that contribute to decrease automobile dependence.	The draft policy encourages the local municipalities to establish standards and policies that support active transportation and public transportation in Strategic Growth Areas (i.e., reduced parking). Text revised to state alternative development standards to capture other development standards that may support increased Active Transportation and Transit use.
STAT-21-073xli	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18: May be worthwhile mentioning the connectivity Growth Plan 3.2.3.4 Municipalities will ensure that active transportation networks are comprehensive and integrated into transportation planning to provide: a) safe, comfortable travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other users of active transportation; and b) continuous linkages between strategic growth areas, adjacent neighbourhoods, major trip generators, and transit stations, including dedicated lane space for bicyclists on the major street network, or other safe and convenient alternatives.	Please see transportation policy section 5.10 for direction on connectivity/linkages, complete streets, and active transportation. Additional policy revisions were made based on Brampton comments STAT-21-423.
STAT-21-073xlii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18.1: Opportunity to identify mixed use developments and existing communities, services, and public amenities.	Urban Growth Centres can support a mix of high intensity compact forms while recognizing existing communities and services.
STAT-21-073xliii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18: Should also reference transportation network. Land uses are a direct outcome of the transportation network.	As per policy 5.6.18.8, local policies are required to address the transportation system to and within Urban Growth Centres and the location, type, and density of land uses.
STAT-21-073xliv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18.1: Recommend using language from Growth Plan - an integrated transportation network will allow people choices for easy travel both within and between urban centres throughout the Region.	See comment above.
STAT-21-073xlv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18.2: To achieve Urban Growth Centres that support *land use patterns* that establish safe and secure communities, public transit, and cycling.	Land use patterns are only one of many contributing factors to support safe and secure communities, public transit, and cycling. No change recommended
STAT-21-073xlvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning	Section 5.6.18.4: It would be beneficial to include language from the “culture of conservation” section of the GHG to support sustainable	Policies addressing energy and emissions goals and objectives are provided in Sections 2.4 Climate System, 3.7 Energy and 7.6 Sustainability. The policy direction reflects provincial policy

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	development within High Density areas particularly as they relate to local energy and emissions goals. Energy conservation for existing buildings and planned developments, including municipally owned facilities, including through land use patterns and urban design standards that support energy efficiency and demand reductions, and opportunities for alternative energy systems, including district energy systems.	and supports implementation of requirements at the local level. The role of Urban Growth Centres and Regional Intensification Corridors supports these objectives and facilitates implementation of energy efficiency, energy conservation and alternative and renewable energy systems.
STAT-21-073xlvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18.5 b): Residents, workers, and *students* - as the Region urbanizes and more post secondary opportunities are located within the Region, it's important to plan for transient groups who may be temporary residents, or commuters for the purposes of schooling.	Policy 5.6.18.5 a) references opportunities for institutional uses as designated and defined in local municipal official plan. No change recommended.
STAT-21-073xlvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18.9 and 5.6.18.9 b): Hurontario-Main corridor: Consider opportunities for learning within intensification corridors (whether it be JK-12 or post-secondary). Consider opportunities for recreation (provision of parks and open spaces).	Policy 5.6.18.9 c) refers to the designated and defined uses in the local municipal official plan.
STAT-21-073xlix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.18.12: Am unclear of the intent and direction this policy is offering – is this direction for the Region to consider this designation in a future MCR? Or providing direction to the locals to recognize Regional Intensification Corridors through our OPRs?	Designation of Regional Intensification Corridors can only occur through a Municipal Comprehensive Review and ROPA.
STAT-21-073l	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19: This section and the sections before it does a great job at addressing the vision for land uses and built form, however, lacks in describing the streets/roads, and network required in the realization of this vision. Compact built form is really only successful with a compact road network that offers the connectivity for all users. From the GGH: A comprehensive and continuous active transportation network will offer a viable alternative to the private automobile for personal travel. Using a complete streets approach to roadway design, reconstruction, and refurbishment will ensure that the needs and safety of all road users are considered when planning and building the street network.	The policy provides direction and guidance to the local municipalities for implementation. Street network and road design are largely the responsibility of the local municipalities outside Region Road. Please refer to the transportation section of the ROP which directs local municipalities to create complete streets and prioritize active transportation (5.10.32.10).
STAT-21-073li	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and	Section 5.6.19.4: Complete streets – its important to foster a comprehensive AT network that includes both on street and off-street connections.	The intent of the policy is to encourage the development/enhancement of active transportation connections to improve station access and transit ridership, which support the achievement of the Regions Modal split target.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Comma required after complete communities, and before improving multi-modal. "Region's modal split target by increasing transit ridership in Peel." Should be changed to "Region's modal split target *to* increase*e* transit ridership in Peel."	
STAT-21-073lii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.13 c): Compact street pattern to correspond with compact built form.	Noted.
STAT-21-073liii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.20.2: Policy should include street network in addition to complete communities	Agreed, change made.
STAT-21-073liv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.20.12: It should be noted that through Brampton's OPR, we are deviating from the nomenclature of "Block Planning" are pursuing "Precinct Planning" – the intent, however, is the same. As per the requirement of 5.6.20.14.14 - this policy should also speak to the need of precinct planning to require community/neighbourhood energy studies.	Each of the local municipalities refer to this level of detailed plans differently. Regional Official Plan policies refer to "community or neighbourhood block plans." The preamble under section 5.6.20 – Designated Greenfield Area has been revised to describe in more detail what is meant by community or neighbourhood block plans to recognize the various terminologies and processes for addressing the requirements. Reference to planning for energy systems / community energy planning will be added to the block planning policy 5.6.20.13.
STAT-21-073lv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.9 d): Presumably not all new communities will be able to be developed around major stations – perhaps the language should be supportive vs. oriented. Language around connectivity/robustness should be added to ensure the transportation network is able to support the land use vision of "compact, mixed-use, sustainable, transit-oriented communities"	Terminology throughout the draft polices has been revised to reference transit supportive as per the Growth Plan.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-073lvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.11 c): Should reflect “protect and enhance” direction of the Growth Plan.	Agreed. The policy will be changed to: <u>c) include the protection and enhancement of a natural heritage system and water resource system informed by subwatershed study recommendations and the integration of water and stormwater management objectives and requirements;</u>
STAT-21-073lvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.11(e): From the Growth Plan: "Building more compact greenfield communities reduces the rate at which land is consumed. Communities in larger urban centres need to grow at transit supportive densities, with walkable street configurations. Compact built form and intensification efforts go together with more effective transit and active transportation networks and are fundamental to where and how we grow. They are necessary to ensure the viability of transit; connect people to homes, jobs, and other aspects of daily living for people of all ages; and meet climate change mitigation and adaptation objectives. Moreover, an increased modal share for active transportation and transit, including convenient, multimodal options for intra- and inter-municipal travel, supports reduced air pollution and improved public health outcomes." Policy lacks detail on street configuration/integrated transportation network and its relationship to positive land use outcomes, and ancillary benefits of increase modal spits, and climate goals. Section also lacks direction on complete streets: As per policy 3.2.2.3. of the Growth Plan: “In the design, refurbishment, or reconstruction of the existing and planned street network, a complete streets approach will be adopted that ensures the needs and safety of all road users are considered and appropriately accommodated.”	Noted, however this level of detail in is covered in Transportation Section 5.10. No change recommended in this section.
STAT-21-073lviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.11(g): Open space - it is important to note that open spaces often have recreational context and does not necessarily equate to the Natural Heritage System – NHS should also be noted as a logical boundary Policy is confusing – starts with what I interpret as boundary identification and transitions to prioritizing community amenities through the development process. Policy should be clearer.	The policy 5.6.20.14.11 is providing criteria for the delineation of secondary plan areas in the 2051 New Community Areas. The criteria listed are relevant considerations for this purpose. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-073lix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.11(i): Policy lacks direction – refer to Section 4.2.9 of the Growth Plan: Municipalities will develop and implement official plan policies and other strategies in support of the following conservation objectives: b) energy conservation for existing buildings and planned developments, including municipally owned facilities, including through: i. identification of opportunities for conservation, energy efficiency and demand management, as well as district energy generation, renewable	Policy 5.6.20.14.11(i) (now renumbered 5.6.20.14.11) reflects recommendations in the Opportunities for Climate Change Mitigation, Energy and Emissions Reductions Study conducted as part of the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Study and is intended to provide direction when establishing the location of secondary plan areas to maximize the feasibility of implementing alternative and renewable energy systems specifically. Comprehensive policy direction addressing the detailed matters and how planning should be conducted within secondary plan areas is provided in other sections of the Regional Official Plan. No changes are recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>energy systems and alternative energy systems and distribution through community, municipal, and regional energy planning processes, and in the development of conservation and demand management plans; ii. land use patterns and urban design standards that support energy efficiency and demand reductions, and opportunities for alternative energy systems, including district energy systems; and</p> <p>iii. other conservation, energy efficiency and demand management techniques to use energy wisely as well as reduce consumption.</p> <p>Its important to realize the success and viability in the establishing renewable energy systems relies on there being suitable densities and a street configuration that makes the installation of infrastructure less cost prohibitive. Consider adding provision that speaks to the intent of ROPA 27 Policy – encouraging land use patterns and transportation systems that encourage positive health outcomes. There is an opportunity to further the review of climate considerations</p> <p>As per Growth Plan Policy 4.2.10.2 a) develop strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve resilience through the identification of vulnerabilities to climate change, land use planning, planning for infrastructure, including transit and energy, green infrastructure, and low impact development, and the conservation objectives in policy 4.2.9.1.</p>	
STAT-21-073lx	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.6.20.14.13(f): Policy lacks detail on street configuration/integrated transportation network and its relationship to positive land use outcomes, and ancillary benefits of increase modal spits, and climate goals.</p> <p>Semantics – but what is considered to be an “efficient provision”?</p>	The purpose of this policy is to ensure that there is a plan in effect for sufficient east-west transit and road and goods movement capacity to support development should the GTA West Corridor not proceed.
STAT-21-073lxi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.6.20.13.15.7: Areas 52 and 53 will be amended to be 1 SP – Heritage Heights Area 52. If this policy refers to Mount Pleasant and the difference of NW Brampton, this should be clearer. Confirm timing - should it be 2031 or 2051?</p>	<p>The policy refers to the area identified on draft Schedule Z1 and includes Secondary Plan Areas 51, 52 and 53.</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) and exclude the area in Huttonville Secondary Plan 29b.</p> <p>Reference to timing (2031) and to Table 3 have been removed.</p>
STAT-21-073lxii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton	<p>Section 5.6.20.13.15.8 c) & d): c) Please add language that refers to Phase 1 as Mount Pleasant (if this is what is referred to).</p> <p>d) Regional and Local Councils have opposed the construction of a highway within the GTA West Corridor – recommend changing highway to “infrastructure”.</p>	<p>Northwest Brampton includes Secondary Plan Areas 51, 52 and 53.</p> <p>Reference to the highway has been removed in policy 5.6.20.13.15.8d).</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073lxiii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.7: For clarification: How do you classify the rural system and is this deviating from Provincial definition - are rural lands not a part of the Agricultural System? How does the Rural System as you define it in the ROP? Would the Rural system not form a part of the Agricultural System by Provincial definition?	By provincial definition, the Agricultural System, including its agricultural land base made up of Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Lands, is part of the Rural System. The Rural System in Peel includes Prime Agricultural Areas, Rural Lands, Rural Settlement Areas, the Palgrave Estate Residential Community, natural heritage and water resources and other natural resources. The definition is consistent with provincial policy.
STAT-21-073lxiv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.8: Need to attract a local workforce, as well as jobs through employment area planning - consideration of connection to 15-minute communities/mixed use to enable compact, walkable communities. Sections 5.8.38-39 starts to get to it.	Noted.
STAT-21-073lxv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.8.31: Brampton staff will confirm if this designation will continue to exist through the review of our local OPR.	Noted.
STAT-21-073lxvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Sections 5.9.2 and 5.9.6: Section 5.9.2 and 5.9.6 could be merged - both focus on supply and could be done to ensure adequate supply of existing and projected needs for both rental and affordable housing, including increasing the existing.	5.9.6 has been removed. Providing more affordable housing and rental stock is captured in 5.9.1 and 5.9.2.
STAT-21-073lxvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.1: Should also mention complete streets and should tie back to the land use relationship of the previous sections - somewhat mentioned in section 5.10.32.29, but good to incorporate back in the preliminary policies.	The OP is meant to be read in its entirety, and complete streets and land use relationship is reinforced through other policies.
STAT-21-073lxviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.3: Policy should be clearer: SOV are considered to be part of the movement of people. To optimize the use of existing the Region's Regional transportation infrastructure and services by prioritizing the *sustainable* safe and efficient movement of people and goods by all modes, rather than the movement of single occupancy vehicles.	Word "sustainable" added to objective.
STAT-21-073lxix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning	Section 5.9.1.6 (original policy): Why is this policy being removed?	The intent of this old policy is covered in other policies focused on optimizing the transportation system.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073lxx	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.10 a): Why is energy being removed? Climate change is critical for the local municipalities and transportation has been identified as the highest contributing sector in Brampton based on the CEERP. This policy lacks the public health imperative of creating walkable and transit supportive networks that contribute to positive health outcomes Policy lacks integration with Land use planning – from the GP: They provide for a balance of jobs and housing in communities across the GGH to reduce the need for long distance commuting. They also support climate change mitigation by increasing the modal share for transit and active transportation and by minimizing land consumption through compact built form. It is important to realize that transportation planning and network planning plays a critical role in achieving these desired land use outcomes and creating complete communities	A comprehensive policy framework addressing environmental, climate change and energy objectives related to transportation is provided in a Section 5.10.37. Policy direction for energy conservation and transportation were relocated into the new section.
STAT-21-073lxxi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.1: Reducing auto dependency can not occur by just promoting sustainable modes. Land uses should provide a balance of jobs and housing in communities across the Region to reduce the need for long distance commuting.	Policies updated based on comment.
STAT-21-073lxxii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.8: Could this policy be expanded beyond Regional roads/to work with local municipal partners for a Regional network for active transportation?	Yes, words “on Regional roads” will be deleted from this objective, many subsequent policies apply beyond Regional roads.
STAT-21-073lxxiii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.37: Just a thought - could expand policy to meet the challenge of the first and last mile.	OP should be read in its entirety, other policies address first and last mile challenges.
STAT-21-073lxxiv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development	Section 7.4.10.8: Could this policy be expanded to include guidelines/training and support for local municipalities. This can also be useful to coordinate on planning matters of interest to communities with both Regional and local staff.	Policy has changed from previously being outward facing to internal guidance only as the result of Indigenous community feedback and legal input.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073lxxv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 7.11.6: Just a thought - maybe just word concept of growth paying for growth instead of self-supporting?	This Policy objective has been revised and reads: "To promote the philosophy that new development and growth should be fiscally responsible and support the Region's financial sustainability.
STAT-21-073lxxvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.4.1: Consider strengthening this. Instead of directing "a significant portion of growth" and "particularly UGCs, SGUs and Corridors" consider rewording to "UGCs, SGUs, and corridors are the focus (or primary locations) for highest levels of intensification".	No change recommended. Further direction on directing growth within the delineated built-up-area and a hierarchy of strategic growth areas can be found in Chapter 5.6.17 – Strategic Growth Areas policies. Please also see the preamble statements such as "The Strategic Growth Areas identified on Schedule Z2 of this Plan, are priority areas for intensification and higher densities..." and "The Strategic Growth Areas identified in the Regional Official Plan establish a hierarchy for which the highest densities and scale of development will be directed."
STAT-21-073lxxvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.8.32, 5.8.33 and 5.8.34: Consider making a reference to these policies in 5.6.19.	Policy 5.6.19.9.N references the applicable policy 5.8.32. A separate policy has been added to 5.6.19 regarding adding new MTSAs to the ROP. Section 5.8.33 specifically applies to adding stations to the Employment Areas schedule to allow land use flexibility policy 5.8.32 to apply. 5.6.19 already speaks to high density mixed uses including employment uses such as major office to locate in MTSAs.
STAT-21-073lxxviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.43: Add reference to this section and general policy in 5.6.19.13. Something like "policies that encourage the implementation of inclusionary zoning, as described in 5.8.43".	A reference to the policy previously numbered 5.9.43 has been included in the MTSA policy in section 5.6.19 regarding the review of development applications prior to the local municipality establishing MTSA policies.
STAT-21-073lxxix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.43: Consider clarity on what "applicable MTSAs" means? If all delineated MTSAs are protected, it should apply to all.	Previously numbered draft policy 5.9.43 has been reworded to provide greater clarity that inclusionary zoning can be implemented through zoning by-laws in primary Major Transit Station Areas and secondary Major Transit Station Areas, where deemed appropriate by the local municipality, and in community planning permit system areas, as ordered by the Minister.
STAT-21-073lxxx	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton	Section 7.3.10: Clarify what adjusting means. Can the boundary or location of an MTSA be changed?	Policy has been updated to clarify 'adjusting' pertains to only a change in the location of the transit station or stop.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073lxxxi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 7.9.22 and 7.9.24: Consider adding some wording here, or just in 5.6.19 that speaks to affordable housing. MTSAs and intensification areas should be a, if not the, focus for affordable housing. Consider setting a minimum target of new housing units in major transit station areas / intensification areas be affordable, to offer a range of compact housing forms and tenures, and intrinsically affordable units for low- and moderate-income households. The ROP speaks to affordable housing but consider focusing that on the intensification areas/MTSAs (this is in addition to Inclusionary zoning policy).	The preamble of the MTSA section 5.6.19 has been updated to reference varied housing types and affordability.
STAT-21-073lxxxii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.3: Change "support" to "provide" or stronger language. Clarify what is meant by "tipologies".	The policy framework supports a range of station typologies 'types' recognizing that stations across Peel will have different built form, densities, and ridership levels. "Tipologies" was an error and replaced with typologies.
STAT-21-073lxxxiii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.4: Change "enhance" to "develop and/or strengthen" or stronger language. There are no transit stations yet in many of these areas, so connections have yet to be built. Where they do exist, they must be strengthened. Also, consider adding "safe": "to support safe complete communities..."	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-073lxxxvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.7: Change "direct the local municipality to delineate" to "local municipalities shall delineate". Strengthen language.	Formal language in the ROP provides 'direction' from Regional Council to the local municipalities. No change recommended.
STAT-21-073lxxxv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.8: Same as above. Change to "the local municipality shall..."	See response above.
STAT-21-073lxxxvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.9 (all): Consider revising all policies under 5.6.19.9 to indicate timing of when all these applicable policies are to be implemented by the local municipalities and provide clarity of expectations. Timing of zoning implementation is not being indicated.	This policy has been updated based on stakeholder input.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-073lxxxvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19 (general): Clarity is required to understand the process of delineating "planned" stations in the future.	Policy has been updated to provide additional clarity.
STAT-21-073lxxxviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.9: Same as above. Change to "The local municipality shall..."	See response to comment STAT-21-073lxxxvi.
STAT-21-073lxxxix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 6.5.19.9 a): Consider replacing/revising to include "residents to job target ratios to ensure live and work opportunities and an appropriate balance of jobs and population."	The requirement to provide the minimum number of people and jobs will effectively allow for the balance to be determined. Lower-tier municipalities may establish more detailed ratios through their local official plan.
STAT-21-073xc	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.9 b): Consider replacing with "land uses in each station that will support the achievement of complete communities and the min. density targets..."	Policy updated in response to stakeholder feedback.
STAT-21-073xci	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.9 d): Consider moving it to 5.6.19.9 a) and renumber subsequent policies.	Policy subsections reordered in response to stakeholder feedback.
STAT-21-073xcii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.9 (l): Suggest replacing with "...including but not limited to site design..."	Noted. The policy was updated to read "...including but not limited to consideration of site design...".
STAT-21-073xciii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design	Section 5.6.19.10: Change "encourage" to "require".	Policy updated to state "require" and in response to other stakeholder feedback.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073xciv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.11: Change "encouraged" to "required".	A permissive approach is required as the context for each MTSA is different and there may be cases where existing buildings/structures may have non-transit supportive uses and densities.
STAT-21-073xcv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.13 a): Consider adding requirement to identify ratio of people to jobs in each MTSA to this policy.	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-073xcvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.13 c): Change "or" to "and". Need street pattern that encourages active transportation and transit use, not one or the other.	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-073xcvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.13 d): Change "foster" to "contributes to" or "creates" for stronger language.	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-073xcviii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.13 (e): Replace "consider" with "implement".	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-073xcix	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton	Table 5: HLRT-21 under Municipality says "combined". It is a combined MTSA, but this should read "Brampton" as this combined MTSA falls completely within Brampton, not 2 combined municipalities.	Delineation for HRLT-21 is combined with HRLT-20 Ray Lawson. No change recommended.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073c	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19: Consider adding this as a policy: That in cases where a major transit station area and a designated Urban Growth Centre or other SGU/Intensification area overlap, the higher density requirements shall apply.	The minimum densities are applied across each individual Policy Area (i.e., MTSA or UGC). Specific areas within each policy area may have lower or higher densities based on the land use designation and development density as long as the overall policy area meets the applicable target density.
STAT-21-073ci	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19: Consider adding this as a policy: That major transit station area density targets apply to the entirety of the area within the boundary delineation, not individual parcels.	The minimum density target is applicable to the entire policy area. For the case of Protected Major Transit Areas, minimum densities will be required for each building or parcel as per the Planning Act requirements of Section 16(16).
STAT-21-073cii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.9: Consider adding this as a policy/objective or absorb into section 5.6.19.9.c: "Local municipalities develop policies to enhance connectivity and customer experience including design elements to assist with wayfinding and defining gateways/entrances to station stops.	The policy identifies the consideration of elements of site design which is broad enough to capture design elements such as wayfinding and gateways at the discretion of each lower tier municipality.
STAT-21-073ciii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.19.9: Consider adding policies that encourage the implementation of inclusionary zoning, as outlined in described in section 5.8.43 of this plan.	Policy 5.6.19.9.(m) provides direction to local to provide description of future actions including IZ that will be considered to support implementation. For more information on IZ please see Chapter 5.9.20.
STAT-21-073civ	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Schedule Y7: Revised boundary delineations for the 13 Primary stations are attached with this submission. Secondary MTSA's are not planned at this time. All other stations will remain as planned.	Schedule Y7 and Table 5 updated based on comments from stakeholders.
STAT-21-073cv	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Schedule Y7: Increase text size of the Station IDs on this schedule. They are too small to read, yet they are the most important text on this map.	Schedule Y7 updated in response to comment.
STAT-21-073cvi	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning	All Schedules and Figure: Deleting "legend" from the legend title block - intuitive already.	Recommend legend be maintained for consistency across mapping.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-073cvii	November 29, 2021	Shannon Brooks Policy Planner III, City Planning and Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton shannon.brooks@brampton.ca	Schedule Y7: Suggest aligning the boundaries of the Bramalea GO MTSA with the boundaries of the proposed MZO for consistency.	The boundary of the Bramalea GO was determined through comprehensive study including consideration of Brampton’s Bramalea GO Secondary Planning Area. The MZO application is a separate process outside of the Regional MCR and did not request for the limits of the subject lands to be defined as the limits of the Major Transit Station Area.
STAT-21-426i	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.5.2.7: Staff continue to see the need to distinguish between advocacy for frequent rail service between Union Station and Bramalea Station as part of the GO Rail Expansion Program and advocacy for improved rail service on the Kitchener line as a whole.	Suggested language was provided in subsequent communication with City of Brampton, and changes to policy made to reflect these comments.
STAT-21-426ii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.7.2.4: Staff continue to see merit in having the policy regarding the review of the strategic goods movement network explicitly speak to land use (i.e., any such reviews need to consider changes to land uses along or near the corridors included in the network). Staff see this as supportive of Provincial direction regarding the integration of transportation planning and land use planning.	Reference to land use to be incorporated back into the policy.
STAT-21-426iii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.9: Staff suggest retaining the word “facilities”. To account for all possible impacts, staff contend that the policy needs to reference physical facilities/infrastructure in addition to services.	Policy will be updated based on suggestion.
STAT-21-426iv	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.2.18: Why has this policy been deleted? Staff acknowledge that monitoring is addressed elsewhere in the transportation policies – monitoring for the purpose of determining the priority for improvements is cited in Policy 5.10.34.17 – but see merit in retaining the old policy and its broader focus on monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the Regional transportation system. Staff see such monitoring as a required precursor to planning for and implementing improvements to the Regional transportation network.	Policy will be retained.
STAT-21-426v	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton	Section 5.10.32.10 b): Consider referencing services in addition to infrastructure in this policy, as services such as ridesharing and transit can play an important role in TDM strategies.	Policy wording will be revised as follows: Work with the appropriate agencies to promote infrastructure and services that encourage implementation of TDM strategies.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		brian.lakeman@brampton.ca		
STAT-21-426vi	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.10 (e) (i): Staff suggest that a stronger word than “support” be used in this sub-section. Staff note that, from a Brampton perspective, the implementation of actions that result in complete streets is now, as evidenced in ongoing work on the City’s Complete Streets Guidelines, Official Plan and Secondary Plan for Heritage Heights, a “shall” than a “should”.	The policies in the OP need to be worded so as to suit each of the municipalities at different stages in development - therefore we feel support is appropriate in this case.
STAT-21-426vii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.17: Consider removing the “inclusive of electric vehicle charging infrastructure” wording from this policy – the wording feels like an odd fit in a policy focused on transportation demand management. Staff note that wording on such infrastructure is appropriately included elsewhere in the Official Plan (Policies 5.6.20.14.14(d)(iv), 7.6.6 and 7.9.2).	Agreed. Reference to electric vehicle charging will be deleted.
STAT-21-426viii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.21 a): Staff suggest retaining the word “attractive” in this policy – the look and feel of pedestrian and cycling infrastructure can encourage the usage of it.	Agreed. Policy will be updated to reflect suggestion.
STAT-21-426ix	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.5.2.4: Why has this policy been deleted? This policy aligns with and implements Objective 5.10.32.4. Staff recognize that Policy 5.10.32.41 d) speaks to coordination with respect to inter-regional transit connections but note that the part of Policy 5.9.5.2.4 that spoke to inter-municipal connections appears to have been lost.	Agreed, policy and reference to "inter-municipal" will be added to 5.10.32.41 d).
STAT-21-426x	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.36: Clarification is requested as to the difference between sub-sections a) and b) of this policy (‘b’ appears to be a subset of ‘a’). In their dealings with Metrolinx, staff are advocating for the timely provision of frequent (15 minute or better) two-way all-day service on the Kitchener line to Bramalea Station and for improved two-way all-day service to Mount Pleasant Station (recognizing that frequent two-way all-day service beyond Bramalea Station is not yet in Metrolinx’s plans). Was this the intention of sub-section b)? If so, or even if not, staff request modification to this sub-section to reflect this.	Suggested language was provided in subsequent communication with City of Brampton staff, and changes to policy made to reflect these comments.
STAT-21-426xi	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.5.2.17: Why has this policy been deleted? This policy supports Objective 5.10.32.7. Staff recognize that other policies speak to innovative technologies and strategies but note that none of these speak explicitly to transit.	Agreed, policy will be retained.
STAT-21-426xii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton	Section 5.10.33.2 (and other references to the GTA West Transportation Corridor): Clarification is requesting regarding the Region’s stance regarding the corridor, particularly in light of Regional Council’s decisions on this project, and how this is reflected in the policies. (Staff do not object to the policies regarding the corridor and welcome the inclusion of	Regional obligation to plan for and protect the corridor explained in meeting with Brampton staff.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Policy 5.10.33.16 encouraging the Province to explore alternative transportation solutions to a freeway that would support complete communities and sustainable transportation.)	
STAT-21-426xiii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.3.1.2: Why has this objective been deleted? The Parkway Belt West remains an area of interest for the City of Brampton, particularly as regards the proposed 407 Transitway	Agreed, policy 5.6.20.14.17.4 will be modified to read: "To plan for the provision of major <i>infrastructure</i> , including the Provincial <i>rapid transit</i> corridor along Highway 407 and other transit <i>infrastructure as identified in provincial policy documents</i> , while minimizing the financial impact on Peel Region and member local municipalities."
STAT-21-426xiv	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.33.7: Staff question the deletion of the wording "and related Bram West Parkway facility" from this policy. Staff recognize that if a transportation facility is built in the corridor being defined as part of the GTA West Transportation Corridor EA Study then the Bram West Parkway will not be part of the north-south corridor but note that this is not yet a done deal and do not want to preclude an alternate alignment of the north-south corridor.	Agreed, reference to Bram West will be retained.
STAT-21-426xv	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.34: Staff acknowledge and support preamble wording, objectives and policies in Chapter 5.10 that speak to the integration of land use planning and transportation planning and to complete streets and communities (such as Policy 5.10.34.17). Staff see merit, however, in adding a policy that speaks more explicitly to street design in the context of streetscape, public realm and land use intensification (possibly in Section 5.10.34). This policy could speak to the design and construction/reconstruction of streets on the major road network that create/support a more pedestrian, cycling and transit-oriented streetscape and that create/support a less auto-oriented public realm. Such a policy would both build on the existing policies that speak to the integration of land use planning and transportation planning and to complete streets and communities and raise them to a higher level.	Agreed, Policy 5. 10.12 will be modified as follows: "Work with the Province, local municipalities and relevant stakeholders to <i>support</i> the integration of transportation system planning, transportation <i>infrastructure</i> investment and local municipal land use planning and design at all stages of the planning process."
STAT-21-426xvi	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.34.9 and 5.10.34.10: It feels odd, given that Brampton and other municipalities have shifted to undertaking multimodal level of service analyses, to have a policy (5.10.34.9) and glossary definition focused solely on auto level of service. Staff see multimodal level of service analysis as a given rather than as something to be investigated. Can policies 5.10.34.9 and 5.10.34.10 be merged? Also, consider revising how level of service is defined in the glossary to account for all modes of transportation. Further to this, staff question, if left unmerged, the use of the word "investigate" and the addition of the words "as appropriate" to Policy 5.10.34.10. For the former, staff see the development of a multimodal level of service methodology as a "need" rather than as a "maybe" (i.e., any future level of service analysis needs to consider all modes). For the latter, in what context could the investigation of a multimodal level of service methodology in consultation with local municipalities and external agencies not be appropriate?	MMLOS would need to go to Council. The status of it and traditional auto-oriented LOS are different therefore appropriately separated in policy framework. We are waiting for the outcome of the work on MMLOS. Policy 5.10.34.10 to be revised as follows: "Investigate a multi-modal <i>Level of Service</i> methodology in consultation with the local municipalities and external agencies." Level of Service is a defined term and OP is intended to be read in its entirety.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			In addition, consider providing a brief explanation of “level of service” in the body of the policy (in addition to the more fulsome definition included in the glossary). This would be helpful for readers not familiar with the concept.	
STAT-21-426xvii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.34.21 and 5.10.34.22: Staff question the inclusion of the qualifier “where feasible” in these policies. From a Brampton, all new or improved Regional roads should support the viability of existing or planned rapid transit services and the development of a connected and accessible network of sustainable transportation facilities.	where feasible means needs to be justified by TPAP process and/or functional design Policy will be updated with text "where justified and feasible".
STAT-21-426xviii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.9.7.2.11: Why has this policy been deleted? Staff contend that Regional support for provincial and federal studies on the movement of goods in Southern Ontario has value for the Region and its local municipalities.	Agreed, policy will be retained.
STAT-21-426xix	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.38.10: Staff note the revisions to this policy remove the reference to/emphasis on accessible transportation. Can the policy speak to providing and maintaining a built environment that supports trips made using both accessible transportation services and conventional public transit? This is important for both but is arguably more important for transit riders with accessibility challenges.	Definition of public transit includes accessible transit. Policy wording will be revised as follows: "Work with local municipalities, transit providers and the private sector to provide and maintain a built environment that <i>supports</i> trips made using <i>public transit</i> and rapid transit".
STAT-21-426xx	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Schedule Y2: How are major roads defined for the purpose of this schedule? This could impact whether or not to depict the extension of Sandalwood Parkway through the Heritage Heights area as a future major road (current plans call for Sandalwood Parkway to be extended as a two-lane road from Mississauga Road to Winston Churchill Boulevard).	Include the extension of Sandalwood Parkway through the Heritage Heights area as a dashed line.
STAT-21-426xxi	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Schedule Y4: As noted in the comments submitted in April 2020, Brampton Transit’s plans for expansion of their Züm network include routes and/or route extensions not included in Metrolinx’s Frequent Rapid Transit Network. As this Schedule is intended to show the long-range concept for rapid transit corridors in and adjacent to Peel, these should be included. Additions that are required are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segments of the future Bramalea Züm corridor north of Bovaird Drive (to Countryside Drive) and south of Steeles Avenue to Pearson International Airport (via Bramalea Road, Derry Road, and Airport Road). • The future Kennedy Road Züm corridor, extending from south of Derry Road to Sandalwood Parkway. • The future Chinguacousy-Mavis Züm corridor, extending from Derry Road to Wanless Drive. • The future Sandalwood Züm corridor, extending from the Mount Pleasant GO Station to Airport Road. 	Schedule will be revised accordingly.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-426xxii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.18 and 5.10.21: Staff request clarification on the meaning of the term “appropriate” as used in these policies. Can this term be replaced with a more definitive list of municipalities?	Policy was updated to reflect a broader group of municipalities which would also include local municipalities as well as other municipalities in the GTHA and other stakeholders (i.e., Vision Zero municipalities, TAC, Urban Land Institute, OTC, Green Communities School Based TDM). Policy will be revised to change "appropriate" to "relevant".
STAT-21-426xxiii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.30: Consider defining “first and last mile”, as the meaning of this term may not be apparent to people not immersed in transportation planning matters	Definition consistent with the Metrolinx RTP will be added: First-and last-mile: Describes the challenge of getting people to and from transit stations, mobility hubs, and fixed-route transit services to and from their home or workplace without the use of a private automobile. Policy will be updated as follows: "Identify and support improvements for first and last mile connections across the transportation network, including implementation of <i>infrastructure</i> , and encouraging the use of innovative technologies, in collaboration with the local municipalities, other levels of government and non-government agencies.
STAT-21-426xxiv	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.22: Consider replacing the words “pedestrian and cycling” with “active transportation”. (Staff note that the latter term is used throughout Chapter 5.10.)	Agreed, policy will be updated as follows: "Work with the Province, the local municipalities, adjacent municipalities and stakeholders to implement and regularly update the Sustainable Transportation Strategy for Peel that builds on local municipal active transportation plans."
STAT-21-426xxv	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.33.6 a): This sub-section references the Niagara to GTA Corridor. Staff suggest checking with the Ministry of Transportation regarding this project (as staff recall hearing during a recent meeting on the Greater Golden Horseshoe Transportation Plan that this corridor is no longer being planned for).	Corridor is identified in the growth plan schedule 2. Policy will be reworded to remove the word "encourage".
STAT-21-426xxvi	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.34.6: Clarification is requested as to how this policy differs from Policy 5.10.34.5 (Policy 5.10.34.6 looks to be subset of Policy 5.10.34.5). Can these two policies be merged?	Policies kept separate to maintain simplicity. Policy wording for 5.10.34.5 will be revised as follows: <i>Support</i> the provision, in conjunction with the Province and the local municipalities, of the <i>Major Road</i> Network shown on Schedule Y2, regardless of road jurisdiction. A jurisdictional transfer between local municipal and Regional roads will not require an amendment to Schedule Y2 and Schedule Y3 of this Plan.
STAT-21-426xxvii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner, Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.38.5 and 5.10.38.6: Consider merging these two policies, as both speak to encouraging transit accessibility.	Agreed, policy 5.10.38.5 will be removed and policy 5.10.38.6 will be revised as follows: Encourage local municipalities and Metrolinx to make all public transit, rapid transit, and transit facilities accessible to accommodate the travel needs of persons with <i>disabilities</i> in Peel Region.
STAT-21-426xxviii	August 5, 2021	Brian Lakeman, Transportation Policy Planner,	General: Staff request clarification as to how the term “transportation hub” is defined for the purpose of the Official Plan. Staff note that a	Agreed, definition will be added:

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Planning, Building and Economic Development Department, City of Brampton brian.lakeman@brampton.ca	number of policies speak to transportation hubs and that in many of these instances the term is italicized. Staff note, however, that this term is not included in the glossary.	Transportation hub: A station designed to support a high number of transit boardings and alightings, and facilitate transfers between modes. Reference to transportation hubs in preamble for section 5.6.18 UGC and Regional Intensification Corridor will be removed: Metrolinx has also identified a series of <i>transportation hubs</i> in Peel and throughout the <i>GTHA</i> in the 2041 Regional Transportation Plan. Reference to mobility hubs in 5.10.32.42 will be replaced with transportation hubs: <i>Support</i> interconnections between the local bus network and existing planned <i>rapid transit</i> corridors, especially at Urban Growth Centres and other transportation hubs.
STAT-21-423i	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.17 – Preamble: The <i>Strategic Growth Areas</i> identified in the Regional Official Plan establish a hierarchy for which the highest densities and scale of development will be directed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Urban Growth Centres</i> 2. <i>Major Transit Station Areas</i> 3. Nodes/Centres 4. Intensification Corridors The Regional Official Plan identifies a hierarchy for density and scale of development being directed to Strategic Growth Areas (Urban Growth Centres, MTSAs, Nodes/Centres, and Intensification Corridors). This hierarchy needs to be considered when reviewing all policies in 5.10, particularly the Road Network and Goods Movement sections, as many Regional roads intersect with these strategic growth areas.	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423ii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.6.17.1: ‘To achieve an urban, integrated and connected system of <i>Strategic Growth Areas</i> that supports complete communities and multi-modal transportation options.’ To achieve this objective, City staff require a re-prioritization and reframing of the Major Road Network and Goods Movement policies that play an important role in achieving an urban, integrated and connected system that supports complete communities and multi-modal transportation options.	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423iii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.3: ‘To achieve a 50 per cent <i>sustainable</i> mode share in the Region of Peel by 2041.’ In light of prioritization of goods movement in subsequent policy sections, City staff are concerned that a higher sustainable mode shift is not an attainable target. However, ensuring this target is met is incredibly important to support the transportation vision for the City of Brampton. This policy should speak to the role of intensification in creating shorter trips as a result of concentrated mixed land uses. This policy should be	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			prioritized throughout section 5.10 of the ROPA.	
STAT-21-423iv	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.6: 'To support and encourage transit-supportive development densities and patterns, particularly along rapid transit corridors and at designated nodes such as transit terminals, Urban Growth Centres, GO stations <u>Major Transit Station Areas</u> , and <u>mobility transportation hubs</u> , consistent with direction in the latest provincial plans.' Priority growth areas identified by municipal governments should also be included and not limited to provincial areas of interest.	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423v	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.8: 'To encourage and support the development of a safe, attractive, accessible and integrated network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities <u>active transportation facilities on Regional roads</u> that enhances the quality of life, and promotes the improved health, of Peel residents <u>of all ages and abilities</u> .' Staff agree with this policy and how it identifies the importance of an integrated network of active transportation facilities on Regional roads, thereby identifying the importance of road design. On the other hand, the Goods Movement policy framework is not compatible with the objectives of this policy. By prioritizing level of service in relation to goods movement and single occupant vehicles, it does not address future needs of residents located in these communities, nor does it plan for the changing transportation needs of the future.	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423vi	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.10: Encourage area <u>local</u> municipalities to: a) Promote land uses and site design which foster the <u>safe and efficient</u> use of <u>sustainable</u> modes of transportation. City staff agree with how this policy is written and a similar one should be created to identify the importance of land use and site design on Regional roads.	Policy has been updated to include reference to local and regional roads.
STAT-21-423vii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.32.10: ' <u>d) Prioritize transit and active transportation to support future travel demand; and</u> <u>d)e) For new development in Designated Greenfield Areas and redevelopment areas, create street complete streets</u> configurations, densities and an urban form that: <i>I. support walking, cycling and the early integration and sustained viability of transit services; and</i> <i>II. create high quality public open spaces with site design and urban design standards that support opportunities for transit, walking and cycling.'</i> City staff agree with intent of these policies and they should be expanded to Regional roads. This concept of complete streets should be expanded	Need clarification on what this means as new development and redevelopment are the two opportunities to achieve the intent of this policy.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			beyond new development and redevelopment areas to make this a Region-wide standard.	
STAT-21-423viii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.32.12: ‘Work with all levels of the public and private sectors <u>and non-government organizations</u> to develop programs that place primary consideration on the reduction or elimination of trips and the increased use of <i>sustainable</i> modes of transportation and to develop programs for implementing these and other travel demand management strategies.’</p> <p>Agree with the principles and objectives of this policy. On the other hand, the framing of goods movement and road network policies identified below pose a challenge to meeting this objective, as this continues to influence how land use is built as a response to car demands.</p>	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423ix	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34 - Background & Introduction: ‘The <i>Major Road</i> Network in Peel provides for inter- and intra-municipal travel within Peel and for connections to other regions/municipalities and the Provincial <i>Freeway</i> Network. The network is comprised of <i>major roads</i> under the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario (Highways 9 and 10 in Caledon), <u>the Region</u> and the <u>area local</u> municipalities. <u>The Regional</u> roads are designed to provide a high level of inter-municipal <i>transportation capacity</i>. <u>The Region</u> works with the <u>area local</u> municipalities to plan for transportation on a region-wide basis. The provision of a safe, efficient, and reliable <i>major road</i> network plays an important role in the movement of people (by automobile, transit, <u>and bicycle and walking, as well as</u>) and goods. Opportunities for additions and expansions to the <i>major road</i> network in Peel are limited. <u>With sustainable transportation infrastructure investments, additions and expansions can be made to the network to improve efficiency of the system and increase alternative mobility options.</u>’</p> <p>Staff acknowledge and support preamble wording, objectives, and policies in Chapter 5.10.34 that speak to the integration of land use planning and transportation planning to support the creation of complete streets and communities (such as Policy 5.10.34.17). Staff think that a policy should be added that speaks more explicitly to street design in the context of streetscape, public realm, and land use intensification (propose in Section 5.10.34).</p>	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423x	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34.1: ‘To work with the <u>area local</u> municipalities and the Province to provide, <u>optimize</u>, maintain and operate a <i>Major Road</i> Network to facilitate the safe, efficient and reliable movement of people and goods.’</p> <p>Use of wording “efficient and reliable” in the policy infers a focus on peak hour demand, maintaining speed and reducing delay. However, City staff are worried that throughout the rest of the day, these fast-moving, wide-</p>	Policy has been updated to add reference to “multimodal” consistent with the PPS as efficient and reliable should also apply to sustainable modes.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			lane roads do not foster 15-minute communities for vulnerable user access, safety, and comfort due to the nature of road design/operations.	
STAT-21-423xi	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34.2: <u>'To control access to Regional Roads through the planning and development process so as to: ... d) Reduce the number and location of intersections along Regional Roads in greenfield and brownfield developments through consolidation of neighbouring accesses.'</u></p> <p>This policy does not consider intensification areas near Regional roads, thereby undermining local municipal context and city building initiatives. This policy does not consider the intent of the Road Characterization Study, which states that Regional roads must evolve based on land use character. As a result, this maintains traditional suburban land use/road dichotomies in urbanizing areas.</p>	Policy has been updated policy to reference the RCS and updates to the RCS.
STAT-21-423xii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34.4: <u>'To avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate impacts of transportation on the community, natural environment and the Agricultural System consistent with the objectives and policies of this Plan'</u></p> <p>Road design needs to consider the impact that roads have in facilitating complete communities, not acting as a community constraint. This policy prioritizes transportation infrastructure over the needs of the community and instead, should be reprioritized so that the infrastructure responds to the needs/sensitivities of the community. Staff recommend the reconsideration of the wording around avoidance or mitigation and shift to community prioritization-based language.</p>	This policy prioritizes avoiding impacts to the community, natural environment and agricultural system followed by minimization and mitigation in transportation planning. Language follows Provincial policy (PPS Policy 1.2.6.1).
STAT-21-423xiii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34.7: <u>'Work with the Province, 407 ETR and the area local municipalities to identify, prioritize and resolve; a) Gaps, bottlenecks and jogs in the Regional and local road networks...'</u></p> <p>Staff believe the reduction of bottlenecks is not a blanket approach that should be used, nor is it a good outcome from a land use planning perspective. In these urbanizing and mixed-use areas, permeability, higher pedestrian usage, active transportation options and public transit routes require roads to move slower in order to foster complete communities. Staff propose the removal of bottlenecks as a positive policy outcome, or at least recognition that we cannot reduce bottlenecks everywhere and so "as appropriate". In strategic growth areas, reducing bottlenecks means the prioritization of auto-oriented movement rather than access and safety for more complete streets for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders.</p>	Policy has been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423xiv	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic	<p>Section 5.10.34.7: <u>'Work with the Province, 407 ETR and the area local municipalities to identify, prioritize and resolve; c. Impediments to transit and active transportation on the Regional and local road networks...'</u></p>	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	This is a good policy, but the intent of this policy may be challenging from an implementation perspective. Staff request clarification on how to implement this policy in light of other policies in the section.	
STAT-21-423xv	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.34.9: 'Ensure that, where possible, adequate <i>transportation capacity</i> on Regional roads is based on a " <i>Level of Service</i> " Policy adopted and periodically reviewed by Regional Council .' Level of service needs to be more clearly defined, as the current framing of this policy relates back to reducing traffic congestion, supporting single occupant vehicle users, and not considering other policy directives in the Regional Official Plan. This framing does not account for the experience of other users and as a result, impacts the ability of City staff to implement the mobility hierarchy of Vision 2040 (walking, cycling, transit, goods movement, shared vehicles, and private vehicles). The current overarching, Region-wide policy is not responsive to the context of the evolving conditions that the roadway passes through, including other planning initiatives and policy objectives for these strategic growth areas.	LOS is a defined term in the glossary. LRTP modelling considers road character, 50% sustainable mode share in addition to LOS.
STAT-21-423xvi	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.34.11: ' <u>Protect the designated Regional rights-of-way requirements, as shown on Schedule Y3, to accommodate future road widenings and improvements consistent with Section 7.10 of this Plan.</u> ' This policy must consider street design and complete street principles in deciding on future road widenings. This would ensure that other road users are involved and considered in the decision to change the layout of the street, while prioritizing impacts on land use and urban design. The road design process needs to remain flexible and adaptable to new land use assumptions and evolving conditions.	Policy has been updated to remove reference to road widenings.
STAT-21-423xvii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	Section 5.10.34.14: 'Control frontage <i>development</i> and vehicular access onto Regional roads consistent with relevant Regional By-laws, <u>including the Controlled Access By-law, and the Regional Roads Characterization Study, as amended from time to time.</u> ' Reference to the Regional Road Characterization Study is not appropriate considering evolving land uses planning for Brampton, particularly as the Study has not been updated to incorporate the Vision 2040 direction and emerging Brampton Plan city structure based on Council and the public direction. City staff are grappling with instances where land use planning has evolved and no update in Regional road characterization now constrains strategic planning.	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423xviii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton	Section 5.10.34.15: 'Control access to Regional roads so as to optimize traffic road safety and carrying capacity and control the number and location of intersections with Regional roads in consultation with the affected area local municipality. <u>Where feasible, and consistent with context, access to developments should be obtained via municipal roadways and not Regional roads.</u> '	Where feasible and consistent with context is intended to consider local context and ensure safety.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	The addition of the “where feasible and consistent with context” portion does not consider strategic growth areas where access is mainly on Regional roads. The policy should be more accommodating/flexible to support sensitive/contextual road design in strategic growth areas.	
STAT-21-423xix	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34.16: ‘Protect residential <i>development</i> adjacent to Regional roads from vehicular noise through appropriate noise mitigation, planning and design, and by ensuring the provision of noise attenuation measures at the time of <i>development</i> for outdoor living areas that have reverse frontage (rear or side lot abutting a Regional road).’</p> <p>The language around the protection of adjacent residential development is framed in a manner that does not highlight the importance of integrating the road into the design of the community. Roadway design and urban design must be done in tandem, whereas protection infers that those that live in these communities are secondary to the road work.</p> <p>Staff also request the identification of working with local municipal planning staff to integrate transportation and land use planning.</p>	<p>Policy has been reworded for clarity.</p> <p>Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.</p>
STAT-21-423xx	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34.17: ‘Determine the priority for improvements to the Regional road system periodically in the context of monitoring and inspection reports, system status reports, studies on growth and other indicators related to the Regional Structure, in consultation with the area local municipalities.’</p> <p>Staff are requesting the term “improvements” be defined. In reviewing this policy in the context of the rest of this section, it seems it is focused on increasing capacity for fast mobility rather than place making, which is particularly challenging when applied to the intensification happening in Brampton’s strategic growth areas. Studies on growth and other indicators are vague and staff think that it would be useful to add land use and urban design considerations and reporting as criteria/indicators to determine “improvements”.</p>	<p>“Improvements” is a broad term that can include road and sustainable transportation improvements. The nature of the improvement is typically determined through transportation studies and therefore the term is left undefined for flexibility.</p>
STAT-21-423xxi	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton	<p>Section 5.10.34.21: ‘Ensure that new or improved Regional roads <i>support</i> the viability of existing or planned <i>rapid transit services</i> where feasible and encourage the area local municipalities to do the same for roads under their jurisdiction.’</p> <p>How does the Region determine “where feasible”? Transit is a priority for</p>	<p>Where feasible refers to where feasible based on the results of the TPAP.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	the City of Brampton to meet sustainability, community, public health, and equity goals. In cases where rapid transit may conflict with Regional road planning for conventional vehicular levels of service, transit should be prioritized rather than applied only “where feasible”.	
STAT-21-423xxii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.34.22: <u>‘Support the development of a connected and accessible network of sustainable transportation facilities on new or improved Regional roads, where feasible.’</u></p> <p>Sustainable transportation should be supported everywhere to align with 5.10.32 Sustainable Transportation policy section to achieve net zero carbon emission aspirations. Staff are wondering where this would not be feasible. If Vision Zero is an objective, this needs to be prioritized and roads need to integrate sustainable modes and find a way to make it feasible if not originally feasible. Safe and accessible road space should be provided for bikes and other active modes of transportation on all roads in order to achieve Vision Zero objectives.</p>	Agreed.
STAT-21-423xxiii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.36 – Goods Movement: <u>‘To support goods movement in the Region of Peel, there is a need for a coordinated network linking major road network, the provincial freeway, areas of significant employment activity and major goods movement corridors. With an increase traffic congestion, there is a resulting delay in the movement of goods in the GTHA which is contributing to diminishing productivity, wasted energy, environmental degradation, and lowering of standard of living. Economically, delay in the movement of goods is costing billions of dollars in lost GDP every year. An integrated transportation network, inclusive of road, rail, air, marine, and pipeline, is needed to ensure that goods are transported in an efficient and timely manner. In the Region of Peel, the safe and efficient movement of goods is plays an important role in to regional the Regional economy, is an important factor in attracting and retaining a range of industries and businesses, and directly impacts the competitiveness of the businesses and the availability of high-quality jobs in Peel. The provision of integrated transportation networks (including road, rail, air, marine and pipeline networks) is needed to ensure that goods are transported in an efficient and timely manner. The goods movement system developed in Peel needs to be will be advanced in balance with the system requirements of the entire GTHA.’</u></p> <p>This preamble section and policies are problematic considering the 2051 planning horizon. With Brampton objectives of creating complete communities and complete streets, goods movement needs to consider the local context and needs of those residents who live, work, and play in the communities along these roads. City staff are not suggesting the restriction of trucks and transporters to use or move on major arterials, however, staff suggest that some delay to these vehicles on Regional roads would contribute to the overall health of strategic growth areas</p>	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and is necessary to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, as well as the public transit users.</p> <p>Highways are to be prioritized for the fast movement of goods rather than through communities. It is imperative Brampton sets itself up as a future-ready city with economically diverse options beyond traditional transport and trucking industries. Specifically, communities should not be designed for priority goods movement particularly through these strategic growth areas, as identified above.</p>	
STAT-21-423xxiv	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.36.1: 'To facilitate the development <u>and maintenance</u> of a safe and efficient goods movement network within <u>Peel</u> and between <u>Peel</u> and adjacent municipalities that <u>supports the Regional</u> economy <u>while minimizing adverse impacts.</u>'</p> <p>Staff are requesting clarity on how "safe and efficient" is defined and qualified (as this could mean "fast and without delay"), as this may not be congruent with other goals of the Regional Official Plan and may not balance other city building priorities. Minimizing adverse impacts still infers the prioritization of goods movement, which needs to be resolved with these other planning goals and objectives.</p>	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423xxv	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.36.4: '<u>Work with the Province, the local municipalities, adjacent municipalities relevant agencies and stakeholders to implement and regularly update the Goods Movement Strategic Plan for Peel.</u>'</p> <p>What exactly in the Goods Movement Strategic Plan is being referenced? Staff request specific policy extracts from the Goods Movement Strategic Plan be integrated/articulated into Official Plan policy rather than a general policy referring to the Strategic Plan in its entirety.</p>	This policy speaks to the need to implement the action items in the Goods Movement Strategic Plan and regularly update the document as a whole. For specific action items the reader should consult the Goods Movement Strategic Plan document.
STAT-21-423xxvi	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.36.5: 'Establish strong partnerships with <u>public and private</u> stakeholders to develop a vision for goods movement in <u>Peel</u>, determine priorities, and implement action plans for advancing a <u>sustainable</u> goods movement system in <u>Peel.</u>'</p> <p>The City's comments related to 5.10.36.4 would accomplish this. The current Strategic Plan sets out a vision, priorities, etc.</p>	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-423xxvii	December 17, 2021	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>Section 5.10.36.7a: '<u>Define a Periodically review the strategic goods movement network strategic goods movement network shown in Figure Y6 in Peel and related studies</u>, in consultation with the Province <u>and appropriate municipalities in the GTHA, local municipalities and other stakeholders, the other regions in the GTHA, area municipalities, adjacent municipalities and other public and private stakeholders.</u> In so doing, undertake the following:</p> <p>a) <u>Review</u> and update <u>of</u> the existing <u>and future</u> transportation network to ensure the safe and efficient movement of goods throughout <u>Peel</u>. As a part of this effort, <u>continue working work</u> with the Province</p>	Comment discussed with City of Brampton staff and policies have been updated to reflect comment.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>and the area local municipalities to identify <u>and update</u> priority goods movement routes in Peel;’</p> <p>The priority goods movement routes in Peel do not have the intensification areas and urban design context considered. Many of these routes coincide with strategic intensification and rapid transit corridors. As per previous comments, there is a need to allow for the movement of goods without prioritizing it over the experience of the streets for residents. Staff are requesting the Region look at how goods movement has been planned for in other urbanizing contexts to find a better balance of policy objectives that lead to the outcome of complete communities.</p>	
STAT-22-020i	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>City staff provided comments describing the comments originally submitted to the Region on December 17, 2021 which have not been resolved.</p> <p>STAT-21-423i - Section 5.6.17 Preamble: This comment has been resolved, however the intent of this comment still needs to be effectively resolved through subsequent sections.</p>	Resolved.
STAT-22-020ii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423iii - Section 5.10.32.3: This policy has not been resolved. Policy and subsequent sections do not speak to how this mode split target will be achieved. The policy should provide clarity on the pathways to implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subsequent policy sections should be more intentional, and clear as to how the competing objectives of the Transportation section result in achieving this mode split. • Staff recommend deriving policies from the Long Range Transportation Plan, and the Road Characterization Study to provide more clear policy guidance. <p>Regional Staff should consider policies that focus on travel behavior and increased connectivity such as increased intersection density, enhanced road design/character, streetscaping considerations (urban design), an active transit network identifying type of facility with associated mapping, first/last mile transit policy, guidance on creating shorter trips (land use integration).</p>	<p>High level policies that speak to the mentioned actions are included in the Region's OP update. All specific implementation action items can be found in the following documents and policies, which will be updated regularly as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Characterization Study • Sustainable Transportation Strategy • Long Range Transportation Plan
STAT-22-020iii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423iv - Section 5.10.32.6: Resolved, however a definition on local strategic growth areas with the glossary should also be added if it hasn't already, recognizing local urban growth structures.</p>	Definition on "Strategic Growth Areas" has been added to glossary.
STAT-22-020iv	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning &	<p>STAT-21-423v - Section 5.10.32.8: It is still not clear how all of these objectives can be achieved. The policy is not clear about how various</p>	New policies have been added to encourage context sensitive solutions. New figures have been added depict the Region's existing and proposed pedestrian and cycling networks.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>interests are being reconciled and requires explicit policies explaining how to do this. More clarity is required also in the Goods Movement section. Recommendation: Criteria based policy is required to help the reader navigate competing policy/AT mapping identifying the long-term implementation and type of AT infrastructure on Regional Roads.</p> <p>Movement priority needs to be established more clearly. The transportation section currently reads that Goods movement and cars are the priority, which leads to certain policies countering one another.</p> <p>An implementation policy should be established to help the reader understand in what instances competing policies need be exercised (e.g., strategic growth area policies are prioritized first over goods movement in strategic growth areas).</p>	<p>OP policies call for a balanced approach, and context sensitive solutions.</p> <p>The ROP is a high level strategic document that provides overall guidance for how the Region conduct's its work. The key policy directions of the transportation policy framework will be implemented through plans and strategies such as the STS, VZ RSSP, LRTP, GMSP and RCS.</p> <p>Regional staff recognize that in some instances there will be competing priorities, however, there is no one-size fits all solution for these cases, particularly considering that each of Peel's local municipalities at varying stages of the urbanization. As such, the transportation policy framework provides flexibility for decision makers to consider local context, public and stakeholder consultation, and develop context sensitive transportation solutions.</p>
STAT-22-020v	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423vi - Section 5.10.32.10: The policy proposed is still just encouraging local municipalities.</p> <p>The City is requesting 'like' policy that requires the Region to respect land uses and design roadways according to planned context.</p>	<p>There are a number of new policies in this update that have been added to strengthen direction to ensure the Region respects land uses and designs roadways appropriately to planned contexts. Two additional policies have been added in response to the City of Brampton's concerns, as detailed below:</p> <p>5.4.5 <i>To coordinate infrastructure planning and land use planning to achieve the objectives of this Plan.</i></p> <p>5.10.34.22 Support the development of a connected and accessible network of sustainable transportation facilities on new or improved Regional roads, where feasible.</p> <p>New policy: Promote intensification and mixed land uses in strategic growth areas to support sustainable transportation modes, complete communities, and complete streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.4.15 <i>Employ a comprehensive, integrated approach to land use planning, infrastructure planning and infrastructure investment to achieve the objectives of this Plan.</i> 5.6.3 To achieve intensified and compact form and a mix of land uses in appropriate areas that efficiently use land, services, infrastructure and public finances while taking into account the characteristics of existing communities and services. 5.10.7 To support the integration of transportation planning, transportation investment and land use planning, in collaboration with local and municipalities, the Province, the Federal government and the private sector. 5.10.12 <i>Work with the Province, local municipalities and relevant stakeholders to support the integration of transportation system planning, transportation infrastructure investment and local municipal land use planning and design at all stages of the planning process.</i> <p>New policy: Coordinate transportation and land use planning in order to develop context sensitive solutions to accommodate travel demand for all modes in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders.</p>
STAT-22-020vi	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423vii - Section 5.10.32.10: The policy proposed is an encouragement policy for local municipalities. The City of Brampton is requesting policy that requires the Region to respect land uses and design roadways accordingly (i.e., there should be a policy that encourages the Region to <i>Prioritize transit and active transportation to support future travel demand</i>). Tie into directives of the RCS, to provide more clarity on how these policies can be achieved both at a local and Regional level, and</p>	<p>In order to account for evolving land use character, the ROP defers to the RCS to provide guidance on intersection spacing which is updated on a more frequent basis than the Regional Official Plan in consultation with stakeholders including local municipalities. The Region is in the process of commencing the update to the 2012 Road Characterization Study and will ensure City of Brampton staff are engaged throughout the study process.</p> <p>In addition, a new policy has been added related to the City of Brampton's comments:</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			how Regional Road Design will help achieve these objectives. The Policy should respond to evolving land use character that need different spacing to support urban form or industrial functions necessary to meet provincial Growth Plan policies, which significantly allows for reduced intersection spacing (improved access) in urbanizing areas.	5.10.16 b) <u>Prioritize sustainable modes of transportation and goods movement needs over those ahead of single-occupant vehicles;</u>
STAT-22-020vii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423ix - Section 5.10.34 Background & Introduction: Comment not resolved. Staff acknowledge and support preamble wording, objectives, and policies in Chapter 5.10.34 that speak to the integration of land use planning and transportation planning to support the creation of complete streets and communities (such as Policy 5.10.34.17). Staff think that a policy should be added that speaks more explicitly to street design in the context of streetscape, public realm, and land use intensification (propose in Section 5.10.34).	A new policy has been added which captures the intent of this comment while allowing flexibility to account for the various different types of roadways and local contexts in Peel: <u>5.10.12</u> <u>Work with the Province, local municipalities and relevant stakeholders to support the integration of transportation system planning, transportation infrastructure investment and local municipal land use planning and design at all stages of the planning approval process.</u>
STAT-22-020viii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423x - Section 5.10.34.1: Comment not resolved – the City of Brampton proposed a Design based approach as opposed to LOS. V/C has been an ineffective measure for planning in urban contexts. Staff are still concerned with the definition of safe/ efficient/reliable may be interpreted as promoting fast streets. Based on the nature of discipline of staff interpreting the policy could be mean different things – the policy should be clear with intention and eliminate potential misinterpretations. The Region should consider a Criteria based policy - adding clauses for urbanizing areas. Need to prioritize equitable road design for all users vs. road carrying capacity.	The Region of Peel employs a systematic and evidence-based approach to transportation planning informed by a technical analysis that considers LOS and V/C as one of the many inputs during the long range transportation planning and EA phases of transportation projects. Other inputs include sustainable mode share assumptions, road character, land use, natural and cultural heritage constraints, etc. A systematic and comprehensive approach to transportation planning is necessary to ensure the Region's development charges by-law is justified. Further, the Region is also going to take into consideration and explore MMLOS (Multi-modal level of service) as a central consideration for future transportation projects. Criteria based considerations are captured through the RCS. Staff have added the word sustainable to the below policy to help clarify interpretation. <u>5.10.3 To optimize the use of existing Regional transportation infrastructure and services by prioritizing the safe, sustainable and efficient movement of people and goods by all modes, rather than the movement of single occupancy vehicles.</u>
STAT-22-020ix	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xi - Section 5.10.34.2: Comment not addressed. Language is clear within the RCS that the RCS must evolve to changing local conditions and respond to urbanization; and that within Urban Areas, smaller block sizes and increased intersection density should be achieved to ensure desired built form and community outcomes. City of Brampton staff recommend that blanket deferrals to strategic documents not occur within policy, rather policy and mapping be derived from these documents and included within the Official Plan, to provide a clear understanding to all readers and protect appeal rights of all stakeholders. If a designation is to be applied to a Regional Road, that the City or a proponent of development disagrees with, the dispute should be resolved at the Tribunal, and not end with a decision made by Regional Council. Staff recommend the following be included in the Regional Official Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Characterization (table and mapping) • References to the intent of Access control, to enable/support the 	In order to account for the evolution of local municipalities, the Region's transportation policies point to specific planning documents which are updated on a more regular basis in consultation with stakeholders to account for changing local municipal contexts and minimize site specific amendments to maintain the integrity of the OP as a strategic guiding document.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Access By-law</p> <p>RCS Excerpts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 3.3.2: "Road characterization depends on the vision of evolving corridors as communities change and respond to economic and cultural shifts. This makes the characterization of roads depended upon identified future corridor land uses and functions" <p>"The map described in more detail in section 2, will be amended periodically in response to approved secondary plans, block plans and council endorsed development applications"</p>	
STAT-22-020x	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xiii - Section 5.10.34.7: Not resolved – no change to the policy.	<p>5.10.34.7. a) has been updated to say "as appropriate".</p> <p>5.10.34.7 Work with the Province, 407 ETR and the area local municipalities to identify, prioritize and resolve;</p> <p>a) Gaps, bottlenecks and jogs in the Regional and local road networks, as appropriate; and</p> <p>b) Opportunities for new or improved highway interchanges; and</p> <p><u>c) Impediments to transit and active transportation on the Regional and local road networks. -</u></p>
STAT-22-020xi	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xiv - Section 5.10.34.7: Not resolved – not clear how this is implemented (a and c are contradictory).	This policy furthers the Region's goals to achieve a more balanced and multimodal approach. a) and c) are not contradictory as road improvement projects can include improvements to both vehicular, AT, and transit mobility and this policy further encourages the Region to do so.
STAT-22-020xii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xv - Section 5.10.34.9: Not resolved - LOS is not appropriate for growth areas. This conventional decision making does not support the municipality's urban approach. There needs to be a mutual understanding that roads may be over capacity in urban areas and there is a need to focus on other modes.	The Region's LRTP process takes into account a number of other factors including road character, local context, and mode share goals. Further, the Region is also currently evaluating a MMLOS approach. As mentioned in the previous response, it is necessary for the Region to undertake a systematic and comprehensive approach to transportation planning to ensure the Region's development charges by-law is justified.
STAT-22-020xiii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423xvi - Section 5.10.34.11: Criteria needs to be established about where and when improvements take places - RCS should be considered.</p> <p>For example, strategic land use integration could be a trigger/criteria to explore improvements (as opposed to LOS), where we know that major intensification is happening in Uptown Brampton, this may be a trigger to look a different design/operation options for Steeles from 410/Bramalea</p>	<p>This is done through the integrated growth management and long range transportation planning processes.</p> <p>The Region can explore this through the upcoming TMP and RCS update.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			GO to McLaughlin to improve the streetscape, walkability, transit access, crossings, speed etc. Instead as part of a resurfacing project an inconsistent multi-use path was implemented in sections of the corridor.	
STAT-22-020xiv	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423xvii - Section 5.10.34.14: Comment not resolved – no change was made.</p> <p>RCS Schedule should be in the ROP, to allow for appropriate amendments from time to time.</p> <p>It is improper form for the policy to be “consistent with” the implementation tool - the By-law should be derived from the policies with the ROP, not the other way around.</p>	<p>The Region is currently in the process of updating the RCS and local municipal staff will be key stakeholders in the update process. Further, the ROP includes policies such as those below which also require consultation with local municipal staff:</p> <p><u>5.10.34.15 Control access to Regional roads so as to optimize traffic safety and carrying capacity, and control the number and location of intersections with Regional roads in consultation with the affected area municipality. Control access to Regional roads so as to optimize road safety and carrying capacity, and control number and location of intersections with Regional roads in consultation with the affected local municipality. Where feasible, and consistent with context, access to developments should be obtained via municipal roadways and not Regional roads.</u></p> <p><u>5.10.34.17</u> Determine the priority for improvements to the Regional road system periodically in the context of monitoring and inspection reports, system status reports, studies on growth and other indicators related to the Regional Structure, in consultation with the area local municipalities.</p> <p>Lastly, as mentioned in previous comment responses, the ROP refers to implementation plans and documents as it was written to be a strategic document to minimize frequent amendments by ensuring there is flexibility to account for evolving land uses through updates to the RCS.</p>
STAT-22-020xv	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xviii - Section 5.10.34.15: Not resolved - the policy is still at odds with the recommendations of the RCS. More information is required from an implementation perspective.	This policy is directly in line with section 3 of the RCS, in particular Section 3 Subsection 1.6.3.
STAT-22-020xvi	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xix - Section 5.10.34.16: "Is appropriately mitigated" is too ambiguous - the policy is still specific to noise attenuation where the roadways should be designed to be compatible with the community and consider potential design alternatives to noise walls.	Noise attenuation does not mean noise walls but rather the decrease in sound. This policy is purposefully vague to provide flexibility for noise attenuation alternatives to noise walls.
STAT-22-020xvii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xxi - Section 5.10.34.21: Not resolved - Staff believe this policy should speak to transit as a priority vs Single Occupancy Vehicle LOS.	This policy speaks to the need for transit projects to go through the TPAP process, but other policies have been added that speak to the Region's shift to prioritizing more safe, efficient, and sustainable modes over the needs of single occupant vehicles.
STAT-22-	February 11,	Bob Bjerke	STAT-21-423xxii - Section 5.10.34.22: Not resolved - the policy needs to	The Region's desire is certainly to fill the gaps in the AT network, however there are constraints,

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
020xviii	2022	Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	be explicit remove "where feasible" or describe the situations where Active Transportation may not be feasible.	such as natural or cultural heritage features that need to be considered in the transportation planning process.
STAT-22-020xix	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423xxiii - Section 5.10.36 Goods Movement: Not resolved - read in isolation the section is misleading that the Movement of Goods is the highest priority of the Region's network. While the City agrees that Goods movement is critical for the economic success of the Region as a whole, the section still needs to reconcile all of the community building objectives of other sections of the ROP, including the Council and community directed visions of local municipalities.</p> <p>Regional Staff have added 5.10.36.7f) Consider road way design, intersection spacing and land use planning contexts within local strategic growth areas. Brampton Staff proposed the following revisions, highlighted in yellow: Consider enhanced road way design, decreased intersection spacing and existing and proposed land use planning contexts within local strategic growth areas.</p>	<p>The Sustainable Transportation policies, provincial freeway policies, major road network policies, airport policies, goods movement policies, environmental impact policies, and accessible transportation policies all have their own sections in the Transportation Policy Framework. One section does not take priority over another section as the ROP is to be read in its entirety. Overall, the transportation policy framework calls for the prioritization modes other than single occupancy vehicles, including sustainable transportation and goods movement.</p> <p>Enhanced is a subjective term and can be difficult to define. Leaving the phrase as is permits flexibility while still maintaining the intent of the comment.</p> <p>Regional staff cannot support decreased intersection spacing as a blanket approach that may result in unsafe driving conditions and operational issues.</p> <p>Re: "existing and proposed land use planning contexts" - we can update policy to include this wording:</p> <p>5.10.36.7 f) Consider road way design, intersection spacing and existing and proposed land use planning contexts within local strategic growth areas.</p>
STAT-22-020xx	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xxiv - Section 5.10.36.1: Staff are still unclear about how safe and efficient is defined, and who conducts analysis to assess the severity of impacts, as they relate to potential "adverse impacts". In practice the speed of cars has been a priority over pedestrian safety, comfort, land uses, etc. Criteria based policy should be developed to help the reader understand how this policy is implemented.	Safe refers to minimizing collisions and conflict points and efficient refers to minimizing delay and using appropriately sizes and types of vehicles in the context of the movement of goods.
STAT-22-020xxi	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	<p>STAT-21-423xxv - Section 5.10.36.4: The Policy still needs to be explicit about what it wants stakeholders to do. Policies should be developed that are derived from the recommendations of the Goods Movement Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Policy should be clear on vision, intent and priority for regional roads and should not have to rely on Staff for interpretation of what policy is applied in what instances.</p> <p>Staff are concerned with the blanket policy approach of "implementing" a document that requires more foundations in planning policy. The recommendations of the Goods Movement Strategic Plan should be translated to policy, and well understood by stakeholders, to</p>	<p>Regional staff can reword this policy to be clear that the policy is referring to updating the goods movement strategic plan in consultation with local municipal staff and stakeholders:</p> <p><u>Work with the Province, the local municipalities, adjacent municipalities relevant agencies and stakeholders to implement and regularly update the Goods Movement Strategic Plan for Peel.</u></p> <p>Goods movement strategic plan is updated on a more frequent basis than the OP. This framework minimizes the need for frequent amendments to the OP.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			protect the stakeholder interims of what this policy is expecting.	
STAT-22-020xxii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xxvi - Section 5.10.36.5: Comment still stands – The Vision should be established in the Official Plan. Does this policy need to be in the Official Plan if the GMSP is completed? (Isn't the vision set out already).	This policy provides the framework for the Goods Movement Strategic Plan and future updates to the plan. In order to allow for evolving contexts, the OP defers to the Goods Movement Strategic Plan to develop the vision.
STAT-22-020xxiii	February 11, 2022	Bob Bjerke Director, City Planning & Design Planning, Building & Economic Development Department City of Brampton bob.bjerke@brampton.ca	STAT-21-423xxvii - Section 5.10.36.7a: Comment still stands – establish the vision in this document.	The Region is undertaking an update to the Goods Movement Strategic Plan and network in consultation with the local municipalities and stakeholders to ensure new information is considered including strategic growth areas and evolving goods movement needs.
STAT-22-025	March 8, 2022	Claudia LaRota Principal Planner/Supervisor, Policy City Planning & Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton claudia.larota@brampton.ca	Schedule E-5: Requested that the Mississauga/Steeles MTSA be identified as a Primary station on Schedule E-5 in accordance with the preliminary boundary that was delineated for this station as part of the August 2021 Phase 1B report. Further requested that this station be included on the list of MTSAs identified as having the potential to permit non-employment uses as proposed on draft policy 5.8.36. Brampton staff recognize that although the Mississauga/Steeles MTSA is located within an employment area, it has the potential to develop over time as a mixed use complete community and are initiating a review of the Bram West Secondary Plan where this station is located. Through this study, the appropriate mix of employment and non-employment uses for this area will be assessed to demonstrate how transit-supportive employment densities can be achieved to meet the target established for this MTSA (160/ppj/ha). Provided a screenshot of the subject MTSA.	Comments are noted, please be advised that staff have determined that it is appropriate to elevate the status of the MTSA HUB-3 Steeles at Mississauga Rd from 'Planned' to 'Primary' with a minimum density of 160 people and jobs per hectare. Further, staff recommend the MTSA be added to draft policy 5.8.36 to allow for the consideration of non-employment uses in employment areas to reflect the potential for non-employment uses to be introduced through the Bram West Secondary Plan Review.
Town of Caledon				
STAT-21-074i	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Town Staff provided comments regarding the Peel 2051 Official Plan to Town of Caledon Council in a staff report dated November 30 and December 16, 2021. Council adopted resolutions that these comments serve as the Town's comments and therefore be provided to the Region of Peel and the other local municipalities. These comments include the following: Table of Contents and Glossary: Suggest "Definitions" [instead of "Glossary" title].	Previous plan was Glossary as well. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074ii	November 26, 2021,	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of	Table of Contents: Change "Chapter 5: page 1070" to "page 170".	Noted – change made.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	December 16, 2021	Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca		
STAT-21-074iii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Foreword – Background: Service provision should include transit and policing.	Policing is included but transit is not mentioned as it is not a service provided or funded by the Region.
STAT-21-074iv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Foreword – Need for a Plan: Lot of use of Peel, the Region, Regional etc. through whole document. Use one term, maybe two, to define in this Plan.	Noted however different terms are referring to different documents or entities, i.e., the Region of Peel and Regional Council. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074v	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.1: When the Planning Act is referenced, other Provincial policies should be noted.	Specifically referencing that the need for the Official Plan comes from the Planning Act. The Plan must conform to the Planning Act and other Provincial policies which is referenced elsewhere in the Plan (Section 1.3).
STAT-21-074vi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.1: The Role of the Plan should be clear. Council’s Plan, staff implement the Plan.	The role of the Plan is explained in Chapter 1. No changes are recommended in this section.
STAT-21-074vii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.2: Geo/Indigenous are combined. Should be separate.	Treaties and land history also speak to geography and lands. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074viii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.2: Is the Regional Council Acknowledgement at meetings consistent with this section?	Yes.
STAT-21-074ix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.2: Last sentence, page 2 notes “Treaty rights are the specific rights...” Should it not read “specific rights for our Indigenous communities were...”?	This sentence is intended to help define treaty rights. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074x	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.3: In the reference to Provincial Plans, should all Plans have the date, with an “as amended from time to time”?	All dates for Plans have been removed throughout the plan to reflect the fact that they may be updated from time to time by the Province. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074xi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.3: Section speaks to "Peel Planning Carefully". Should reference "Peel and the local municipalities planning carefully"	Reference to local municipalities not required in this preamble.
STAT-21-074xii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.3: “Strong, directive policy language” → “strong, prescriptive policy language”.	Section 1.3 (renumbered 1.4) explains the purpose of the Regional Official Plan to clarify Regional roles and responsibilities appropriate at the regional level and assign roles to the local municipalities through strong, directive language. This direction is further explained in Section 1.5 clarifying the Five Principles of the Plan which aim to eliminate duplication and not complicate local municipal planning. The policy direction and directive policy language is intended to support this distinction. Changing the term “directive” to “prescriptive” is not necessary as the terms have similar meaning. No changes are recommended.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-074xiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.4: Can this be made easier to read?	Do not see issue with current section. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074xiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.4: "This plan directs the local..." → "this plan prescribes the local..."	The Plan's direction to the local municipalities is consistent with the Five Principles of the Plan and provides clarity with respect to specified matters that are to be implemented by the local municipalities. The directive language has been maintained in the Plan since its initial adoption by the Region in 1996. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.5: Use "intended" rather than "aim".	The revision will be included in Section 1.5 as follows: "b) The Plan should aim is intended to disentangle local municipal, regional and provincial activities in planning..."
STAT-21-074xvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.5 (e): References Delegated Authority. Already provided - means more delegated authority.	The principle of delegating approval authority from the Province to the regional and local levels continues to be a guiding direction for the Regional Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.6: Page 8 speaks to the Region promoting "beautiful" buildings. The Region has no control over buildings. Site Plan Approvals are a local responsibility (other than Regional buildings).	Section on overarching themes reflects ROP theme of sustainability generally that captures four imperatives at a high level. Cultural imperative is all encompassing, and no changes recommended. ROP sufficiently differentiates Regional and local roles, and not found elsewhere in the plan.
STAT-21-074xviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 1.7: References "Regional communities". What does this mean? Should it be defined?	Intentionally not defined and intends to capture all scales and forms of 'community' in Peel.
STAT-21-074xix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Paragraph under Section 1.7.4: References "fiscal constraints" – negative tone. Should have wording like "... are to be supported fiscally."	Language captures the intent and no changes recommended. Addressing fiscal constraints is an important goal of the plan.
STAT-21-074xx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Paragraph under Section 1.7.4: References "inaction". Would the development industry not do this? Many examples are certain matters that are built by them.	Recommending no changes to this goal statement.
STAT-21-074xxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2 Purpose: All reflected on public sector. Does the private sector not have a role?	The Preamble to Chapter 2 and reference to "joint" role of the Region, local municipalities, conservation authorities and other agencies refers to the specific responsibilities of government agencies and organizations. The roles of landowners and the private sector is addressed in other policies of the Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2: Appears very lengthy, may be cumbersome for reading the Plan. Would an Appendix work, with an overall high-level direction?	The purpose of the introductory text is to provide enough background information and context for the reader to be able to understand and interpret the policies. The policy direction reflects consultation heard through the review process from agencies, stakeholders and the public that the Regional Plan provide specific and detailed environmental policy direction. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxiii	November 26, 2021, December	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon	Section 2.3.4: Development industry not noted. They should be stewards too.	This policy references the adoption of policies and programs jointly with the local municipalities, conservation authorities and provincial agencies. The definition of 'jointly' references co-operative projects that are intended to be initiated and led by the listed

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	16, 2021	bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Include the development industry. They are our partner incity building.	organizations. Landowners and the private sector are important partners and stewards. Specific direction acknowledging the private sector role is provided in other policies in the Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.3.6: Add spacing for the words “jointly with”.	Formatting comment is noted.
STAT-21-074xxv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.4, second paragraph: References “agencies”. Should that no be the CAs?	The reference to ‘agencies’ is intended to capture a broader range of organizations that would include the CAs. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.4.10: References “direct collaboration”. Should not use direct, as it is counter intuitive.	The direction is intended to require collaboration with the Region. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.4.10: “Direct the local” → “require the local”	No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.4.2: References transit-supportive communities. How - especially if there is no Regional system being put in place?	2.4.2 is a broad objective of the Plan to support the development of transit supportive communities which the Region expects would be implemented through land use planning tools at the local level and through the provision of Regional and local infrastructure, services, and programs. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.4.5: Supportive of this objective however, it requires the necessary designations to support waste management and waste recycling facilities.	Comment noted. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.4.6: No reference to encouraging vertical agricultural operations that could occur outside of agricultural or rural land base (e.g., in an employment area). Add this reference.	The promotion of local food production is a broad term that would not preclude vertical agriculture. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.4.7 to 2.4.12: None of these objectives have a timing component for when the Region/locals should complete the suggested studies/work (this comment can be applied in many areas of the OP where it suggests work to be completed (e.g., sections 2.5.4 to 2.5.11). Add timing.	It is not recommended that timeframes be added to the policy direction. In most instances policy actions are currently underway or are ongoing.
STAT-21-074xxxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.5.10: Clarify what you mean by “mostly industrial uses”. State “industrial and other offensive uses”.	Policy 2.5.10 does not reference “industrial uses”. The policy was developed by Public Health staff and previously approved by the Province. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.5.6: This is weak – already an issue. Need a stronger policy.	Additional stronger policies addressing climate change are included in other sections of the Regional Official Plan. This policy is providing direction regarding education and awareness. No changes are recommended.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-074xxxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.5.8: (same as above)	No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxxv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.5, page 18, second paragraph: Lists the watercourses – why not the watersheds?	First paragraph references watersheds. The second paragraph references features. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxxvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.6: “...and direct the local...” → “...and allow the local...”	The intent of the policy wording is to flow implementation authority to the local municipality. The directive language is preferred as it gives direction to the local municipalities to further, interpret, refine, and designate Water Resource System features and areas in their official plans. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.10: “...direct the local municipalities...” → “...local municipalities are to...”	The intent of the policy wording is to flow implementation authority to the local municipality. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xxxviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.11: “...direct the local municipalities to include...” → “...local municipalities are to include...”	Provincial staff has requested that the Region incorporate key provincial policies in the Region’s OP to ensure a consistent approach across the Region and to coordinate the effective implementation of provincial policies (i.e., provincial policies containing “will” or “shall” directive language should be reflected as a policy of the Region and not only defer to the local municipalities). The policy direction will also need to be incorporated in local official plans in accordance with the applicable provincial policy or plan. Regional staff recommend that the policy be revised as follows: “Direct the local municipalities to include policies in their official plans to implement restrictions on Restrict development and site alteration to protect municipal drinking water supplies...”
STAT-21-074xxxix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.12: “...direct the local municipalities to require...”, “...resources be supported...” → “...local municipalities are required to ensure that development...”, “...resources are supported...”	The policy will be revised to delete “direct the local municipalities to”. Provincial staff has requested that the Region incorporate key provincial policies at the upper-tier level to ensure a consistent approach across the Region and to coordinate the effective implementation of provincial policies (i.e., provincial policies containing “will” or “shall” directive language should be reflected as a policy of the Region and not only defer to the local municipalities). The policy direction will also need to be incorporated in local official plans in accordance with the applicable provincial policy or plan. Regional staff recommend that the policy be revised as follows: “Direct the local municipalities to Require that development and site alteration that may have an immediate or cumulative impact...”
STAT-21-074xli	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.13: Is this a Region or local Official Plan policy to exempt? The Town to capture this requirement in local Official Plan and in pre-application requirements if subject to other planning approvals (i.e., Site Plan).	The policy direction is to be implemented by the local municipalities.
STAT-21-	November	Bailey Loverock	Section 2.6.14: “Direct the local municipalities to prohibit...” →	The policy will be revised to delete “direct the local municipalities to”. Provincial staff has

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
074xli	26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	“Development and site alteration in key hydrologic features or any associated vegetation protection zone outside of settlement areas is prohibited, in accordance with any policies of this Plan and applicable provincial plan. All local Official Plans shall conform to this policy.”	requested that the Region incorporate key provincial policies at the upper-tier level to ensure a consistent approach across the Region and to coordinate the effective implementation of provincial policies (i.e., provincial policies containing “will” or “shall” directive language). The policy direction will also need to be incorporated in local official plans in accordance with the applicable provincial policy or plan.
STAT-21-074xlvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.16: What is "large scale" development? Permit it anywhere outside of the "settlement area"? Provide guidance. Need to understand the context. What is that measurement based on? We have large homes (30,000 sq. ft.+), would this include those homes?	The direction referencing large scale development is consistent with policy wording of the Growth Plan and references development by plan of subdivision, plan of condominium and site plan. The implementation of the policy will require interpretation by the local municipalities on a case-by-case basis but would generally not apply to single dwellings on existing lots of record or smaller scale development of new dwellings on lots created by consent. No changes recommended.
STAT-21-074xlvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.19.5: Subwatershed plans - why not strengthen this to have the private sector do it? Avoids them getting ahead of the plan seeking development.	It is recommended that local municipalities lead and undertake subwatershed planning. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xlvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.20: SWMs – preamble is repetitive.	The Preamble supplements the policy interpretation for this section of the Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xlviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.20.11: “Direct the local municipalities to develop and implement...” → “Local municipalities are required to develop and implement...”	The direction reflects the primary responsibility of the local municipalities to undertake stormwater master planning and deliver stormwater management programs and services. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074xlix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.20.14: Plan preparation - should this not be at a larger level? There are potentially up and down stream issues.	The policy should be interpreted to provide flexibility to require broader scale plans if needed to address issues of managing stormwater in existing developed areas.
STAT-21-074l	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.10.19: Pagination – should the last paragraph be e)?	No, it is intended as a concluding direction of Policy 2.6.20.19.
STAT-21-074li	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.6.20.20: “Direct the local municipalities and conservation authorities to ensure...” à “Local municipalities and conservation authorities are required to ensure” Can the CA be directed by the Region?	This policy direction is included to provide clarity and address a previous gap in stormwater planning. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.7: Add “Authorities”.	The title and subject of the section is source water protection generally. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074liii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.7.6: “Direct the local municipalities to identify the boundaries of vulnerable areas...” → “The local municipalities shall identify the boundaries of vulnerable areas...”	The directive language is consistent with the Five Principles of the Regional Official Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074liiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.7.7: “Direct the Local municipalities to include policies in their Official Plans...” → “The Local municipalities shall include policies in their	The directive language is consistent with the Five Principles of the Regional Official Plan. No changes are recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	December 16, 2021	Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Official Plans..."	
STAT-21-074lii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.7.21: "Direct the Town of Caledon to restrict development dependent on sanitary sewers and related pipes in wellhead protection areas A, B and E with a vulnerability score of 10, and in issuecontributing areas for nitrates or pathogens. New development dependent on sanitary sewers and related pipes shall only be permitted where it has been demonstrated through an approved environmental assessment or similar planning process that the location of the sanitary sewer andrelated pipes is the preferred alternative, and the safety of the drinking water has been assured." The Town would defer approval of sanitary pipes to the Region.	The policy direction is referencing "restricting development" which is a local municipal responsibility. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074liii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.7.22: "Direct the Town of Caledon to prohibit the use of land for the establishment of sewage storage facilities in wellhead protection area A with a vulnerability score of 10, wellhead protection area E with a vulnerability score of 9 or greater, and in wellhead protection area E in an issue contributingarea for nitrates or pathogens, where the activity would be a significant drinking water threat." Would the Region not be the approval authority for sewage storage?	The policy direction is referencing "prohibiting the use of land" which is a local municipal responsibility. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074liv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.7.23: "Direct the Town of Caledon to restrict the use of land for the establishment of sewage storage facilities in wellhead protection area B with a vulnerability score of 8 or greater, wellhead protection area C with a vulnerability score of 8, and issue contributing areas for nitrates or pathogens. The use of land for sewage storage facilities shall only be permitted where it has been demonstrated through an approved environmental assessment or similar planning process that the location of the sewage storage facility is the preferred alternative, and the safety of the drinking water system has been assured." Would the Region not be the approval authority?	The policy direction is referencing "prohibiting the use of land" which is a local municipal responsibility. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.7.24: "Direct the Town of Caledon to prohibit development dependent on the establishment of sewage works where the sewage works dischargewould be a significant drinking water threat and the discharge is to surface water from..." Includes clauses a) to c). Would the Region not be the approval authority?	The policy direction is referencing "prohibiting development" which is a local municipal responsibility. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.9.9: "Direct the Town of Caledon to prohibit new on-site sewage systems or subsurface sewage works within 100 metres of any permanent stream, except in the following circumstances..." Includes a) to c).	The policy direction is referencing "on-site sewage systems" which is a local municipal responsibility. No changes are recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			Would the Region not be the approval authority?	
STAT-21-074lvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.9.12: “Direct the Town of Caledon to require an environmental assessment for the expansion of an existing or the establishment of a new sewage treatment plant to be completed or approved prior to giving any approvals for the proposal under the Planning Act or the Condominium Act, for a proposed settlement area expansion or a development proposal outside of a settlement area that requires an increase in the existing rated capacity of a sewage treatment plant or the establishment of a new sewage treatment plant.” Ultimately, the Region would be the approval authority for the establishment of new sewage treatment plans in this scenario as it would most likely be a communal system.	The policy is referencing “prior to granting approvals under the Planning Act or Condominium Act”, which is a local land use planning approval matter. The directive language is consistent with the Five Principles of the Regional Official Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.9.15: “Direct the Town of Caledon to prohibit the alteration of intermittent streams within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan Area.” Would conservation authorities not be responsible for approving/prohibiting alterations to a stream?	Regional staff agree that clarification is needed. Policy 2.9.15 (now renumbered 2.9.16) will be revised to clarify that the direction applies to Town of Caledon decisions regarding “development” under the Planning Act, which is a delegated authority to the Town. Conservation Authority matters would continue to be regulated by the CAs under the Conservation Authorities Act.
STAT-21-074lix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.11.7: The Town is not permitted to “refine” the requirements of the ORMCP, the Town is required to conform with, at the very least, not conflict with the requirements of the ORMCP. The Region is requested to consider rephrasing this policy to remove reference to “refine”.	The reference to ‘refine’ in the policy is intentional as certain refinements to the ORMCP policies, as appropriate, have been included in both the Region and Town’s official plans (e.g., refinements to the mapping of the Palgrave Estate Residential Community boundary). This wording is contained in the existing OP and was previously approved by the Province. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.11.14 a): Add in that the Natural Core Areas, existing mineral aggregate operations may not be expanded beyond the existing licensed area and new aggregate resource extraction is not permitted.	The policy outlines the general purpose and intent of the ORMCP’s Natural Core Areas policy direction in conformity with the ORMCP. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.11.14 c): Add that new aggregate resource operations are permitted subject to other provisions in the ORMCP.	The policy outlines the general purpose and intent of the ORMCP’s Countryside Areas policy direction in conformity with the ORMCP. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxii	November 26, 2021, December	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon	Section 2.11.52: Section 33 should be changed to Section 35	Policy section cross referencing has been corrected.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	16, 2021	bailey.loverock@caledon.ca		
STAT-21-074lxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.12.12.1.3 and 5.7.20.9. b): Does this mean a single dwelling on a lot in prime ag needs an AIA? Perhaps refinement required?	Policy 2.12.16.23 b) permits single dwellings on existing lot of record within the Protected Countryside provided they were zoned for such as of the date the Greenbelt Plan came into force. Policy 5.7.20.9 b) only requires an AIA for development on Rural Lands requiring Planning Act approval and thus is very unlikely to apply to a proposed single dwelling on an existing lot. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-074lxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.12.12.2.2: Greenbelt - Does this mean active parks? Parkland dedication issue?	The policy conforms with the policy direction for the Protected Countryside in the Greenbelt Plan. In accordance with the General Policies for the Protected Countryside, Rural Lands are intended to support a range of recreation and tourism uses such as trails, parks, golf courses, and other tourism-based accommodation, serviced playing fields and campgrounds. Within the Natural Heritage System overlay, parkland dedication required as a condition of approval for development within an urban settlement area is not permitted in accordance with the Region of Peel and Town of Caledon Official Plans. The Town is required to develop Rural Lands policies and set out appropriate permitted uses in accordance with the direction of the PPS, Greenbelt Plan and Regional Official Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.12.12.2.5 and 5.7.20.8: Does this apply to apartments? Garden suites, etc.? Is this more restrictive than provincial policy?	The terms “ <i>New multiple units or multiple lots for residential development</i> ” are indicated in bold italics and reference the Greenbelt Plan definition which clarifies how the policy is to be interpreted. The definition (copied below) references the creation of more than three units or lots. The policy is not more restrictive than provincial policy with respect to additional residential units and the provision for additional residential units in the Planning Act. No changes are recommended. “ <i>New multiple units or multiple lots for residential development</i> Means the creation of more than three units or lots through either plan of subdivision, consent or plan of condominium.”
STAT-21-074lxvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.12.15.5: “Direct the Town of Caledon to include policies in their Official Plan to develop best practices and strategies for the reuse and the management of excess soil generated and fill received during development or site alteration, including infrastructure development, to ensure that...” The Town will have to follow O. Reg 406/19 and is working on polices to comply with this regulation. Would like to change direct to encourage.	The policy direction is consistent with the Greenbelt Plan policy direction. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.14 Preamble: Proposed Schedule Yxxx needs to be added.	Comment is noted. Schedule renumbering will be addressed in the recommended amendment.
STAT-21-074lxviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 2.14.26: It appears this policy phrasing incomplete, is it intended those criteria and threshold for woodlands referenced are to be included in the local Official Plans? The Region is requested to please clarify.	The policy cross references Policy 2.14.16 (now renumbered 2.14.20) which enables the local municipalities to further interpret and identify Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors consistent with provincial policy. Natural Areas and Corridors and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors include woodlands. The Town of Caledon has already implemented criteria for significant woodlands in its official plan in accordance with this policy direction. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxix	November 26, 2021, December	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon	Section 3.3: Supportive of the 3.3 Agricultural System section the objectives and policies appear to assist with the long-term sustainability both for the environmental health of the lands, crop, and livestock but	The potential for carbon storage in soil is dependent on the type of land management practice being implemented. Staff is aware that the science regarding soil carbon storage is evolving.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	16, 2021	bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	<p>also the economic wellbeing agricultural businesses. Lacking, however, is how objectives are to be met as dependency rests on farmers to act as the stewards of the land without little monetary or administrative support. The objectives and policies are weakened without appropriate programs and services in place perhaps by Regional, Provincial or Federal cooperation with agencies and profit and nonprofit businesses.</p> <p>Propose changing “improve carbon storage in soil” to “help reach climate change targets”. Suggested change to wording as carbon storage in soil is still not conclusive in this approach – CVC and TRCA conversation indicated there was little scientific support for this.</p>	<p>Staff recommend that the Preamble be revised as follows:</p> <p>The Region recognizes the role of that agriculture can play in addressing the impacts of a changing climate and supports land management practices that can improve carbon storage in soil mitigate emissions.</p>
STAT-21-074lxx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 3.3.19: The requirement for an Agricultural Impact Assessment is a Peel requirement and not a Provincial policy requirement. This should be clarified.	The requirement that applications for mineral aggregate operations in prime agricultural areas be supported by an AIA is a provincial conformity requirement in Growth Plan Policy 4.2.8.3. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 3.4.14: New policy being added, is aggregate not being addressed through a separate policy review?	The Aggregate Resources Policy Review is a component of the Peel 2051 review but proceeding on a separate timeline. The policy 3.4.14 is being added as an agricultural policy in conformity with the Growth Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 3.4.9: Exemptions - should it not be the policies they are to be exempted from?	The aggregate resources policies will be reviewed and amended at a later time. The references to section numbers and policies for cross-referencing purposes will be reviewed and corrected for consistency.
STAT-21-074lxxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 3.5.5: Spacing of words "consistent with" – add a space.	Does not appear in latest version. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074lxxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	<p>Section 3.6: The protection of cultural resources, particularly built heritage is typically a local role - not a Regional role.</p> <p>Policy should reference local role. Also don't like the "will aim to ensure" reference. Shall ensure, intends to ensure, etc.</p>	<p>For Regional infrastructure projects, the Region may require the protection of cultural resources and under Provincial policy, the Region is required to include such policies. No change recommended.</p> <p>Change made to adjust “will aim to ensure”.</p>
STAT-21-074lxxv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 3.6.10: Require that local municipal official plans include that the proponents of development. There is existing example of how different words can be used to remove “directives”.	Change made in Section 3.6.
STAT-21-074lxxvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 3.7.15: No reference to District Energy options. The Town should include District Energy as an option - MTSA areas? Section also speaks to wind as energy - if policy rewind incorporated must identify where they will be permitted.	This policy is addressing energy generation. Policy direction for alternative and renewable energy systems, including district energy is included in Policy 3.7.17. Policy 3.7.16 will be amended to include reference to “geothermal” energy to ensure a comprehensive range of renewable energy generation projects are listed.
STAT-21-074lxxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	<p>Section 3.7.17: “Direct municipalities to "require" all major development proposals to submit alternative and renewable energy systems feasibility studies, where appropriate...”</p> <p>What constitutes major development? What are criteria which</p>	The criteria or guidance to determine what is a major development is a local planning matter. No changes are recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			determines "when appropriate"? Need criteria/guidance in the policy.	
STAT-21-074lxxviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 3.7.21: Alternative energy system proposals? In Zoning By-law for evaluating alternative energy system proposals? Not typically included in a ZBL.	The reference to zoning by-laws will be deleted.
STAT-21-074lxxxix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 4.3.11: "Viable" employment lands - who determines what is "viable"? It is usually the market that is driving a change in employment lands. Market a "viable" rationale?	The interpretation of this policy should rely generally on Provincial and Regional policies for protecting and planning for employment areas, and scenarios where mixed uses may be considered.
STAT-21-074lxxxx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 4.3.13: Population forecast used to support development application where infrastructure or capital investments required. How is it intended this be implemented? If a new subdivision requires new roads including improvement to a local or regional road, how is it intended the forecast be used?	The Region utilises development application statistics, growth forecasts, and infrastructure plans to compare planned and proposed growth as new development applications are made. Examples of information that may be considered include traffic volume impacts to road design, or water and sanitary sewer demand impacts on water and wastewater system upgrades.
STAT-21-074lxxxxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.3.2: Pagination – add last one as c).	Formatting correction has been addressed.
STAT-21-074lxxxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.3.3: Support this item, however, require the necessary designations to support waste management and waste recycling facilities.	Comment noted. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074lxxxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.3.3: Supportive of this item. Need to designate the lands surrounding the Brampton- Caledon Flight Centre and its flight paths.	Noted.
STAT-21-074lxxxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.4.10: Should be re-worded. The Region is requested to consider clarifying what constitutes "a significant portion of" growth, new growth and future growth referenced in sections 5.4.1, 5.4.10, 5.4.17 and 5.6.20.14.16.1.	Growth Plan Section 2.2.1 – Managing Growth provides direction to upper- and single-tier municipalities in allocation forecasted growth. <i>Growth Plan Section 2.2.1.2.a.i</i> directs that the vast majority of growth be directed to Settlement Areas that have a delineated built boundary and Section 2.2.1.2.c.i provides direction that within Settlement Areas growth be focused in delineated built-up areas.
STAT-21-074lxxxv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.4.12: Is it required? Suggest 5.4.13 does it.	Policy 5.4.12 refers to the establishment of 'new' settlement areas and Section 5.4.13 refers to expansion of settlement areas. Also, Policy 5.4.12 has been revised to remove "through an MCR".
STAT-21-074lxxxvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.4.14: Broadband seems out of place here.	An objective of growth management is providing necessary growth-related infrastructure, including broadband.
STAT-21-074lxxxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon	Section 5.4.17.10: Not needed. Add to end of 5.4.17.9	Policy 5.4.17.10 provides direction that it is a policy of Regional Council to facilitate and promote intensification.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	16, 2021	bailey.loverock@caledon.ca		
STAT-21-074lxxxviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.4.18.4: Not needed. Already taken care of in previous policies.	Noted. This policy has been deleted and instead, policy 5.4.18.2 is revised to add the word “efficient” to the statement regarding compact form.
STAT-21-074lxxxix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6.18.6: Is this preamble needed as part of this? Should be at front of Official Plan.	Town staff clarified that the comment refers to the preamble to 5.6.18 only, and not the specific section 5.6.18.6. No change was made, as the ROP chapter 1 speaks generally to the need to plan for complete communities and the efficient use of transportation networks. Section 5.6.18 speaks to the Urban Growth Centres and Regional Intensification Corridor as specific designations. - tto
STAT-21-074xc	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6: Table 5 says Bolton GO. Rename to Caledon GO (Bolton).	Implementation policy 7.3.10 has been updated. Should the official name of the station be changed in the future a technical revision to the ROP can be made with no ROPA.
STAT-21-074xci	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6.20.11: Staging and sequencing plans - include a policy which identifies the requirements and provides the ability to be flexible.	Staging and sequencing plans are required primarily to ensure development occurs in a manner that is fiscally sustainable from the perspective of providing regional infrastructure and must be undertaken to the Region’s satisfaction. Policy 5.6.20.11 was revised to include more details on what is to be addressed in a staging and sequencing plan in the general DGA policies – the policy language is similar to Bolton Policy 5.6.20.14.19.1.a).
STAT-21-074xcii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6.20.12: We are opposed to the requirement for block plans. The Block Plan process has come under extreme scrutiny for the perceived "delay" by developers for bringing housing to the market. In some areas with block planning, they have considered removing this requirement in favour of more detailed Secondary Plans. If use Block Plans need to carefully consider implementation to avoid duplication and changes in policies/guidelines over time.	Noted. Under the 5.6.20 – Designated Greenfield Area preamble, a sentence will be included describing that if the secondary plan provides a sufficient level of detail (ultimately meeting the level of detail that a block plan would address) a separate block plan process may not be required. Additionally, the preamble will be revised to describe in more detail what is meant by community or neighbourhood block plans to recognize the various terminologies and processes for addressing the requirements.
STAT-21-074xciii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Sections 5.6.20.12, 5.6.20.13 and 5.6.20.14.9: Block Plans - if a local does not do these - why require it? Not a statutory process under Provincial policies or the Act. Change to may not a must there could be circumstances where it makes sense to implement and somewhere secondary plans are sufficient.	See response above to STAT-21-074xcii.
STAT-21-	November	Bailey Loverock	Section 5.6.20.14.14: If there is MDS mapping inserted in the OP, it does	The policy direction states “iii) identify through mapping any required Provincial <i>minimum</i>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
074xciv	26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	not mean that it is the only MDS applicable as that mapping was based on a snapshot in time. Some may not recognize that you would still need to review the area to identify setbacks. In addition, if the resource is removed and the setback no longer applies, to keep the OP current, we would need to continuously update mapping. Suggest that the OP policies for the secondary plan would include policies which would require MDS be met and that through zoning, draft plan conditions, etc. you would specify the MDS requirement and how it is applicable.	<i>distance separation</i> (MDS) I setback (the Setback Area) that extends into the secondary plan area; and". It does not specify that setbacks need to be designated in an official plan or secondary plan; however, it is preferred that secondary plans include or reference maps to ensure that policy restrictions are effectively communicated when processing development approvals for the secondary plan areas. Regional staff are open to different options to implement the mapping direction including use of a figure or map that is not formally part of the official plan recognizing that the policy will need to be addressed through zoning, site plans or draft plan conditions that require compliance with MDS formulae.
STAT-21-074xcv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.14 I): 0 Charleston Sideroad could apply to a number of properties. Caution the way the lands are described. Do we want this to be in accordance with the Rehabilitation Master Plan? What about sewage servicing for this area? Specifies Campbell's Cross, but there could be other communities affected – should this be broadened?	Agreed – revised to include legal descriptions. Ability to service the lands would need to be determined through the subsequent analysis for expansion as required by the Growth Plan. The Hemson Rural Settlement Technical memorandum only recommended further study and consideration of the two settlements (Inglewood and Caledon Village for specific properties) that have unique characteristics.
STAT-21-074xcvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.17.10: It would appear that the last sentence of this policy intended to include the word "planning", rather than "panning" – correct typo.	Agreed – change made.
STAT-21-074xcvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.19.1: Affordable housing - why have separate housing policies for Mayfield – should they not be universal from a Regional perspective?	These policies are related to Bolton, not Mayfield West. These were approved through ROPA 30, and each previously approved settlement expansion which stemmed from the Growth Plan 2006 growth allocation through ROPA 24 continues to have individualized policies in the Regional Official Plan according to their approved ROPAs or OMB/LPAT settlements.
STAT-21-074xcviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.6.20.14.19.1: Phasing - should this be done first at the Region?	This policy is directly taken from the approved ROPA 30. No change recommended.
STAT-21-074xcix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.7.1.6: 0 Charleston Sideroad could apply to a number of properties. Caution the way the lands are described. What about sewage servicing for this area?	Agreed – revised to include legal descriptions. Ability to service the lands would need to be determined through the subsequent analysis for expansion as required by the Growth Plan.
STAT-21-074c	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.7.18: Palgrave is the only area being designated. Are you advocating more housing here or protecting it?	Policies in Section 5.7.18 recognize the historical Estate Residential Community and that development will be planned to occur in a phased manner, considering factors such as the financial capabilities of the Region, and as a logical extension to existing estate areas and servicing systems.
STAT-21-074ci	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.7.20.7: This policy should only refer to existing licensed mineral aggregate operations.	Policy 5.7.20.7 (now renumbered 5.7.19.7) is intended to refer to new mineral aggregate operations and require that new uses are subject to the policies of the Plan. It is recommended that the policy clarify that land use permissions are also subject to local official plans. "5.7.19.7 Permit the following uses in Rural Lands without the requirements for an amendment to the Regional Official Plan, subject to the other policies of this plan and the applicable local

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				official plan: ...”
STAT-21-074cii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.7.20.11: We want to align this with our Rural Economic Development Area permissions in our OP (not be more restrictive).	This policy is required for conformity with Policy 2.2.9.4 of the Growth Plan. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-074ciii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.7.3: Complete rural communities - how do you achieve this?	Section 5.7.3 is a broad objective that simply promotes achievement of healthy and complete rural communities. The achievement will be accomplished through land use policy implemented at the local level and through complementary municipal infrastructure, programs and services.
STAT-21-074civ	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.7.9: This policy should recognize that CHPMARAs may be identified in the Caledon Official Plan.	Policy 5.7.9 only lists the components of the Rural System that are identified in the Region’s proposed ROP. This includes HPMARA shown on Schedule C. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-074cv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8 Employment: Include the following: for the support of employment areas, encourage policies to assist employers in the attraction and retention of skilled workforce – public transit (local and regional connection), active transportation, employment area commercial uses to support workforce including health, education, post-secondary campus and other services, mixed use zones and affordable housing.	The importance of attracting employers and providing services and amenities to support the workforce is recognized. The ROP achieves this goal through objectives 5.8.1, 5.8.3, 5.8.5, 5.8.6, and 5.8.8 and policies 5.8.18, 5.8.20, 5.8.24, and 5.8.29.
STAT-21-074cvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8 Employment: Include the following: the general allocation of employment areas does not effectively protect the various needs associated with different types of industry. Heavy industrial uses including asphalt plants, waste processing, concrete batch plants and other noxious uses need specific areas allocated, identified, and have the necessary buffer/setbacks to separate these areas from neighbouring sensitive uses such as residential and prestige industrial areas.	Noted. The proposed Schedule Y6 identifies lands within the Regional Employment Area that are protected from employment conversions. The specific employment land use designations within these Employment Area areas are determined by the local municipalities. See policies 5.8.17 and 5.8.18.
STAT-21-074cvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8: Employment – no need for population number. Can be removed.	Agreed, change made to policy text.
STAT-21-074cviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.19: Employment forecasts - should clarify locals to meet these numbers.	Table 3 allocates the 2051 Employment forecast for the Region to the local municipalities. Policy 5.8.17 directs local municipalities to achieve the forecasts.
STAT-21-074cvix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.2: Supportive of this policy as it does support the protection of employment areas and a broad range of employment uses but there is a lack of focused policy on the protection of key economic sectors within the Region, City of Mississauga, City of Brampton and Town of Caledon would all through their economic strategies have identified key industrial sectors which are of strategic importance and have a significant interest to have land use planning, infrastructure and other services dedicated to	Noted. All Employment Areas identified on the proposed Schedule Y6 are protected from employment conversions. Policy 5.8.17 encourages the local municipalities to identify and designate specialized employment uses within Employment Areas. It should be noted that lands identified by the Province as Provincially Significant Employment

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			retain, grow and attract investment in these sectors. It is encouraged that additional policy is included to have specific employment areas protected for key industrial sectors	Zones provides an extra layer of protection.
STAT-21-074cx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.27: Do not support this policy as the general allowance for industrial uses does not protect the lands adjacent to the Brampton-Caledon Flying Club for uses that support and enable the growth of the airport as an aviation hub for flight and associated aviation goods and services.	Noted. The intent of the policy is to protect lands for employment uses including manufacturing, warehousing, and ancillary uses around goods movement infrastructure, where appropriate. Note – Name change to Brampton-Caledon Airport and have identified name change on all mapping schedules (complete).
STAT-21-074cxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.28: Employment uses vs. sensitive uses - how is retail or commercial deemed sensitive, or not considered as a lower end employer? Clarify.	Noted. Policy adjusted with the introduction of Major retail threshold to provide clarification on what is an acceptable level of retail/commercial within an Employment Area.
STAT-21-074cxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.39: Supportive of this policy as it supports public transit and active transportation in our employment areas making it easier and more affordable for employees to access the workplace – further to this point is the need to have transit connectivity at a regional level and have the infrastructure in place for the last mile to safely and efficiently allow employees to move from the bus stop to the front door of the employer.	Noted. In addition to this policy, the ROP achieves this goal through objectives 5.8.6, and 5.8.8 and policies 5.8.20, and 5.8.37. Please also see the objectives of transportation section 5.10.32 and particularly 5.10.32.5.
STAT-21-074cxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.43: Support this policy however it does not provide an action on what the Region of Peel and the Town of Caledon can take if it is identified there is an inadequate supply of land. Include those actions in this policy.	Noted. The intent of the policy is to ensure monitoring is in place to support technical analysis and decision making. Depending on the specific situation, a range of measures may be appropriate beyond OP policy.
STAT-21-074cxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.44: Not fully supportive of this section and would suggest further refinement of the policies as currently drafted. Sandhill would be suitable for transportation depot/logistics hub offering an option to remove illegal truck parking from agricultural and residential designated properties. Suggest that the future strategic employment areas (i.e., the Sandhill area) be designated as an area to allow for un-serviced industrial and would allow for setback and buffer to remove access to Airport Road and provide widelandscape boulevards to improve the aesthetic environment through the Airport Road corridor. This area should be added to the Employment lands allocation for the purpose as noted.	The intent of this policy and corresponding mapping on Schedule Y6 is to conceptually identify and protect strategically located Employment Areas, or if appropriate, permit an expansion to Sandhill for dry industrial uses subject to further assessment. Dry industrial uses could include transportation depot/logistics. The subsequent assessment would meet the requirements of the Growth Plan and determine appropriate locations, uses and buffers as appropriate. Please see new clarifications to Section 5.8.44.6 for implementation policies for the Sandhill future strategic employment area and requirements for the inclusion of additional lands in the rural settlement area.
STAT-21-074cxv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.8.44.6: Dry industrial should be defined.	This policy is the only reference to dry industrial uses and the definition is included in the policy. Additional clarity was added.
STAT-21-074cxvi	November 26, 2021, December	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon	Section 5.9 Housing: Overall - written as work with locals, then directives added. Keep the tone more even	The housing section is intended to provide policy directions to local municipalities which will be implemented in the spirit of collaboration.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	16, 2021	bailey.loverock@caledon.ca		
STAT-21-074cxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.9 Housing: Affordable Housing Assessment - policies required in the Town OP require an Affordable Housing Assessment to be undertaken for "large development applications". What is a "large development application"? Policy must be included in Town OP. Also referred to in section 5.9.68	Policy revised to describe large development applications as those with 50 or more units. The inclusion of the housing assessment in the Regional Official Plan recognizes and strengthens efforts that are already taking place at the local municipal level and are captured in policy briefs and existing policies and procedures. Local municipalities can choose to further strengthen their local official plan as needed to further incorporate a housing assessment.
STAT-21-074cxviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.9.16: What is "large development"? This needs to be described or defined within this policy. Does this apply to Palgrave Estates? Infill? Greenfield only?	Policy revised to describe large development applications as those with 50 or more units and applies to all residential areas in Peel notwithstanding that other policies in the Plan apply to specific parts of Peel.
STAT-21-074cxix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.9.30: Rates - just use the Regional rate for consistency across the Region.	The policy permits a local municipal rental vacancy rate that is consistent with Provincial legislation. A Regional rental vacancy rate of 3 per cent for the preceding years as reported by CMHC can be used by local municipalities if no data is available or if it is preferable.
STAT-21-074cxx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.9.31: Rental units - need something stronger. Is the Region not a service provider that can help in this?	This policy is guided by provincial legislation and is quite strong. Does the Town have a suggestion on how it could be strengthened?
STAT-21-074cxxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.9.51: Transit noted but no policies to do a Regional transit system. Need to reword to clarify.	The transit network in Peel is provided through Brampton Transit, MiWay, the Town of Caledon and Metrolinx as the provision of transit falls under local municipal and Provincial jurisdiction. Please also see policy 5.10.32.35 which supports the implementation of a GTHA wide and Greater Golden Horseshoe wide rapid transit network comprised of local municipal and provincial transit projects.
STAT-21-074cxxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.9.62: Housing barriers - should this be identified, based on what we know today?	Policy kept broad so as to capture different types of barriers, including those that are emerging.
STAT-21-074cxxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.9.64: Greater community awareness - need something more here, already an issue across the GTA for many.	Noted.
STAT-21-074cxxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10: No polies regarding Regional roads and promoting local road design to achieve sense of place, better design, etc. Transit Schedule Y4 does not show any Rapid Transit Corridor connections into Caledon except for Bolton GO and one transit route into Mayfield to support planned population and employment. Need to reconsider planned transit routes in Caledon- this is a 30-year plan. Want policies to encourage development of public transit facilities through partnerships with the private sector - similar to Metrolinx model for delivering transit station for the Yonge subway extension.	Policy 5.10.32.10 speaks to local road design and policies under section 5.10.34 apply to Regional Roads. Schedule Y4 is based on the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan and rapid transit project being proposed by local municipalities.
STAT-21-074cxxv	November 26, 2021,	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of	Section 5.10: Projected numbers do not match on pages 275 and 252.	Numbers have been corrected.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	December 16, 2021	Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca		
STAT-21-074cxxvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.32.9: To promote a transportation system that encourages sustainable mode choices, reduced emissions, and energy conservation. Add "and recreation".	OP is to be read in its entirety and references to access to recreation is covered elsewhere in the document.
STAT-21-074cxxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.32.11: Carpooling – Agreed, but if they are not associated with larger transportation initiatives, can we be successful?	Comment noted. Regional staff will work in collaboration with local municipal staff and the province when determining locations for carpool lots and they will be planned with consideration for connections to other modes. As discussed, the policy will be updated to include reference to "neighbouring municipalities".
STAT-21-074cxxviii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.33: GTA West Corridor is contained in words but not on mapping. Add to mapping.	GTA West Corridor is still being shown conceptually on Transportation Schedules Y2 and Y4.
STAT-21-074cxxix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.34.10: Investigate multi-modal. Not sure what this means and why it is noted? Should that not be a given?	Policy is referencing the investigation of a multi modal <i>Level of Service</i> approach and application of specific guidelines.
STAT-21-424cxxx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.34.16: Requires noise attenuation along Regional roads with abutting residential. Policy will result in miles of fencing along Regional roads. Does not create any sense of place and results in design typical of 80s subdivision design.	This policy is intended to ensure Region will adhere to noise guidelines and regulatory requirements set by the Ministry of Environment - appropriate mitigation will be based on those requirements.
STAT-21-074cxxxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.34.16: Requires noise attenuation along Regional roads with abutting residential. Policy will result in miles of fencing along Regional roads. Does not create any sense of place and results in design typical of 80s subdivision design.	This policy is intended to ensure Region will adhere to noise guidelines and regulatory requirements set by the Ministry of Environment - appropriate mitigation will be based on those requirements.
STAT-21-074cxxxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.34.22: Support the development of a safe, connected, and accessible network of sustainable transportation facilities on new or improved Regional roads, where feasible. Add "a safe".	Policy will be updated to reflect comment by adding "and a safe".
STAT-21-074cxxxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.35: BFC have applied for an airport zoning regulation. Should there be recognition of supporting requested AZR?	Peel staff have met with Caledon staff and airport representatives to ensure the mapping of the airport is appropriate in the Regional Official Plan. No change needed related to the Airport Zoning Regulation.
STAT-21-074cxxxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.35.1: This section and others refer to the Brampton Flying Club Airport - Schedule Z1 shows a "Brampton Caledon Airport". Use same through text and schedules.	Agreed – change has been made to Schedule Z1 to reference Brampton Flying Club Airport.
STAT-21-074cxxxv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 5.10.38.10: Add "work with local municipalities and the private sector to provide and maintain a built environment that supports active transportation for persons with disabilities."	The intent of this addition is addressed in policy 5.10.32.8
STAT-21-074cxxxvi	November 26, 2021,	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of	Section 5.10.38.12: Add "consult regularly with accessibility groups/committees".	Reference to consultation will be added to policy 5.10.38.9: Support efforts to educate the general public about the transportation needs and issues of

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	December 16, 2021	Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca		persons with disabilities through collaboration with such groups as Local Health Integration Networks, accessible taxi service providers and colleges and universities. Support consultation, public education and outreach efforts that promote and improve transportation needs and issues of persons with disabilities.
STAT-21-074cxxxvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 6.4: Aging in place - can we add the missing middle here and allow mid-rise in certain areas as-of-right?	It is assumed that section 6.3 Age-Friendly Planning is being referenced. Permitting mid rise in certain areas as-of-right would be a matter addressed through local implementation. The Region recognizes the need for different housing options and forms including the “missing middle” for seniors. In-effect policy 6.3.2.5 (draft renumbering to 6.4.9) encourages planning for housing of all types, sizes, densities and tenures, to support seniors to age within their community.
STAT-21-074cxxxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 6.5.7: Are private communal sewage systems permitted in settlement areas? I.e., the proposed development at 18314 Hurontario Street. Would that communal sewage system be permitted? Perhaps how “it is determined” that these are permitted should be discussed?	Policy 6.5.5 identifies municipal services as the preferred form of servicing in Rural Settlement Areas. However, in accordance with Section 1.6.6 of the PSS, Section 6.5 also establishes a policy framework for addressing private communal servicing where municipal services are not available.
STAT-21-074cxxxix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 7: Seems disjointed. Certain sections (like 7.5 and 7.6) should be in other parts of the OP.	Sustainability and healthy communities are both included in the overarching themes of the Plan as outlined in Section 1.6 and as goals as per 1.7 and referenced throughout the plan. Section 7 outlines specific policies and requirements related to sustainability and healthy communities.
STAT-21-074cxl	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 7.3.6: Text vs. mapping - just say the text prevails.	Policy 7.3.6 will be revised as follows: “7.3.6 The text, including the glossary, will take precedence prevail in a case of any discrepancy between the text and the schedules.”
STAT-21-074cxli	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 7.12: Supportive of the collection of information to ensure that the policies and objectives are successful however it is suggested that one measure that would be useful would be the time taken for the approval of Official Plan Amendments, Zoning By-Law Amendments and Site Plan Applications. Economic Development has received numerous comments and requests from industrial/commercial developers related to the recent shifts of demand for industrial and commercial buildings, decisions are made in months and not in years. To be competitive with other regions, Region of Peel and Town of Caledon need to collect information on approval process and based on the measures have the Region and Town of Caledon provided the necessary support and process to have in place an efficient and effective process to have planning applications in a timely manner understanding however that there are some applications that are of a technical nature that requires additional time.	The streamlining and efficiency of the development approvals process is an important issue for the Region. The comment is noted. The Region looks forward to working with the local municipalities and commenting agencies on streamlining initiatives to better understand where there may be opportunities for efficiencies.
STAT-21-074cxlii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 7.3.5: What does this mean? If intent is Regional policy prevails, just say it.	The policy means that in the event of different policy interpretations, that Regional Council will make the final determination.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-074cxlvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 7.4.9.4: Concern is the amount of time they utilize “Direct the Town of Caledon” when it comes to policies onsource water protection, water, and wastewater. Staff are of the understanding that the Region is the main regulatory body when it comes to these items, but now it seems as though they are downloading some of this to the Town. In their response to Town comment on Policy 7.4.9.4 they indicate that they are not precluded (on this particular policy) as a commenting body on applications from raising concerns if appropriate. Would like to know if this applies to all these policies, they are now directing the Town to implement and what they consider to be “if appropriate”.	Policy 7.4.9.4 provides direction for the Region’s review of new lots created by consents which is a local approval. The policy outlines matters of Regional interest relevant to the Region when reviewing consent applications. With respect to the use of directive language in the Plan, the Plan’s direction to the local municipalities is consistent with the Five Principles of the Plan and provides clarity with respect to specified matters that are to be implemented by the local municipalities. The directive language has been maintained in the Plan since its initial adoption by the Region in 1996. No Changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074cxliv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Section 7.12.10: In view of the Region’s four imperatives, it would be reasonable to add cultural impacts	This policy will be reviewed as part of the Aggregates Policy Review.
STAT-21-074cxlv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Definitions: Ensure consistency with definitions in the Regional Official Plan.	Comment noted.
STAT-21-074cxlvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Schedules Y2 and Y3: Schedules identify major roads and mid-block collectors. Policies regarding truck infiltration into residential communities?	Any initiatives related to truck restrictions or routing will be explored through the update of the Region’s Goods Movement Strategic Plan.
STAT-21-074cxlvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Schedule Y3: Does Queen Street go from 45 to 20 to 40? The colours for 20 and 45 are too similar to differentiate. Won't the changing of ROW be an issue? Are there environmental constraints restricting the ROW in these situations?	There are no changes being proposed to the ROW on Queen Street / Hwy 50 in Caledon. Colours will be reviewed by our mapping group.
STAT-21-074cxlvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Figure Y6: Concerned with streets that are included. Is this Parr and George Bolton? Are they okay to be on the Strategic Regional Network? Wouldn't they just be local connectors? Mountainview Road and Horseshoe Hill Road should be removed from the goods movement network. Now that BAR construction is completed, Highway 50 should be removed as a Primary Truck Route.	Figure Y6 is based on the Goods Movement Strategic Network identified in the Goods Movement Strategic Plan. Any changes to the network will be explored through the next update of the Goods Movement Strategic Plan. Updates to Figure Y6 will not require an amendment to the ROP.
STAT-21-074cxliii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Figure Y8: The Existing and Long-Term Cycling Network - the existing cycling network does not seem to include the 2021 cycling routes. Update existing cycling facilities based on the 2021 cycling routes.	Figure is being revisited to reflect comments received from the three local municipalities.
STAT-21-074cxliii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Figure Y9: The Existing and Long-Term Pedestrian Network, the existing pedestrian data does not include all sidewalks but believe this is deliberate.	Figure is being revisited to reflect comments received from the three local municipalities.
STAT-21-074cli	November 26, 2021,	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of	Table 1: Has this been vetted by and agreed by the CAs? Ensure CAs are in agreement.	Table 1 was developed in consultation with the Conservation Authorities, local municipalities and provincial agencies. Conservation Authority staff have had opportunities to comment on

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
	December 16, 2021	Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca		the Table through the current Regional Policy Plan Review.
STAT-21-074clii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Table 3: Observation - later in the document numbers differ. Compare numbers in document for consistency	Regional staff have reviewed Table 3 forecasts and ensured consistency throughout the document.
STAT-21-074cliii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Table 4: Housing targets - need to determine how these targets will be implemented. These across Region or locals? In each development? Across all new community areas? Also, section 5.9.20 speaks to accommodating one-, two-, and three-bedroom units.	Policy revised to clarify that the housing targets are Peel-wide and that each application should demonstrate a contribution towards these targets. 5.9.20 provides more detail on providing multi-residential units of different sizes.
STAT-21-074cliv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	Definitions: LIDs – not defined, include definition.	Low Impact development term is shown in <i>bold italics</i> to refer to provincial definition in the Growth Plan.
STAT-21-074clv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: Too much ‘plannerese’ throughout document. Remove words that are ‘plannerese’ and make it more user friendly.	Comment noted.
STAT-21-074clvi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: Settlement Area Boundary Expansion – With respect to current land supply that was provided in the last Official Plan Review the additional land was purchased and was no longer available for purchase thereby locking the ten-year land supply within two years. The lands were not immediately developed due to the necessary studies, servicing, and land use approvals but there were no shovel ready and designated lands for attracting new businesses and the Town did not have the ability to retain existing businesses. Provided the experience from Economic Development, 650 net acres every five years would provide a reasonable reflection on the market need and designated and zoned in order to ensure land supply is not locked up to allow for the retention and attraction of businesses in key economic sectors (i.e., manufacturing, food and beverage and knowledge-based industry). Having the lands phased would also ensure that work can be coordinated to ensure servicing, road construction, designations and zoning and the necessary studies are completed. This method will provide the industrial client an assurance that the lands are shovel ready and do not require further planning or servicing construction. With the calculations of having 650 net acres (263 net hectares) every five years, it would require 1,710 gross hectares over 30 years (based on 30% land for road, protected and open space areas). It is economic development’s opinion that an additional 500 gross hectares is needed over the 1,200 ha (estimated on the SABE Concept Map) and would be required till 2051 – Economic Development is in support of the Region working with the municipality to have annual review on land supply, demand, and absorption. The land requirement also needs to include un-	See response to comment STAT-21-424i.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			serviced industrial land for low density logistics – transportation depots use to offer an option for truck companies to help reduce Caledon’s illegal truck parking issue. Using the Future Strategic Employment Area as noted in section 5.8.44 of the draft OP – Sandhill area for this purpose and adding these lands to the employment land allocation as noted on the SABE Concept Map. This could also serve as a peri- urban approach that would allow beyond 20 years the future intensification of the area for other industrial related uses.	
STAT-21-074clvii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: Industrial lands need to be protected from conversion – Bolton has experienced an increase in residential infill in the last several years which is positive however in areas that it impacts existing industrial areas this is a problem. With the current industrial land shortage and pressure on our existing industrial businesses that they are not wanted creates an environment within the community that the Region and Town are not business friendly.	The Regional employment area designation and the provincially significant employment zones provide protection from conversion for industrial lands in Peel and Bolton. Only two employment conversion requests have been supported in Bolton to reflect a Minister’s Zoning Order and existing sensitive use permissions. For more information on protecting employment lands and employment conversions refer to the Employment Planning Implementation Report, January 2022.
STAT-21-074cliii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: The Official Plan is lengthy.	No changes recommended.
STAT-21-074clix	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: 2051 New Community Planning Areas - repeated many times. Settle on 2051 Plan and do it at front of OP.	Noted.
STAT-21-074clx	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: Reconsider use of "direct". It is a word used by Council to direct staff, it is a word for resolutions. It would be better to reflect a unified effort to use "encourages", "work with" or something similar.	The Plan’s direction to the local municipalities is consistent with the Five Principles of the Plan and provides clarity with respect to specified matters that are to be implemented by the local municipalities. The directive language has been maintained in the Plan since its initial adoption by the Region in 1996. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074clxi	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: There are many policies which will trigger site plan control, trigger submission material related to an application, restrict the issuance of building permits. Many of these triggers are speaking to wellhead protection areas. This will result in amendments to our by-laws, etc. Has the Region reviewed these policy directions against Section 41 the Planning Act?	The source water protection policies were developed to conform to direction contained in source protection plans approved under the Clean Water Act. Further background on the policy requirements set out in the source protection plans and the conformity requirements under the Clean Water Act are provided in the Protecting Water Resources: Source Protection Plan Implementation Discussion Paper. Municipal official plans must conform with significant threat land use policies included in the source protection plans. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-074clxii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: While the Region of Peel provided a response to comments regarding Cultural Heritage policies in the Consolidated Comments spreadsheet, the Region has not incorporated the proposed revisions to these policies in the draft Region of Peel OP which was recently circulated (version identified as ‘Draft Tracked Changes as of October 1, 2021’). As such, the Town of Caledon comments regarding the Cultural Heritage policies remain outstanding and must be addressed prior to the finalization of the Region of Peel Official Plan. Furthermore, Heritage staff are of the understanding that the Region of Peel has consulted with Indigenous communities regarding the Peel 2051 Official Plan Review and received in response questions and comments on	Meetings were held with local municipal staff throughout 2020. Based on these, draft policies updated and circulated to local municipal staff in May 2021. A recent meeting with Caledon staff took place in based on the informal comments sent by the Town in Summer 2021 and the outstanding matters resolved. No major policy changes resulted based on the most recent meeting with Caledon staff. A meeting took place on December 1, 2021 with the Six Nations of the Grand River from which comments have not required cultural heritage and archaeology policy changes. Other changes were made to the preamble of the Introduction and Cultural Heritage sections to reflect the general comments.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Indigenous engagement and cultural heritage policies that may result in minor changes to policies. The Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation has requested an additional meeting to further discuss cultural heritage and archaeology.</p> <p>Heritage staff advise that it is premature to provide further commentary on the heritage-related policies in the draft Peel 2051 document until this meeting taken place and the document revised to address the questions and concerns of all Indigenous groups.</p>	
STAT-21-074clxiii	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: It is noted that the Regional plan speaks at length about the importance of compact, mixed, and complete communities. We are hopeful that the Region will help facilitate the growth of nodes and mixed-use corridors. This will require a multi- government approach to investment in strategic infrastructure and municipal transit, and we hope the Region will work with the Town on the delivery of transit.	Through Peel 2051 the Region is planning for significant intensification and greenfield growth, which is being facilitated by a defined Regional Structure and Strategic Growth Areas (like MTSAs) and supported by planning for transit-supportive communities. The Region is also working with local municipalities and the Province on the advancement of transit and will continue to as identified in the transportation policies of the ROP.
STAT-21-074clxiv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: Staff would like to work with the Region to explore a policy that affords flexibility to refine community and employment area as we work through our Official Plan review and secondary planning processes.	<p>The boundaries of the community and employment areas are not flexible. However, there is potential that, if determined through further detailed studies that certain areas within community areas are needed for some employment-type uses, such as office uses, that they could be permitted provided they do not present a land use conflict.</p> <p>Regional employment areas must be protected for employment uses, as outlined in the Regional Official Plan, but local municipalities may identify additional employment outside the regional employment area.</p> <p>The community areas will include “Community Areas” for accommodating approximately 175,000 people and 19,000 supporting jobs as the focus for new residential communities and Employment Areas accommodating approximately 38,000 jobs as the focus for new clusters of business and economic activities.</p> <p>For clarity, the preamble to Section 5.8 has been revised to note that Local Municipalities can identify employment uses outside the regional employment area.</p>
STAT-21-074clv	November 26, 2021, December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	General: When referring to approvals of plans or amendments, it would be helpful if there were specific dates.	Not appropriate in this context.
STAT-21-424i	December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	<p>Staff provided high level comments on the draft Regional Official Plan in Staff Report 2021-0430, which was submitted to the Region as per Town Council’s direction. These comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Region’s preferred SABE scenario would benefit from further review. • The distribution of Community and Employment lands throughout the Focus Study Area could be improved. • Concerned with the Region’s plans to include the treatment of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the 5.6.20 – Designated Greenfield Area preamble, a sentence will be included describing that if the secondary plan provides a sufficient level of detail (ultimately meeting the level of detail that a block plan would address) a separate block plan process may not be required. Additionally, the preamble will be revised to describe in more detail what is meant by community or neighbourhood block plans to recognize the various terminologies and processes for addressing the requirements. • The intent of this policy and corresponding mapping on Schedule Y6 is to conceptually identify and protect strategically located Employment Areas, or if appropriate, permit an expansion to Sandhill for dry industrial uses subject to further assessment. Dry industrial

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>the GTA West corridor, transition between sensitive lands, and community lands shown with the Provincially Significant Employment Zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block Plans are not a statutory requirement; therefore, the Town does not agree with the prescribed use of this tool. Block Plan policies should allow for flexibility, as there may be instances where block planning is necessary but, in some cases, the secondary planning process will be sufficient. Staff recommended that flexibility be built into this policy, and that more details regarding when block plans should be required should be included in the Caledon Official Plan. Town staff support the Regional policy direction for the Future Strategic Employment Area around Sandhill but suggest further consideration be given to this area. From an economic development perspective, the designation of closer to 1,700 hectares of employment land could help Caledon retain existing businesses, attract new businesses, and move towards a more balanced tax ratio. Town staff requested that Regional Council increase the amount of employment lands in the SABE. 	<p>uses could include transportation depot/logistics. The subsequent assessment would meet the requirements of the Growth Plan and determine appropriate locations, uses and buffers as appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see new clarifications to Section 5.8.44.6 for implementation policies for the Sandhill future strategic employment area and requirements for the inclusion of additional lands in the rural settlement area. Other SABE Scenario/land area comments are still being considered and will be responded to as soon as possible. The suggested new FSEA at Dixie north of the GTA West corridor is not supported, as it is outside of the Focused Study Area which is the basis of the SABE study. In addition, that area would be reliant on the Highway 413, in contrast with other SABE areas which could function with or without highway infrastructure. Increasing the minimum greenfield density may reduce flexibility for Caledon to plan communities at a variety of densities to transition to the rural area, an increase in the minimum density is consistent with many regional and provincial priorities. Staff are supporting a minimum density of 67.5 people and jobs per hectare which reduces the Community Area land required by approximately 130 ha. The January 2022 draft SABE map proposes to maintain the overall recommended SABE area at 4,400 ha with Community Area decreasing from 3,000 ha to 2,870 ha and Employment Areas increasing from 1,400 ha to 1,530 ha.
STAT-21-424ii	December 16, 2021	Bailey Loverock Senior Planner, Town of Caledon bailey.loverock@caledon.ca	<p>Staff prepared a revised version of the Regional staff recommended draft SABE map. This mapping is intended to support the Town's comments provided and addresses the concerns highlighted by staff, such as some of the proposed locations of Community and Employment Lands on the Regional draft SABE map.</p> <p>Modifications from the Regional draft SABE map include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of the Provincially Significant Employment Zone in Bolton (identified as a proposed Community Use by the Region); Introduction of a Future Strategic Employment Reserve at the northern limit of the GTA West Corridor between Kennedy Road and Bramalea Road along Dixie; Identification of the south-east and south-west sides of the proposed Highway 410/GTA West Corridor as Employment Area (identified as Community Area by the Region); Introduction of additional Community Area along Old School Road between Dixie Road and Torbram Road; Removal of Employment Area southwest of Campbell's Cross between Kennedy Road and Hurontario Street; Inclusion of a reduced amount of residential land – 2,800 ha vs. the Region's SABE of 3,000 ha; and Inclusion of an increased amount of employment lands – from 1,400 ha to 1,650 ha. 	See response to comment STAT-21-424i.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>The rationale for these modifications is outlined in Staff Report 2021-0468.</p> <p>Town of Caledon Council endorsed this preferred concept map and directed staff to include it in the Town's formal comment submission to the Region. Council further directed staff to initiate public engagement on the preferred concept map.</p>	
City of Mississauga				
STAT-21-075i	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	General: Response noted. As is understood, the Region will continue to offer recycling service and work with Producers legislated through the various independent producer responsibility regulations to collect and recycle materials, including and not limited to blue box materials (i.e., textiles).	This is correct. Where possible and when reasonable agreements can be reached between the Region and producers and their agents, the Region will continue to play a role in the collection of designated materials for diversion.
STAT-21-075ii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 1.6: Response is noted, and the City agrees adaption is captured however in the second paragraph which discusses the environmental imperative adaptation to climate change could be further integrated. Further in section 1.7 goals. Climate Change mitigation and adaptation is not specifically addressed as a goal. (Consider evaluating further with regional contacts: Christine Tu or Anthony Parente)	A new goal will be included in Section 1.7 to address this comment.
STAT-21-075iii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Housing and Climate Change: This title this appears out of norm with other standard titles. No where else in the report do the other relevant sections (e.g., energy, water, natural hazards and transportation) pull out "climate change" in the title. The only other title is Climate Change and Air Quality (which makes sense).	An update to the title will be included as follows: "Housing and Sustainable Development"
STAT-21-075iv	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 3.7.17 Energy Resources: Newly added section 7.6 in addition to revised section 3.7.17 address the City's main comment. Further the City recommends including some further language to support renewable energy and district energy specifically. The City noted section 3.7.7 addresses district energy specifically and recommends further strengthening the language to include language to enable local municipalities to assess opportunities to conserve energy, reduce peak demand and provide resilience to power disruptions as part of new development. The City recommends considering specific references to local integrated energy solutions that incorporate renewable energy such as district energy, geothermal and waste heat energy capturing systems and energy storage.	<p>The terminology and definition referencing alternative and renewable energy systems in the ROP's energy policies is intentionally broad and interpreted to include a range of energy sources and systems such as solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, local integrated energy solutions, distributed energy resources, and district energy.</p> <p>The policies do not limit or restrict the ability of local municipalities to assess opportunities to conserve energy, reduce peak demand or provide resilience to power disruptions in new development.</p> <p>No changes are recommended.</p>
STAT-21-075v	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga	Section 3.3.21.7 Urban Agriculture: Response noted, proposed later amendment addresses the City's comment.	Comment is noted and has been addressed in the Regional Official Plan.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca		
STAT-21-075vi	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 4.3.9: Response noted, proposed later amendment addresses the City's comment. However, the initial comment by City staff was whether this policy could mean a development applicant could request a change to Table 3 and have that change be initiated by the Region? Staff are wondering what is the threshold for a Regionally-initiated amendment to change Table 3?	Changes to the Table 3 forecast may only be initiated by the Region. Amendments have to be undertaken in a manner that addresses the policies of the Regional Official Plan and Provincial planning documents.
STAT-075vii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.14.17.15: The Region's response is noted. It is understood through this response that an intensification strategy isn't thought of as strictly a "strategy document", but can be a combination of documents, plans, planning policies and zoning, and infrastructure planning and investment, for example, to achieve the intensification target prescribed in policy 5.4.17.13 in ROP consolidation	Noted.
STAT-21-075viii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.8.12: The Region's response is noted. It is understood through this response that an employment strategy is not thought of as strictly a "strategy document", but can be a combination of documents, plans, and recommendations from the Employment Strategy, for example, to achieve the employment forecast.	Noted.
STAT-21-075ix	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.6.19.2: Recommend inserting "balanced" to suggest a more balanced mix of uses. "5.6.19.2 Encourage a balanced mix of transit-supportive uses...."	Agreed. Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-075x	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.6.19.3: Suggest rewording from "Support a diverse range...." to " Recognize a diverse range..."and add "...where appropriate" in the end to emphasize the current and short-term context of the stations. Otherwise, it is unclear how this policy would be implemented as currently worded.	Agreed. Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-075xi	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.6.19.10: We still see the benefit in providing more clarity on what is defined as "in close proximity" and include in the wording the intent of gentle intensification (i.e., secondary units and multiplexes, and mid rise built form along corridors).	Policy updated to reflect stakeholder comments.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-075xii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.6.19.9 or 5.6.19.13: The current wording does not provide the cross reference noted. The current policy also references policies prior to the establishment of MTSAs but does not explain that once MTSAs are established, conversions would be municipality led. We agree with the intent identified in the response, but the wording is not reflective or clear. Suggest additional wording along the lines of “strategies to support and retain a balanced mix of employment and non-employment uses” either within this policy or as an additional policy.	A cross reference has been added to the policy formerly numbered 5.6.19.13. Various policies have been revised to address the mix of employment and non-employment land uses in MTSAs.
STAT-21-075xiii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.8.30: Both 2.2.5.7 and 2.2.5.8 speak to compatibility of non-employment in proximity to employment. The link to these Growth Plan policies will be helpful to reiterate land use compatibility considerations for any employment land conversion.	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-075xiv	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.8.43: wording still needs revision. This comment goes back to their previous comment “Awkward and unclear wording as it relates to ‘to determine if the employment forecasts if an adequate supply of land exists to...’. Consider rewording.”	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-075xv	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.6.20: 1. Further to the above under comment GM10: The following policies are from Mississauga Official Plan for the Designated Greenfield Area in the Churchill Meadows Neighbourhood. Based on the growth management work, are there amendments required to 16.4.1.1? Current Mississauga Official Plan Policies: 16.4.1 Designated Greenfield Area There are some lands in the Churchill Meadows Neighbourhood Area identified on Map 16-4.1 as a designated greenfield area pursuant to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. 16.4.1.1 The designated greenfield area will be planned to achieve a minimum density of 77 residents and jobs combined per hectare, excluding permitted environmental take-outs. 2. Schedule Z-1 shows the Ninth Line overlay in a colour different than the legend 3. Just wondered if it should be “road carrying capacity”? RE: ROP policy 5.10.34.2 To control access to Regional Roads through the planning and development process so as to: c) Optimize road carry capacity;	1. The policies for this area would not require updating as they were premised on 2031. 2. Noted, it is due to the blue shade under and has been fixed. 3. Policy will be updated accordingly.
STAT-21-	November	Eniber Cabrera	Section 2.14: Region’s responses provided clarifications to previous City’s	The comment is noted.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
075xvi	30, 2021	Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	comments. No further comments on the Greenlands System policies	
STAT-21-075xvii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.9.23: It is noted that Point 2 will be addressed by correcting the proposed new policy 5.9.23 to reflect the language in Planning Act Section 16(3). The words "new and existing residential development" should also be removed as it is believed Section 16(3) is speaking to permitting additional residential units within existing dwellings. City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions, especially after the Region's review of points 1 and 3. The wording of this policy is essential to directing and supporting local implementation.	Policy has been revised to remove the words "in new and existing residential development, redevelopment and intensification" based on feedback from local municipalities.
STAT-21-075xviii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.9.24: The Region's response is noted. Staff are also left wondering how does the "encouragement" in this policy interact with the "direction" of policy 5.9.23? Moreover, the use of "new" and "existing" implies this would be permitted in "new" eligible dwellings from the start of development when it is the belief that Section 16(3) of the Planning Act is speaking to permitting additional residential units within existing dwellings. The previous policy's "direction" would be further strengthened if policy 5.9.24 could be revised along the lines of: " <u>Support additional residential units in new and existing detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse development in Peel, where appropriate</u> ". City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions to improve local implementation.	Policies have been revised based on local municipal feedback. The previous 5.9.24 will be removed and the revised policy speaks to supporting local municipal initiatives on additional residential units.
STAT-21-075xix	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.9.26: The Region's response is noted. Based on what our Increasing Housing Choices in Neighbourhoods work has shown, local municipalities are better positioned to provide and disseminate educational materials, while looking to upper-tier municipalities for policy, development, and program support on ARUs (e.g., second unit renovation program with forgivable loans to further local implementation of second units and conversion of non-registered units to registered). For example, perhaps the policy could be broadened and revised along the lines of, " <u>Work with local municipalities to develop initiatives that further the implementation of additional residential units and shared housing arrangements.</u> " This could also provide a nod to the Region's current Home Share pilot. City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions to improve local implementation.	The policy will be revised with input from local municipalities. The revised policy speaks to supporting local municipal initiatives on additional residential units.
STAT-21-075xx	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga	Section 5.9.42: This Region's response is noted. In addition to the initial question posed by City staff, staff are wondering how does the "encouragement" in this policy interact with the "shall" direction from the Provincial Policy Statement policy 1.4.3. to provide for an appropriate	Policy will be revised with local municipal input to be broader in nature.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	range and mix of <i>housing options</i> (defined as "...The term can also refer to a variety of housing arrangements and forms such as, but not limited to life lease housing, co-ownership housing, co-operative housing, community land trusts, land lease community homes, affordable housing, housing for people with special needs, and housing related to employment, institutional or educational uses. Something to consider that has come up since this initial circulation, is how the Region's Home Share pilot fits into the Region's encouragement and support for shared housing arrangements.")? The Region has an opportunity through this policy to further support local municipal implementation of shared housing arrangements. For example, perhaps the policy could be revised along the lines of, " Support the local municipalities to support the implementation of shared housing arrangements to provide more housing options in Peel which meet the needs of specific population groups, including economic, accessibility, safety or lifestyle needs". City staff are interested in having a discussion with Regional staff on the thinking behind this policy and likely direction of the revisions to improve local implementation.	
STAT-21-075xxi	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 5.9.43: This Region's response is noted. City's comment still applicable. The Region and local municipalities have been working together to refine the Inclusionary Zoning framework and the City would like to review any revised policies.	The Inclusionary Zoning policy framework will be revised with input from local municipalities.
STAT-21-075xxii	November 30, 2021	Eniber Cabrera Planner, City Planning Strategies City of Mississauga eniber.cabrera@mississauga.ca	Section 1.2 Geographic Scope: Treaty No. 14, 1806 description does not match the description provided in the legend in the image on page 13.	Legend will be changed to reflect Treat No. 14 (1806).
STAT-21-075xxiii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.10 a): Is "accessible" a defined term?	Accessible is not a defined term.
STAT-21-075xxiv	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.10 b): Why is safety bundled with efficiency? Consider moving safety considerations to a dedicated sub-policy. Following Peel Vision Zero Road Safety – "No loss of life is acceptable due to a motor vehicle collision" consider replacing "redacting" with another word with a similar "stronger" connotation.	Will be modified to add "while reducing fatal and injury collisions" to b); however, a) notes safety as a primary concern.
STAT-21-	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works	Section 5.10.15: Comma to be removed. Consider having final draft text	Agreed – will deleted comma after fourth "and".

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
075xxv		Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	copy-edited.	
STAT-21-075xxvi	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.16 c): Only for safety? What about efficiency (for transit)?	Efficiency captured in preamble to policy.
STAT-21-075xxvii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.23: Note that GGH Transportation Plan is referenced below, in policy 5.10.32.25 but not here.	Policy 5.10.25 will be modified to remove reference to GGH Transportation Plan, keeping policies broad.
STAT-21-075xxviii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.25 c): We should take the opportunity to encourage transportation data to be updated and shared with local municipalities and Metrolinx.	Agreed, policy will be revised as follows: "Work with the Province and other levels of govt to improve the standardization, collection and sharing of transportation data..."
STAT-21-075xxix	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.21 c): Not sure if this completely addresses the need for a Complete Streets policy. It's not just safety and needs, but comfort as well.	The term "needs" is broad enough to cover off various aspects including comfort.
STAT-21-075xxx	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.29: Consider referencing this policy in 5.10.34.9	OP is intended to be read in its entirety.
STAT-21-075xxxi	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.31: Why is "where feasible" required? Isn't that a given? Suggest removing.	"Where feasible" accommodates where constraints exists.
STAT-21-075xxxii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of	Section 5.10.32.32: What "Provincial transit authorities"? Metrolinx? If only Metrolinx, then perhaps say "Metrolinx"	Agreed, policy will be modified to read "local municipalities or the Province".

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca		
STAT-21-075xxxiii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.33: What does functional mean in this context? If not clear, suggest removing.	Agreed. Policy will be revised to remove word "functional".
STAT-21-075xxxiv	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.35 a): GGH Trans. Plan included here, but not in Policy 5.10.23	Agreed. Policy 5.10.23 will be revised accordingly.
STAT-21-075xxxv	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.36 b): Isn't this included in a), above? ("a) provide two-way, all day commuter rail GO service on the Milton and Kitchener lines;")	Agreed, policy will be updated.
STAT-21-075xxxvi	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.36: a, b, and c all seem to overlap or are similar. Can they just be one?	Agreed, policy will be updated.
STAT-21-075xxxvii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.36 (e): Can the Region of Peel provide this service? If not, consider rephrasing policy.	preamble reads "work with" therefore Region's role would be advocacy where appropriate.
STAT-21-075xxxviii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.9.5.2.9: Is this removed because its repetitive with 5.10.32.36 d and 5.10.32.7?	Addressed through 5.10.28.
STAT-21-075xxxix	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.32.41 a): Are mobility hubs no longer part of Metrolinx plans (and have been replaced by MTSAs)?	Reference to mobility hubs has been removed from the OP and replaced with transportation hubs and MTSAs as appropriate.
STAT-21-	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works	Section 5.10.32.44: Why use the term "justified" here?	Term "justified" is used to ensure higher order transit projects are supported by an

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
075xl		Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca		accompanying TPAP process.
STAT-21-075xli	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.34.9: This needs to be balanced against the needs and safety requirements of other road users. Suggest reference policy 5.10.32.29 here.	OP is to be read in its entirety which includes policies supporting safety such as policy 5.10.32.29. See previous comment.
STAT-21-075xlii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.37.3: Why is this part of environmental section? Traffic congestion may lead to increased pollution but there may be context where it does not. Less traffic congestion does not always lead to fewer environmental impacts. Suggest removing.	Section 5.10 provides the policy framework for the Transportation System in Peel. Policies under subsection 5.10.37 Environmental Impact are specific to the transportation system and policy 5.10.37.3 is intended to promote the shift to sustainable modes from the vehicle which has a lesser environmental impact.
STAT-21-075xlili	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 5.10.38.2: Don't need to mention this in the OP, but this is an opportunity to work with Uber and Lyft to provide accessible services.	Noted for future Regional transportation studies.
STAT-21-075xliv	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 7.10.7: Very specific. Is this specificity required in an OP?	Yes, specificity is required to meet ROW requirements.
STAT-21-075xlv	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 7.10.13: Very specific, is this sort of specificity required?	Specificity is required to determine ROW requirements at intersections.
STAT-21-075xlvi	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Section 7.10.15: Very specific, is this sort of specificity required?	Specificity is required to determine ROW requirements at intersections.
STAT-21-075xlvii	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of	Section 7.10.16: What sort of access will be restricted? Vehicular, or also cycling and pedestrian access?	Reference to industrial connectors and movement of goods speaks to vehicular access, which is restricted through the controlled access by-law.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca		
STAT-21-075xlvi	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Schedule Y4: Airport Transit Hub should be included in this Schedule as well. It was included in Schedules Z1 and Y6.	Agreed. Schedule Y4 will be updated accordingly.
STAT-21-075xlix	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Schedule Y4: Consider removing the distinction in the schedule between GO Transit Rail lines based on frequency, just have one dark green line to represent two-way all-day service (Lakeshore, Kitchener, and Milton. The draft Rapid Transit Corridors Schedule Y4 is showing Lakeshore Rd as an LRT and not a BRT. Also, the Lakeshore West GO line as not including 15min service (which it is planned to have), while the Milton GO line is showing 15min service when that is only planned for rush hour and not all day.	Frequency speaks to Council endorsed advocacy position. LRT is shown along Lakeshore as Schedule Y4 is a long term concept and is based on the Metrolinx 2041 RTP. Map does not depict what is planned, rather what Peel's advocacy positions are. Lakeshore GO rail line will be updated to show 15 min service.
STAT-21-075l	July 30, 2021	Transportation & Works Department, Infrastructure Planning & Engineering Services Division, City of Mississauga susan.tanabe@mississauga.ca	Schedule Y8 and Y9: Could you clarify what this map represents? It seems that the full network is not depicted; this only seems to show separated trails, rather than network itself and doesn't show anything along Hurontario LRT corridor	Figure is being revisited to reflect comments received from the three local municipalities.
STAT-22-024i	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	Section 2.12.12.3.2: The City of Mississauga has a role to pay in supporting and enhancing the Agricultural System. <u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Add "other local municipalities" as follows: Work with the Town of Caledon as well as other local municipalities and other agricultural organizations...	Regional staff support this suggested revision.
STAT-22-024ii	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	Section 3.7.7 and 5.6.20.13: There is an opportunity to strengthen the two policies with reference to low carbon alternatives in the design of district energy. <u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Add the words "low carbon" before district energy (bolded).	Regional staff support this suggested revision.
STAT-22-024iii	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	Section 5.4.18.15: Why was the direction changed from "require" to "direct"? Is this tied to the Province's comments?	The text was updated to be consistent with wording used throughout the plan that "directs" the local municipalities.
STAT-22-024iv	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	Section 5.4.19.15: City staff are concerned that the second half of the policy could imply encouragement (and tacit approval) of higher densities for non-protected MTSAs prior to detailed study and review to delineate boundaries and set appropriate density targets.	The intent of the policy is to ensure local OPs have policies that protect planned MTSAs for future transit supportive development and active transportation connections. This policy supports the objectives of policy 2.2.4.8 in the Growth Plan which requires all MTSAs to be transit-supportive and achieve multimodal station access and connections. Other policies in the draft Regional Official Plan such as 5.6.19.18 provides direction on how proposed developments

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Consider eliminating the portion of the policy referencing protection of transit-supportive densities and uses, and retain protection for active transportation connections.	should be evaluated in MTSAs that have not met the requirements of Section 16(16) of the Planning Act.
STAT-22-024v	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	Section 5.6.19.13: Gentle intensification is not well defined and should be replaced by the words "modest growth" to avoid confusion and misinterpretation. <u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Replace the words "gentle intensification" with "modest growth". Alternatively, the Region could provide examples of gentle intensification built forms.	Regional staff support this suggested revision.
STAT-22-024vi	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	Section 5.9.11: City staff recommend more general language on the requirement for a housing assessment to allow for flexibility and changes based on continual evaluation of performance. The criteria for requiring a housing assessment are best dealt with through a local municipal terms of reference document. City staff are concerned that there may be operational challenges if the assessment outcomes must demonstrate conformity with all Regional policies. For example, based on the definition will a housing assessment be required where an IZ by-law is in effect? The housing assessment definition requires local municipalities to ensure that the housing assessment conforms to and is consistent with regional policies and definitions. What is the expectation around Peel-wide housing targets being satisfied on a specific site? At what point would we refuse a development application on the basis of what is stated in a housing assessment? <u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Remove numeric threshold requirement at the beginning of the policy. Re-consider the level of conformity and consistency for meeting Regional housing targets in an individual application to enable flexibility where the outcomes of a housing assessment are aligned with the Regional objectives (but may not necessarily meet housing targets specifically).	Policies have been updated to read that the housing assessment should be consistent with local and Regional housing objectives and policies. The definition of housing assessment has been updated to clarify that it is a document that can be a component of a Planning Justification Report and that local municipalities are required to ensure that the housing assessment is consistent with Regional policies and definitions. Demonstration of compliance with these policies would be addressed through the preparation of a housing assessment.
STAT-22-024vii	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	Section 5.9.25: Region held meetings and workshops with local municipalities where this policy was developed. Suggestion was made to reference "housing options" to better align with the Region and PPS definition. <u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Replace the words "housing types and arrangements" with "housing options".	Regional staff support this suggested revision.
STAT-22-024viii	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga	Section 5.9.37: City staff are unsure how to explicitly permit shared housing arrangements such as co-ownership, co-housing, and co-living in zoning especially. When we say "explicitly", does that look like: (1)	Regional staff support this suggested revision.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		christian.binette@mississauga.ca	<p>naming these housing arrangements specifically in the Zoning By-law and permitting them (which is unnecessary in Mississauga's case) or (2) enabling the built form conditions (e.g., appropriate max heights) that can support them?</p> <p>City staff are considering acknowledging the potential of these shared housing arrangements to improve housing options for Mississauga through the ongoing Mississauga Official Plan review.</p> <p><u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Replace the word "explicitly permit" to "enable" in the wording of the policy.</p>	
STAT-22-024ix	March 4, 2022	Christian Binette Planner, P&B/Planning Programs, City of Mississauga christian.binette@mississauga.ca	<p>Previous large site housing policy appears to have been deleted.</p> <p>City staff are supportive of general policy language stating the importance of having a range of housing based on income levels as a principle of good planning in larger developments outside of MTSAs similar to what was approved for Reimagining the Mall.</p> <p><u>Proposed Policy Change:</u> Consider including general policy language for the building of housing tailored to range of income levels for larger developments outside of MTSAs. City staff to meet with Regional housing staff to discuss further.</p>	<p>Peel-wide housing targets and the housing assessment are applicable to large developments.</p> <p>Objectives and policies speak to providing an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities, including affordable housing, to create complete communities that are inclusive to the needs of diverse populations and meet local need so that people can live in the community of their choice.</p> <p>Demonstration of compliance with these policies would be addressed through the preparation of a housing assessment.</p>
Conservation Authorities				
STAT-21-076i	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	CVC staff commend the Region of Peel for putting the environment on the forefront in 1.3 Guide to Reading this Plan. The 'environment first' approach sets the stage for how the various policy layers come into play, but it also acknowledges future growth pressures and carves out the importance of natural heritage protection while balancing growth demands. CVC staff are pleased to see the Region continuing this forward-thinking approach to Regional Official Plan policy writing.	Comment noted.
STAT-21-076ii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	CVC staff support the clarification on Figures, as often times figures depicting land use can be confusing to the general public, and clarity in terms of updates and potential revisions is key to highlight.	Comment noted.
STAT-21-076iii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Suggest revising the term 'ecosystem' to 'natural heritage system' (NHS) as this is more current language and all encompassing of ecosystems as whole.	The use of the term "ecosystem" is appropriate as the Official Plan takes a holistic approach concerned with air quality, climate change and energy, and water resources in addition to natural heritage. Comments received from Indigenous communities expressed an interest in the Region acknowledging a broad, holistic perspective of the environment, air, land, and water that is consistent with the current wording of the Plan. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076iv	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Chapter 2: Natural Environment - recognizing that the term 'natural environment' is more public facing and easier to understand, there remains the opportunity to begin to introduce the term 'natural heritage system' within this chapter and throughout the Official Plan. The term 'natural heritage system' is current and is common language found in many official plans. It is a planning term that should be more prevalent in	See the response to the previous comment (STAT-21-076iii). No change is recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			the Peel Official Plan. Further, the consistency of using one term to describe the natural environment is recommended. In the introduction of Chapter 2 alone the terms 'natural environment', 'ecosystem', 'natural areas', and 'natural system' are used. Consistency allows for direct clarity. As such staff recommend the usage of the term 'natural heritage system'.	
STAT-21-076v	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Page 11: Suggest rewording this paragraph "Large environmental systems interact with smaller ecosystems..." It is unclear and if the intent is to introduce climate change, then that should be the focal point. Also, the term 'climate system' should be defined.	The intent is to make it clear that the policies embody a recognition that large environmental systems impact on conditions in smaller ecosystems and vice versa. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076vi	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.2 Goal: Consider using the term 'natural heritage system' over 'natural environment'. Unless the definition of 'natural environment' is different than NHS. If this goal is intended more broadly to include human health, air quality, noise etc. then it may be appropriate, however it is recommended that the term NHS be used for consistency. Once appropriate terminology is decided upon, it should be then implemented throughout.	See the response to the earlier comment (STAT-21-076iii). No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076vii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.3.5: This is a good policy however the intent is unclear. This policy appears to be a development driven policy, whereby impacts to NHS are assessed as a result of development, however the intent should be prevention of negative impacts as a result of development and/or appropriate mitigation. The policy as such, is open ended, allowing the Region to participate in or support these studies but with no further direction or prescription.	This policy represents a commitment to participate in studies that will provide an information base and guidance for planning and for development review. Policy direction respecting development is addressed in subsequent policies. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076viii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.3.6: It is unclear how the Region regulates lands exposed to natural hazards. This is the jurisdiction of the conservation authorities. Suggest revising to include "support local conservation authorities" in regulating said land.	The policy direction clarifies that the identification and regulation is to occur "jointly" with the local municipalities and conservation authorities. The Region's role is provided through the direction of the Regional Official Plan. The subsequent policies in the Region's role indicate that the Region discourages development in inappropriate locations, such as lands with natural hazards. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076ix	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.4: Climate system - please define the term. Again, consistency in terminology is key and should be reviewed throughout the section.	The climate system is a commonly defined term in scientific literature including in reports prepared by the International Panel on Climate Change. The IPCC's technical summary is provided below: "is an interactive system consisting of five major components: the atmosphere, the hydrosphere, the cryosphere, the land surface and the biosphere, forced or influenced by various external forcing mechanisms, the most important of which is the Sun". It is not recommended that a definition be added to the Regional Plan.
STAT-21-076x	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.6: Water resources system - CVC staff support the inclusion of this new section however note that many new terms are introduced here that should be defined in the glossary and italicized accordingly.	Relevant terms are defined in the Plan when needed for interpretation of the policy. Regional staff will review the current list of defined terms and determine if additional definitions are warranted. No changes are recommended at this time.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-076xi	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.6.19.4 (f): This is an all-encompassing policy that is supported by CVC however it includes a lot of information that could be separated out into sub policies for more focus and ease of review. Recommend that this policy be restructured to provide direction and recommendations for the WRS and NHS respectively. Further, this policy provides guiding principles, and it should be more at the forefront - suggest moving it up to subset B. Suggest removing the term 'water' in sentence "water and natural heritage system...."as the NHS includes water.	The identification of directions and recommendations is one of the key components of a watershed plan and as such should be included in this policy, which satisfactorily identifies the topics to be addressed. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076xii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.7: Consider changing the term "Source Water Protection" to "Drinking Water Source Protection" to be more consistent with the terminology used in Source Protection Plans. Also please include the date of the Clean Water Act (2006).	The title of this section is intended to be consistent with the approved Source Protection Plans. The introductory paragraph clarifies that the subject matter is drinking water. For consistency, the drafting of the Regional Official Plan is not including the year when referencing legislation. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076xiii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.7.2: Recommend revising or adding additional wording/policy which states "mitigate existing significant drinking water threats and ensure activities do not become a significant drinking water threat" to be consistent with language in the SPP (currently the policy does not address existing significant drinking water threats, only a drinking water threat).	The intent of the official plan policies is to provide direction during a process under the Planning Act when a development is proposed. The policies as written would be applicable when a development application for an existing drinking water threat is proposed. No change to the policy is required.
STAT-21-076xiv	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.7.12: Suggest/recommend that the wording for the listed threats is revised to be consistent with the wording of the prescribed 21 threats under the Clean Water Act, 2006 (listed on p. 28 in the CTC SPP).	The wording is intended to be appropriate and applicable in an official plan. For example, the wording in the source protection plans address "operation and maintenance" or "application" of material. Wording which regulates the actions of the user is not appropriate in an official plan.
STAT-21-076xv	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.7.13: Waste disposal sites: Recommend including wording "where the storage or generation of waste would be a significant drinking water threat" to be consistent with wording in the CTC SPP (WST-5 policy).	Policy 2.7.13 will be revised to read as follows: "Direct the Town of Caledon to prohibit the use of land for the following types of waste disposal facilities in wellhead protection areas A and B with a vulnerability score of 10, wellhead protection area E with a vulnerability score of 9 and issue contributing areas for nitrates or pathogens where the use would be a significant drinking water threat: " The above change will clarify the circumstances where waste disposal facilities are considered a significant drinking water threat, subject to prohibition in the source protection plan.
STAT-21-	November	Dorothy di Berto	Section 2.7.14: Septic systems – vacant lots of record: CTC SPP directs	Policy 2.7.14 is consistent with the CTC Source Protection Plan. The reference to the term

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
076xvi	29, 2021	Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	municipalities to adopt OP policies that required the enactment or amendment of Site Control By-laws containing provisions for siting and design of septic systems. Consider revising policy to require site plan control for existing vacant lots of record to ensure siting and design of on-site septic systems is optimized in relation to significant drinking water threats instead of restriction (SWG-3 policy in CTC SPP).	'restrict' is not a prohibition. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076xvii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.8: This section describes Lake Ontario but fails to include that the Lake Ontario shoreline is also characterized by hazards associated with dynamic beaches, wave uprush and erosion. Reference to conservation authorities is missing here and should be included given our role in regulating the Lake Ontario shoreline to protect and manage those hazards.	Revisions to the policies in Section 2.8 have been revised to acknowledge and provide direction for the Lake Ontario shoreline and associated hazards. The policies currently do reference the conservation authorities. Change to the Preamble are not recommended. See below for changes to Policy 2.8.2.
STAT-21-076xviii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.8.2: Suggest revising the last sentence "...and it's shoreline and associated hazards".	Section 2.8.2 will be revised as follows: "Encourage the City of Mississauga, the conservation authorities and the appropriate agencies to develop and implement an Integrated Shoreline Management Plan for Lake Ontario and its shoreline and associated hazards."
STAT-21-076xix	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.12.9 (g): Please define 'small scale structures' or keep consistent terminology such as 'accessory structures'.	The terminology is consistent with Policy 4.2.3.1 g) of the Growth Plan. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076xx	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Page 98: Greenlands system - the rationale for including Escarpment Natural Areas and Escarpment Protection Areas as natural heritage features and areas is unclear; these are designations within the Plan Area and each designation has applicable objectives in terms of development (and are already included separately in 2.14.5h). However similar to the other Provincial Plans, the NEC also identifies Key NH and Hydrologic Features that are to be protected and where possible enhanced (these features are not limited to a particular designation). Designations do not fit the form of the NHS such as components (i.e., features). It is the NEC key features that should be incorporated / included into this list of Greenland System Natural heritage features and areas, rather than the Designation, if there are attempts at merging. Additionally, if a merge is intended, then this Greenlands System list should ensure that it incorporates the key NH and hydrologic features included in the various provincial plans (as per PG. 97) at minimum.	The Greenlands System includes linkages as well as natural features and areas. Escarpment Natural Areas and Escarpment Protection Areas are included as constituting important components of the Greenlands System, not as natural features and areas. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076xxi	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.14.12: CVC staff support the proposed exception policies for the Core Areas and note that specifically for subsection biv) the term 'compensation' should be revised to 'offsetting'. Staff also note that mitigation and offsetting are not the same thing and as per the mitigation hierarchy, offsetting is the last option, after mitigation is considered. As such, offsetting is not a mitigation option, and we suggest are rewording of this policy to further clarify when offsetting can be used (after mitigation option have been exhausted). Notwithstanding, CVC staff are pleased to see the modernization of these policies and the	Policy 2.14.12 b) iv) (now renumbered 2.14.16) will be revised as follows to clarify the distinction between mitigation and compensation: "iv) where ecosystem compensation is determined to be appropriate and feasible, including for essential infrastructure, it may be considered as a mitigation option in accordance with local municipal or conservation authority ecosystem compensation guidelines." Regional staff are not recommending changing "compensation" to "offsetting". The terms have similar meaning.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			acknowledgement of CA based offsetting tools and guidelines. Notably, CVC has produced Ecosystem Offsetting Guidelines which will be of great assistance in these unique circumstances.	
STAT-21-076xxii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.14.14 (f): Includes habitat of threatened and endangered species however this criterion has been removed from the Core Areas list in 2.14.8. Please clarify.	Policy 2.14.15 states that development and site alteration are not permitted in Core Areas, except for certain identified uses. Those exceptions are subject to conditions set out in Policy 2.14.16. The PPS sets out policy specific to threatened and endangered species which differs from the Core Area policies in making exceptions subject to provincial and federal requirements. Thus, it would not be appropriate to list habitat of threatened and endangered species as Core Areas and subject to the Core Area policies. Habitat of threatened and endangered species is listed under Natural Areas and Corridors and subject to a specific policy that conforms to the PPS (2.14.36).
STAT-21-076xxiii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.14.19: Suggest revise to “Direct municipalities to include policies in their official plans that require the maintenance of pre to post development wetland water balance by reducing impervious areas within the wetland catchment and/or by the implementation of best management practices, where feasible and in consultation with the conservation authority”.	See response to TRCA comment STAT-21-421xxix.
STAT-21-076xxiv	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.14.29: CVC staff support this policy however it provides no further direction. It may be a good opportunity to offer a next step such as “...and opportunities to enhance or restore should be implemented as applicable”.	The requirement to restore damaged or destroyed Core Areas of the Greenlands system including Core Woodlands is addressed in Policy 2.14.17. Policy 2.14.29 (now renumbered 2.14.28) is simply providing further interpretation with respect to Core Woodlands. The restoration should be mandatory and not ‘encouraged’ as guided by Policy 2.14.17. General direction for Greenlands System restoration and enhancement is provided in other policies of the Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076xxv	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.14.36: CVC staff support this policy and suggest revising the term ‘compensation’ to ‘offsetting’ here and throughout the document for consistency.	The terminology is consistent with CA guidelines referenced in the development of the policy. The terms are understood to have the same or similar meaning. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076xxvi	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.16: Introductory paragraph should be revised to imply that natural hazards exist on the landscape regardless if there is development, human influence or only when they will impact life and property. Suggest revising to ‘...condition and processes result in hazards which may affect people and structures...’	The intent of the wording is to communicate the circumstances under which natural hazards pose a threat to human life and property. No amendment to the text is necessary.
STAT-21-076xxvii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.16: Second paragraph discusses the various hazards however it should be noted that floodplains are always susceptible to flooding and therefore the notation about floodplains that are susceptible to flooding is irrelevant. Further it is unclear if there is a clear distinction between riverines and valleys. Suggest using valleys or valley lands for consistency.	The intent of the list of hazards is to clarify for the reader which natural hazards or potential hazards are dealt with in this section of the Plan. No change to the policy is required.
STAT-21-076xxviii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.16.2: Please clarify what is meant by ‘human-made hazards’. Also, assuming this is different than natural hazards, please separate the two policies.	The definition for human made hazards is provided in the introduction to Section 2.16. No change to the policy is required.
STAT-21-076xxix	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning	Section 2.16.2: Suggest revising this policy to including wording related to the protection of life and property through proper hazards management,	Objectives 2.16.1 and 2.16.2 will be amended as follows:

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	not just limiting social disruption.	2.16.1 To ensure that <i>development</i> and <i>site-alterations</i> are not permitted in areas where site conditions or <i>their</i> location, including on lands containing human-made hazards , may pose a danger risk to public safety, public health or result in property damage. 2.16.2 To encourage a coordinated approach to the use of the land and the management of water in areas subject to flooding in order to minimize social disruption, and mitigate risk to public safety, public health and property damage.
STAT-21-076xxx	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.16.4: Suggest rewording to be more consistent with O. Reg 686/21 awareness of areas important for management of natural hazards including: wetlands, river/stream valleys..." etc.	The objectives are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, which is concerned with directing development away from areas of natural or human-made hazards and mitigating risks. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-076xxxi	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.16.5 d): It is unclear how the Region will 'regulate' land uses within the various hazard lands as this is the role of the CA. Further, floodplains are considered hazardous lands, so the addition of the term is not necessary when including 'hazardous lands' in the policy.	The policy is providing direction to the local municipalities, in consultation with the Conservation Authorities.
STAT-21-076xxxii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.16.8: CVC staff support the inclusion of LID promotional policy; however, it appears slightly out of place under the Natural Hazards section. Suggest expanding and providing purpose such as "...in effort to mitigate impacts associated with hazardous lands".	It is recommended that the Policy 2.16.8 be revised as follows: 2.16.8 Require the implementation of low impact development and green infrastructure stormwater management practices in accordance with provincial requirements and guidelines to reduce risks associated with natural hazards.
STAT-21-076xxxiii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 2.16.12.2: Please remove reference to CAs in this policy as CAs do not regulate hazardous lands associated with wildfires.	The policy states "in consultation with the conservation authority". In order to implement the policy CA expertise related to forest types may be required. No change to the policy wording is required.
STAT-21-076xxxiv	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 5.4.18.7 a): Please amend to be consistent with language in other sections of the OP. Natural Heritage Systems (NHS) are typically all encompassing including natural areas, natural heritage features and associated hazards. Suggest simplifying by using the term NHS or referring to Core Greenlands as generally prohibitive areas. Suggest also using the term hazardous lands over floodplains, as there are other hazards that impact development and greenfield development should have consideration for.	Policy 5.4.18.7 a) (now renumbered 5.4.19.6) identifies the lands to be excluded in determining compliance with greenlands density targets as set out in Policy 2.2.7.3 a) of the Growth Plan. The wording in the draft ROP is consistent with the Growth Plan. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076xxxv	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 5.6.18: Amend introduction to use the term 'natural heritage system' rather than just 'natural heritage' in second paragraph.	The preamble is intended to refer broadly to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076xxxvi	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 5.6.20: CVC staff support this section on Designated Greenfield Areas.	Comment is noted.
STAT-21-076xxxvii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 5.6.20.12: Consolidate last piece speaking to open space, valley lands etc. and use the term 'natural heritage system' for consistency.	It is recommended that the Policy 5.6.20.12 be modified as follows: "Direct local municipalities to include official plan policies that require community or neighbourhood block plans to implement the policies of any new Secondary Plans and the recommendations of the subwatershed study on a sub area basis in order to co-ordinate"

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				<u>commercial and industrial sites and layout/function of open space corridors, valley lands, woodlands and other natural features natural heritage systems and features, including linkages and enhancement areas, including and storm water management.”</u>
STAT-21-076xxviii	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 5.10.37.2: This section offers a good opportunity to include reference to ecological offsetting as necessary for major transportation and to reduce environmental impacts.	Comment is noted. The provision of public infrastructure, including transportation, is subject to environmental legislation and environmental assessment requirements including requirements to consider alternatives that avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts. Ecological offsetting may be considered in that process in accordance with relevant guidance and/or approval requirements (e.g., Endangered Species Act). It is not recommended that Regional Official Plan objectives or policy require ecological offsetting as mandatory in all projects as requirements will vary project to project. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-076xxxix	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 7.6 Sustainability: CVC staff support the modification of this section as a stand-alone and support the expanded language the informs forward-thinking policy application.	Comment is noted.
STAT-21-076xl	November 29, 2021	Dorothy di Berto Senior Manager, Planning CVC dorothy.diberto@cvc.ca	Section 7.9.5, 7.9.6, 7.9.7 and 7.9.9: CVC staff support the improved section on the Natural Environment.	Comment is noted.
STAT-21-421i	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	In general, the draft ROPA policies and new chapter structure represent positive changes for synergies and consolidation of policy topic areas, as well as carry forward many good policies already found in the existing ROP. TRCA commends the Region for an increased emphasis on a natural heritage systems approach, identification and protection of a water resources system, and the role of these policies in preparing for the impacts of a changing climate change. TRCA is pleased to see that an updated systems approach is applied to identify and implement the Region’s Greenlands System and WRS, while also recognizing and addressing related climate change impacts through a suite of integrated policies, including those pertaining to a “Climate System”.	Comment noted.
STAT-21-421ii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	TRCA staff support the inclusion of new policies to further protect the environment and mitigate risk from natural hazards, including, but not limited to: those that protect, restore and enhance the Region’s NHS; support the use of ecosystem compensation guidelines; require infrastructure and watershed planning studies to protect, improve or restore water quality and quantity; and require the appropriate use of low impact development and green infrastructure approaches to mitigate climate change impacts, and to sustainably manage stormwater.	Comment noted.
STAT-21-421iii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 1.3 – last paragraph: Consider replacing “ecosystem” with “natural heritage system”. Based on the provincial definition of NHS, it incorporates the feature and function components of the ecosystem and its processes. Using the term natural heritage system throughout the	The use of the term “ecosystem” is appropriate as the Official Plan takes a holistic approach concerned with air quality, climate change, energy, and water resources in addition to natural heritage. Comments received from Indigenous communities expressed an interest in the Region acknowledging a broad, holistic perspective of the environment, air, land, and water

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			document will help strengthen the link with the provincial language/guidance.	that is consistent with the current wording of the Plan. No change is recommended.
STAT-21-421iv	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 1.6: This section recognizes the value in taking a systems-based approach, but again, to better define all features, connections, and functions, we suggest replacing “ecosystem” with “natural heritage system (NHS).”	See previous comment. No change recommended.
STAT-21-421v	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 1.6: The overarching theme is currently focused on sustainability. Please consider adding resilience to this theme. The latter directly acknowledges the climate change impacts and highlights the Region’s commitment towards climate adaptation and mitigation. The two concepts are complementary and usually used together for a healthy future. In addition, there is a paragraph on inclusion and equity – the Region can strengthen this piece by extending the overarching theme to include “sustainability, resilience, and equity” right at the start.	Revisions to the first paragraph of Section 1.6 acknowledges that the aim of the Plan is to “create a strong, vibrant and resilient Region that can adapt to changes while meeting the environmental, social, economic and cultural needs of the community”, with the remainder of Section 1.6 providing more clarity on the larger overarching goals of the Plan, including new language on equity. No changes are recommended. Further, an update will be included in Section 1.7 to further clarify a key goal of the Official Plan related to climate change and resilience as follows: 1.7.3 To ensure the Region is resilient and adapted to a changing climate and planned in a manner that works towards achieving net zero emissions over time.
STAT-21-421vi	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 1.7.1: Consider rewording to “to create sustainable, resilient, and equitable communities...”	The recommended revision to Section 1.7.1 will be added as suggested.
STAT-21-421vii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 1.7.2: Consider replacing “ecosystem” with NHS throughout the document, and rewording “preserve” to “protect”, and clarifying the second part of this statement, “and enhance the environmental...”	See response to STAT-21-421iii. No change recommended.
STAT-21-421viii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.1: Third paragraph speaks to the climate resilience that should be connected to the overarching theme (see [STAT-21-421v]).	See response to STAT-21-421v. No change recommended.
STAT-21-421ix	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.1: Consider changing “natural areas” to “natural heritage system”.	It is recommended that the text be modified as follows to be consistent with the shift to a natural heritage systems approach: The Region of Peel recognizes its responsibility to maintain, protect, restore and enhance natural areas natural systems in Peel.
STAT-21-421x	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	System 2.3.2 and 2.3.3: Please replace “ecosystem” with “natural heritage system” in these policies	See response to STAT-21-421iii. No change recommended.
STAT-21-421xi	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.3.3: Consider rewording to “Protect, restore, and enhance the quantity and the quality of the natural heritage system to improve ecosystem and watershed health jointly with the local municipalities, conservation authorities and provincial agencies”. Suggest including the PPS definition of natural heritage system, which includes water, land, and biota, so that it may not need to be repeated here.	See response to STAT-21-421iii. No change recommended.
STAT-21-	December 9,	Mary-Ann Burns	Section 2.3.3: Consider replacing “ecological integrity” with an alternate	The term “ecological integrity” is used in provincial plans. No change is recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
421xii	2021	Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	term of “ecosystem and watershed health” or “ecological function” throughout the document. Ecological integrity is used throughout the document and based on the definition in the glossary, it implies unimpaired from human activity, which is not reflective of the highly urbanized landscapes in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.	
STAT-21-421xiii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.3.5: Consider adding “environmental studies and monitoring programs.”	Direction addressing environmental studies and monitoring is already addressed in policies. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xiv	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.4.7: Consider adding the underlined text: “In collaboration with local municipalities and conservation authorities, support and undertake climate change mitigation and adaptation planning and <u>implementation for resilient ecological, economic, and social systems</u> through coordinated strategies, plans and actions in accordance with accepted frameworks and provincial guidance.”	Section 1.6 provides the overarching themes of the Plan including environmental, social, economic and cultural themes, with the preamble of Section 2.4 providing additional details addressing the climate system, to be implemented through the goal and objectives. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xv	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.4.8: Consider adding the underlined text: “In collaboration with local municipalities and conservation authorities, support and undertake <u>natural systems</u> , community sector, and infrastructure risk and vulnerability assessments and identify strategies and actions that will reduce vulnerability and improve the resiliency of the Region to climate change.”	An update will be included in Section 2.4.8 as follows: <u>2.4.8 In collaboration with local municipalities and conservation authorities, support and undertake natural systems, community sector, and infrastructure risk and vulnerability assessments and identify strategies and actions that will reduce vulnerability and improve the resiliency of the Region to climate change.</u>
STAT-21-421xvi	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.6.9: In recognizing the benefits of Low Impact Development (LID), please also include the role LIDs play in mitigating impacts of development on natural heritage features (including sensitive surface water features (and hazards).	The policy will be amended as follows: 2.6.9 Require the use of low impact development and green infrastructure approaches, as appropriate, to mitigate and adapt to climate change impacts, <u>mitigate the impacts of development on natural heritage features</u> , support the efficient and sustainable use of water resources and to manage stormwater.
STAT-21-421xvii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.6.19.1: Consider adding “ <u>Support</u> , promote, and participate...”	The words “Promote” and “participate” explain the two ways in which the Region is supporting watershed planning. No change is needed.
STAT-21-421xviii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.6.20.9: Should include recognition of the significant role stormwater management plays in the protection, improvement, and restoration of natural heritage system functions.	The recognition of the benefits of stormwater on the natural heritage system can be made earlier in this section: 2.6.20.3 To manage stormwater to maintain the natural hydrologic cycle, <u>prevent an increased risk of flooding, reduce risks associated with flooding</u> and stream erosion, replenish ground water resources and protect, improve or restore water quality <u>and natural heritage system functions</u> . 2.6.20.9 Promote and implement stormwater management practices to maintain the natural hydrologic cycle, <u>prevent an increased risk of flooding, reduce risks associated with flooding</u> and stream erosion, replenish ground water resources and protect, improve or restore water quality <u>and natural heritage system functions</u> .
STAT-21-	December 9,	Mary-Ann Burns	Section 2.7.30 b): Could be revised to improve conformity to related	The policy will be amended as follows:

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
421xix	2021	Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	recharge reduction policy (REC-1) from the CTC Source Protection Plan (SPP). The CTC SPP Explanatory Document specifies that the policy intends to ensure planning applications for larger-scale development on lands where permitted uses provide the greatest potential for reducing recharge (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial, residential subdivision, etc.) don't become a significant drinking water threat for water quantity. As written, the policy creates ambiguity regarding what constitutes a "major" land use, without regard for the types of applications specified in the REC-1 policy and explanatory document. We suggest the following revision: "Requiring that all site plan and subdivision applications to <u>facilitate major development</u> for major -residential commercial, industrial and institutional uses provide a water balance assessment..."	2.7.30 Requiring that all site plan and subdivision applications for major residential, commercial, industrial and institutional <u>uses development</u> provide a water balance assessment to the satisfaction of the municipality, which addresses each of the following requirements:
STAT-21-421xx	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.7.30 b): Note that "major development" is inconsistently italicized throughout the draft ROPA. We suggest a corresponding definition be included consistent with provincial policy as applicable (e.g., ORMCP) and consistent italicization of the term.	Staff will review the document for consistency. The reference to "major development" in the Regional Plan will have a different purpose and context depending on the purpose of the policy. One standard definition is not recommended.
STAT-21-421xxi	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.7.30 b): The definition of "existing threat activities" is defined in accordance with applicable source protection plans, as noted. Please be advised that that CTC Source Protection staff and the CTC Amendments Working Group are undertaking research and review of CTC SPP's current transition provision. Under the Clean Water Act, 2006, CTCs can implement a transition provision to outline circumstances under which a "future" drinking water threat activity, that would otherwise be prohibited, may be considered as "existing", even if the activity has not yet commenced. Review of the current transition provision is being undertaken with a view to recognizing circumstances where existing threat policies would apply to prescribed drinking water threat activities in regulated areas newly identified through an amendment to an Assessment Report (e.g., addition of a WHPA). As such, we recommend working with CTC SPA staff to ensure the ROPA reflects anticipated amendments to the CTC SPP.	Comment is noted.
STAT-21-421xxii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.11.32: Consider adding a policy that speaks to accounting for the habitat connectivity/linkages in the infrastructure section, as well as to require and participate in watershed planning to protect, improve, or restore the quality and quantity of water resources.	The policy 2.11.32 (renumbered 2.11.31) conforms to the ORMCP. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xxiii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.12: The ROPA rightly provides policy direction to Caledon and Brampton to adhere to the policies of the Greenbelt Plan for natural heritage and water resource protection and connections. TRCA suggests the ROPA could also provide direction to Mississauga with respect to section 3.2.6 of the Greenbelt Plan, External Connections.	The External Connections policies of the Greenbelt Plan have been revised and merged with the new Urban River Valley section (2.12.17) policies and mapping (Schedule X11 – renumbered Schedule B-5), which includes direction to all three local municipalities to designate and have regard for the Urban River Valley requirements. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xxiv	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.8, 2.14.14, and 2.14.15: Note that a significant policy gap exists in Ontario where wetland evaluations have not been undertaken. Where policies apply based on wetland significance, a policy is required that directs when and where an evaluation is required to be undertaken to determine significance. In the absence of an evaluation, there is	Comment noted. The Plan includes numerous policies requiring watershed and subwatershed plans and other environmental studies which would provide the basis for requiring wetland evaluations where appropriate. Policy 2.14.22 directs the local municipalities to study and evaluate wetlands as appropriate. No change is recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			difficulty in applying these policies.	
STAT-21-421xxv	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.15: Note that policy 2.14.15 incentivizes proponents to not undertake evaluations, rendering wetlands on their lands as PNAC. Please revise policy 2.14.15 to prevent inadvertently encouraging proponents to avoid wetland evaluations.	See response to previous comment (STAT-21-421xxiv).
STAT-21-421xxvi	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.15: Pleased to see (h) enhancement areas, buffers, and linkages and (i) other features and functional areas... included in the PNAC definition. Please consider adding “restoration opportunity” in (h) to be consistent with other points such as 2.14.16.	Enhancement areas as defined in the Glossary include areas with the potential for restoration. Modification to the policy is not required.
STAT-21-421xxvii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.17, 2.14.18: Consider including a policy requiring wetland evaluations under specific circumstances. We suggest revising policy 2.14.17 or 2.14.18 to reflect the following suggested wording, “...using evaluation procedures established by the Province, as amended from time to time, such as the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System”.	See response to earlier comment (STAT-21-421xxiv).
STAT-21-421xxviii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.17: The ROPA correctly recognizes that the Greenlands System and WRS are interrelated. It is recommended that the Region ensure consistency between the policies for the two systems. In particular, wetlands are both a feature of the WRS and NHS, including in provincial policies (e.g., Section 4.2.1.2 of the Growth Plan). Please consider this inter-relationship and revising policies accordingly, e.g., policy 2.14.17, as follows, “Recognize the environmental value of all <i>wetlands</i> as part of the Greenlands System and related Water Resource System in Peel and <i>support</i> their identification and protection through the land use planning process, <i>as appropriate.</i> ”	Policy 2.14.17 will be revised as requested (now renumbered 2.14.21).
STAT-21-421xxix	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.19: Appreciate the policy for wetland water balance but given the PPS requirement for no negative impacts, and that failing to provide adequate water balance to wetlands could have impacts, implementation of best management practices on an “if feasible” basis is not appropriate. Please revise this policy to require wetland water balance, where appropriate.	Policy 2.14.19 (renumbered 2.14.23) will be revised as follows: 2.14.23 Direct the local municipalities to include policies in their official plans that require pre-development wetland water balance to be maintained in areas proposed for development by limiting the area of impermeable surface within the wetland catchment or by using best management practices, where maintaining water balance has been determined to be feasible and appropriate in accordance with provincial policy and the policies of this Plan.
STAT-21-421xxx	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.28: This policy indicates that an exclusion for tree communities containing invasive species may be considered. While the ecological function of a community dominated by invasive species may be limited, it could still be considered a part of the broader system. The removal of any such feature without a suitable woodland replacement strategy would represent a loss of land base for the NHS. Ecosystem management strategies could be implemented to enhance these woodlands, while maintaining the general structure, which could be an effective long-term solution for helping to ensure no loss of overall natural cover. This type of management option would be strengthened if these communities were not excluded from the Core Area, NAC or PNAC designations but were afforded a modified designation recognizing the need for management. Please revisit the criteria for exemptions related to invasive species and explore alternatives recognizing the opportunities	The Core, NAC and PNAC woodland policies were comprehensively reviewed and updated through the previous Peel Region Official Plan Review (PROPPR) in accordance with the Peel-Caledon Significant Woodlands and Significant Wildlife Habitat Study with extensive input from CA staff. The policies, criteria and definitions were approved by the Province in Regional Official Plan Amendment 21B. The exclusions policy was carefully worded with input from a woodland ecologist retained by the Region with input from the CAs at the time. No changes to Policy 2.14.28 are recommended.

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			for management and the risk of removals if compensation is not provided.	
STAT-21-421xxxii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.35 – 38: Appreciate these policies that highlight the importance of the systems approach to implementing the Greenlands System and explicitly providing guidance on enhancement and restoration opportunities to improve ecological functions, including linkage areas and the adjacent/surrounding areas that contribute to the overall function of the natural heritage system/Greenlands System. Also, highlighting the importance of ecosystem compensation for net gain or no net loss is appreciated as this will provide an additional lens for the systems approach when opportunities may be limited on-site.	Comment is noted.
STAT-21-421xxxiii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.36: The proposed policy approach where removal and compensation for a feature is only an option where "...development or site alteration will not result in negative impacts" is flawed. It is not possible to fully remove a feature and have no negative impact. It is, however, possible to have no negative impacts on ecological function through a compensation scenario. An alternative policy approach that clearly provides the circumstances where compensation is an option would be more appropriate. Specifically identifying feature types and level of significance where compensation is an option would be preferred. Please revise this policy accordingly.	The Region's preference is to tie the policy to circumstances when consistency with the appropriate protection standard under the PPS can be demonstrated. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xxxiiii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.39: Consider adding a policy to, "Recognize the urban forest as an integral component of the ecosystem in urban settlements that contribute to improving natural heritage systems quality (or ecosystem health/integrity) and provide direction to incorporate urban forest in natural heritage system planning and management."	The preamble to Section 2.14.39 (renumbered 2.14.43) recognizes the urban forest as an integral component of the ecosystem in urban settlements. Sufficient policy direction for the urban forest is provided in Section 2.14.43. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xxxv	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.14.40.3: Consider adding the underlined "...promote <u>measures for early detection and rapid response, control, eliminate and/or manage</u> non-native invasive species and discourage the use of non-native invasive species plantings in new <u>and redevelopment</u> developments adjacent to the Greenlands System." This is especially important given that it is often redevelopment sites that are in highly urbanized areas where these types of species are prevalent.	Comment noted. Additional wording in the section not necessary. No change recommended.
STAT-21-421xxxvi	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Table 1: The table indicates that any woodland =/>>0.5 ha supporting a significant linkage function, as determined through a natural heritage study approved by the Region or area local municipality, would be considered NAC. Significant is italicized indicating that it is subject to a definition. Please ensure that significant linkage is defined or clarified within the ROPA.	The Core, NAC and PNAC woodland policies and criteria were comprehensively reviewed and updated through the previous Peel Region Official Plan Review (PROPPR) in accordance with the Peel-Caledon Significant Woodlands and Significant Wildlife Habitat Study with extensive input from CA staff. Definitions for the terms "significant" and "significant feature" were reviewed and determined to provide sufficient clarity for the purpose of the policy. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xxxvii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 2.16.10.5: This policy states that the Region will direct local municipalities to "Discourage the creation of additional tableland within <i>valley and stream corridors</i> ." TRCA is pleased with the overall intent of this section and in particular, this policy. However, we note that extension of tableland within valley and stream corridors is generally prohibited under TRCA's Living City Policies. We recommend	Regional staff agree. The policy will be revised as suggested to align with the CA regulatory authority and policies under the Conservation Authorities Act

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			strengthening the language to “generally prohibits” instead of “discourage.”	
STAT-21-421xxxvii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	<p>Section 2.16: To further enhance the implementation of provincial policy direction for natural hazards, TRCA recommends adding policies to be more specific to requiring local official plans and zoning by-laws to contain policies and/or mapping to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address floodplains, hazardous lands, hazardous sites and regulated lands; • Identify permitted uses and requirements for setbacks or buffers; • Address land use within and adjacent to hazardous lands and hazardous sites; • Identify approved Special Policy Areas and include their associated site-specific policies related to development and redevelopment. 	The additional direction as requested is currently provided in Section 2.16. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xxxviii	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 3.3: Consider speaking to agro-ecology that connects agricultural practices within the context of ecosystem health. It may be useful to include an objective and policy that explicitly speaks to the commitment to promoting agro-ecological practices and taking a systems approach to connect agriculture with ecosystem health.	The comment is noted and currently addressed in Section 3.3.21 broadly. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-421xxxix	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 5.9.23: This policy that encourages and supports local municipalities to permit additional residential units (ARUs) should emphasize that ARUs are generally not prohibited in floodplains, hazardous lands or sites, as per provincial policy (e.g., Section 3.1 of PPS) and CA policy and regulation.	The comment is noted. Policies prohibiting development and site alteration in flood plains are provided in Section 2.16.
STAT-21-421xl	December 9, 2021	Mary-Ann Burns Senior Manager, Provincial and Regional Policy, TRCA MaryAnn.Burns@trca.ca	Section 7.4.9.4: Among the conditions for the creation of lots, suggest that a condition be added to ensure natural hazards/hazardous lands are not fragmented through the creation of lots by consent as doing so would increase risk and not conform to the PPS requirement to direct development (including lot creation) outside natural hazards.	Section 7.4.9.4 addresses specific Regional matters and interests related to lot creation. Broad policy direction regarding compliance with provincial policy (interpreted to include natural hazards) is addressed in 7.4.9.3 and other policies. No changes recommended.
Prescribed Bodies				
STAT-21-077i	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 1.1 Introduction: Add to the list: "Recognize the importance of land use needs of public service facilities, which include educational facilities and programs planned by School Boards, to serve current and projected needs of residential growth areas in the Region of Peel. Any amendment to the Regional Official Plan or a local municipal Official Plan shall address the adequacy of public service facilities including publicly funded schools to support residential development"</p> <p>To provide policy that recognizes that new schools and additions are planned by School Boards based on enrolment in excess of capacity, minimizing student transitions, future enrolment growth, reduced need for portables, organization of school (e.g., Elementary K-8, Secondary 9-12), community partnerships, transportation savings.</p>	Addition of public service facilities being considered in ROP. Adding new purpose specifically speaking to this matter not appropriate in this section. Policies are reflected adequately elsewhere in the plan.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 defines "Public Service Facilities" as follows: "means land, buildings and structures for the provision of programs and services provided or subsidized by a government or other body, such as social assistance, recreation, police and fire protection, health and educational programs, long-term care services, and cultural services."</p> <p>PPS, 1.6.1, Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities: "Infrastructure and public service facilities shall be provided in an efficient manner that prepares for the impacts of a changing climate while accommodating projected needs. Planning for infrastructure and public service facilities shall be coordinated and integrated with land use planning and growth management so that they are: a) financially viable over their life cycle, which may be demonstrated through asset management planning; and b) available to meet current and projected needs."</p> <p>PPS, 1.6.5, Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities: "Public service facilities should be co-located in community hubs, where appropriate, to promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration, access to transit and active transportation."</p>	
STAT-21-077ii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 3.5.1 Recreation: Add: "school boards".</p> <p>Schools can offer community use recreational opportunities.</p>	Objective will be revised to include 'school boards' as an example of partnerships with agencies having the prime responsibility for recreation facilities.
STAT-21-077iii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 3.5 Recreation: Add as 3.5.10: "Promote safe and active pedestrian movement through walking, cycling and non-motorized forms of transportation between school sites and natural features, open spaces and parkland. Active transportation destinations should be clearly accessible for a variety of users and routes incorporated into natural features, open spaces and parkland should be demarcated. Active transportation routes providing passive recreation in urban areas should be elevated and include instructional barriers from motorized forms of transportation."</p> <p>School sites offer opportunity for connecting passive recreational areas of school sites with other natural features, open spaces, and parkland.</p>	The promotion of using active transportation for travel to school is addressed through Policy 5.10.32.26.
STAT-21-077iv	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 4.1 Growth Management Forecasts – Purpose: Add into last paragraph after "population" on page 165: "school enrolment and capacity".</p> <p>School enrolment is directly impacted by any increase or decrease in gross population of the Region of Peel.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>School enrollment is an important part of delivering the necessary infrastructure to support complete and healthy communities.</p> <p>Section 4.3.16 requires the Table 3 forecasts to be reviewed and updated jointly with the Province and local municipalities.</p> <p>Further Section 7.10.11.10 encourages school boards and other appropriate agencies to plan</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				capital expenditures consistent with the objective and policies in this Plan.
STAT-21-077v	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 4.3.6 Growth Management Forecasts – Objectives: Add after "workers": "including students and seniors".</p> <p>New growth should be planned in accordance with 8-80 Cities goals and priorities. This will help to maximize the amount of personal discretionary time and increases the overall quality of life of all age groups in the community.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>For the purpose of forecasting and measuring growth. We utilize people and jobs as the primary metrics, which is inclusive of sub-groups of residents and workers in Peel.</p> <p>Additional details on how the Region is planning for the goals and objectives of 8-80 Cities, please refer to 'Age-friendly' policies in this Plan</p>
STAT-21-077vi	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 4.3.8 Growth Management Forecasts – Population and Employment Forecasts – Policies: PDSB requests Region of Peel consider reviewing and assessing PDSB's Annual Planning Document (APD) on an annual basis.</p> <p>Student enrolment trends based on the Board's elementary and secondary enrolment growth over the past five years should also be used for the basis of this Plan for the planning of school sites and educational facilities (the enrolment gathering, and projection process is an annual undertaking, and a five-year projection can be provided to support this plan).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Region is required to plan for and accommodate population and employment growth in accordance with Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2020 to the Planning Horizon (2051).</p> <p>The Region works with the school boards in Peel by providing our latest planning forecasts and policies detailing where and how (i.e., greenfield vs intensification) development is anticipated to occur which may inform the school board projections and planning for school sites and facilities.</p>
STAT-21-077vii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 4.3.14 Growth Management Forecasts – Population and Employment Forecasts – Policies: Add policy after 4.3.14: "Direct municipalities to ensure the necessary infrastructure and the adequate supply of public service facilities and school sites are provided to meet current and projected needs of the growing population."</p> <p>PPS, 1.1.3.3., Settlement Areas: "Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for transit-supportive development, accommodating a significant supply and range of housing options through intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs."</p>	<p>A new policy was added to section 4.3 directing local municipalities to work with school boards to ensure public service facilities are in place to accommodate growth. Please note that staff intend to add specificity regarding planning for schools in secondary plan and block planning policies in section 5.6.20, while in the preambles to growth-related sections in the ROP higher level recognition of the need to plan for public service facilities will be added.</p>
STAT-21-077viii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.3.2 Regional Structure – General Policies: Add to 5.3.2: "d) Not located near existing elementary or secondary school sites or school catchment areas or ensure public service facilities are planned for accordingly in areas of residential expansion (such as in greenfields)."</p> <p>PPS, 1.1.3.7, Settlement Areas: "Planning authorities should establish and implement phasing policies to ensure: a) that specified targets for intensification and redevelopment are achieved prior to, or concurrent with, new development within designated growth areas; and b) the orderly progression of development within designated growth areas and the timely provision of the infrastructure and public service facilities required to meet current and projected needs."</p>	<p>This policy has not been modified as it is meant to address major technical / provincial policy limitations on growth.</p>

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-077ix	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	Section 5.4.9 Growth Management – Policies: Add to Section 5.4.9: "include public service facilities including schools". Schools are an integral part of any complete community. With regards to alternative projects, the government amended the Education Act in June 2019, through Bill 108 - More Homes, More Choice Act 2019. This legislation provided school boards with more flexibility to apply EDC revenue to support lower-cost alternatives to site acquisition and provided EDC eligible school boards the option to enter into a "Localized Education Development Agreement (LEDA)".	Policy updated to reflect comment
STAT-21-077x	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	Section 5.4.17 Intensification – Policies: Add: "Direct municipalities to ensure the necessary infrastructure and the adequate supply of public service facilities and school sites are provided to meet current and projected needs of the growing population." PPS, 1.1.2, Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient and Resilient Development and Land Use Patterns: "Sufficient land shall be made available to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 25 years, informed by provincial guidelines. However, where an alternate time period has been established for specific areas of the Province as a result of a provincial planning exercise or a provincial plan, that time frame may be used for municipalities within the area. Within settlement areas, sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, designated growth areas. Nothing in policy 1.1.2 limits the planning for infrastructure, public service facilities and employment areas beyond a 25-year time horizon."	Please refer to Chapter 5.5 for Regional direction on public service facilities.
STAT-21-077xi	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	Section 5.5.6 Regional Urban Boundaries – Policies: Add to 5.5.6 after "such as": "the adequate supply of public service facilities and school sites to meet current and projected needs of the growing population." PPS, 1.1.2, Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient and Resilient Development and Land Use Patterns: "Sufficient land shall be made available to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 25 years, informed by provincial guidelines. However, where an alternate time period has been established for specific areas of the Province as a result of a provincial planning exercise or a provincial plan, that time frame may be used for municipalities within the area. Within settlement areas, sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, designated growth areas. Nothing in policy 1.1.2 limits the planning for infrastructure, public service facilities and employment areas beyond a 25-year time horizon."	Policy updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-077xii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board	Section 5.6 Urban System: Add to Policies: "Direct municipalities to ensure the necessary infrastructure and the adequate supply of public service facilities and school sites are provided to meet current and	A new policy was added to section 4.3 directing local municipalities to work with school boards to ensure public service facilities are in place to accommodate growth.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>projected needs of the growing population."</p> <p>PPS, 1.1.2, Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient and Resilient Development and Land Use Patterns: "Sufficient land shall be made available to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 25 years, informed by provincial guidelines. However, where an alternate time period has been established for specific areas of the Province as a result of a provincial planning exercise or a provincial plan, that time frame may be used for municipalities within the area. Within settlement areas, sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, designated growth areas. Nothing in policy 1.1.2 limits the planning for infrastructure, public service facilities and employment areas beyond a 25-year time horizon."</p>	This is a better location for the policy under section 4.3 "population and employment forecasts" as it applies to the entire Region of Peel, not only the Urban system.
STAT-21-077xiii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	Section 5.6.17 Strategic Growth Areas: Pleased to see Public Service Facilities included.	Noted.
STAT-21-077xiv	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.6.17.9 Strategic Growth Areas – Policies: Add after "that:": "Ensures necessary infrastructure and the adequate supply of public service facilities and school sites are provided to meet current and projected needs of the growing population."</p> <p>PPS, 1.4.3, Housing: "Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities to meet projected market-based and affordable housing needs of current and future residents of the regional market area by: d) promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed;"</p>	Refer to Policy 5.6.1.7.9.d which requires the phasing and sequencing of development in an orderly manner, co-ordinated with regional and local infrastructure, transit, and services.
STAT-21-077xv	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	Section 5.6.17.13 Strategic Growth Areas – Policies: Pleased to see Public Service Facilities included.	Noted.
STAT-21-077xvi	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.6.17.14 Strategic Growth Areas – Policies: Development of shared parking spaces between schools and municipal parks should be encouraged for efficient land uses, reduce environmental impacts, and mitigate the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Parks should be located adjacent to school sites to facilitate active transportation and access to additional community recreational space. Enhancing parking space policies will establish the policy framework for more shared opportunities. Cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication is not a requirement for school boards under the Planning Act.</p>	Noted
STAT-21-	November	Nick Gooding	Section 5.6.18.5a Urban Growth Centres and Regional Intensification	A new policy was added to section 4.3 directing local municipalities to work with school boards

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
077xvii	30, 2021	Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Corridor: PDSB requests adding a policy stating: "Any high-density institutional employment uses in Urban Growth Centres and Regional Intensification Corridors, such as educational space in public service facilities, should include joint use facilities, community hubs and alternative projects where possible." PDSB requests adding a policy stating: "The provision of adequate school site size to accommodate students should be assessed in all areas of high-density residential development within Urban Growth Centres and Regional Intensification Corridors."</p> <p>PPS, 1.6.5, Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities: "Public service facilities should be co-located in community hubs, where appropriate, to promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration, access to transit and active transportation."</p> <p>Examples of Alternative Projects: Alternative parking arrangements such as underground parking garages or off-site parking, additional construction cost attributed to vertical construction, alternative play area enhancements, pedestrian access improvements.</p>	<p>to ensure public service facilities are in place to accommodate growth. Section 4.3 "population and employment forecasts" applies to the entire Region of Peel, including the urban system, urban growth centres, and Regional intensification corridor.</p> <p>The draft ROP has also been revised to include more specificity regarding planning for schools and public service facilities in secondary plan and block planning policies in section 5.6.20</p>
STAT-21-077xviii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.6.19 Major Transit Station Areas: Add: "Direct local municipalities to ensure the provision of adequate school sites and school accommodation, joint use and community hub projects."</p> <p>PPS, 1.6.5, Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities: "Public service facilities should be co-located in community hubs, where appropriate, to promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration, access to transit and active transportation." PPS, 1.1.3.3, Settlement Areas: "Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for transit-supportive development, accommodating a significant supply and range of housing options through intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs."</p>	Chapter updated to reflect comment.
STAT-21-077xix	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.6.20.13 Designated Greenfield Area: Add: "the provision and integration of adequate educational spaces in public service facilities."</p> <p>Community block plans of new neighbourhoods and communities should address the provision and integration of adequate educational spaces in public service facilities. Schools and their adequate capacity are a critical part of any sustainable community design that serve a range of housing options, including affordable housing, walkable communities, transit supportive densities and designs, financial sustainability, attention to detail in the design of the public realm, and respecting natural and cultural heritage.</p>	Agreed. Policy revised to be more inclusive of public service facilities.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-077xx	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.6.20.14.9 Greenfields – New Community Area: Add: "Provide direction to local municipalities to plan for the adequate provision of school sites and public service facilities."</p> <p>The 2051 New Community Areas are new Designated Greenfield Areas for accommodating growth up to 2051. The New Community Areas will include "Community Areas" for accommodating approximately 175,000 people and 19,000 supporting jobs as the focus for new residential communities and Employment Areas accommodating approximately 38,000 jobs as the focus for new clusters of business and economic activities. As these greenfield areas are planned for and residential development increases, local municipalities should be given direction to plan for the adequate provision of school sites and public service facilities.</p>	The intent is noted, however these are pre-2041 policies, and we are not recommending making changes to these settlement expansion policies unless there is a correction. Other policies have been revised to reflect this intent for 2051 New Community Areas and other new Designated Greenfield Areas.
STAT-21-077xxi	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.6.20.14.15 Greenfields – Special Policy Area: Add: "Provide direction to local municipalities to plan for the adequate provision of school sites and public service facilities."</p> <p>Special policy areas are Designated Greenfield Areas that have detailed direction for land uses, infrastructure, transportation, and the environment in unique Designated Greenfield Areas of the Region that address matters beyond the general framework of the Official Plan. These specific policies resulted from planning amendments since the last Regional official plan review. These areas include North West Brampton (Brampton), Ninth Line Lands (Mississauga), Mayfield West Phase 2 (Caledon), and Bolton Residential Expansion (Caledon). As these greenfield areas are planned for and residential development advances, local municipalities should be given direction to plan for the adequate provision of school sites and public service facilities.</p>	The intent is noted, however these are pre-2041 policies, and we are not recommending making changes to these settlement expansion policies unless there is a correction. Other policies have been revised to reflect this intent for 2051 New Community Areas and other new Designated Greenfield Areas.
STAT-21-077xxii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>Section 5.10.32.10 Sustainable Transportation: "Promote safe and active pedestrian movement through walking, cycling, non-motorized forms of transportation to and from school sites and routes. Active transportation destinations should be clearly accessible for a variety of users and demarcated (elevated + instructional barriers) from motorized forms of transportation."</p> <p>PPS, 1.0 Building Strong Healthy Communities, 1.2 Coordination, part 1.2.1: "A coordinated, integrated and comprehensive approach should be used when dealing with planning matters within municipalities, across lower, single and/or upper-tier municipal boundaries, and with other orders of government, agencies and boards including: d) infrastructure, multimodal transportation systems, public service facilities and waste management systems;"</p>	Agreed, policy will be added.
STAT-21-077xxii	November 30, 2021	Nick Gooding Intermediate Planner, Peel	<p>Section 5.10.32.10 Sustainable Transportation: Add: "Support ongoing winter maintenance of multi-use trails along</p>	The Region follows provincial regulations for maintenance.

Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		District School Board nick.gooding@peelsb.com	<p>paths, boulevards and routes that connect pedestrians to key destinations such as school sites."</p> <p>Add: "Ensure sidewalks are required on one side of the street on all new local roads for safe and designated walkability. Sidewalks on both sides of local roads should be required in the vicinity of school sites, to ensure the safety, walkability and accessibility of all students and users."</p> <p>Add: "Fragmented sidewalks and connectivity should be identified within existing residential areas and a plan should be developed for the construction of sidewalks or multi-use trails at least on one side of the road."</p> <p>Add: "Through the development approvals process active transportation amenities, including bicycle parking and racks, should be required."</p> <p>Add: "Wayfinding signage should be assessed and improved to promote active transportation."</p> <p>PPS, 1.6.5., Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities: "Public service facilities should be co-located in community hubs, where appropriate, to promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration, access to transit and active transportation."</p>	<p>The Region aims to achieve this through the implementation of the Sustainable Transportation Strategy. See policy 5.10.32.22.</p> <p>The Region reviews sidewalk gaps along the Regional Road network through the Sustainable Transportation Strategy. These gaps are also being shown in Figure Y9 of the ROP.</p> <p>Addressed through Policy 5.10.32.21</p> <p>This strategy is included in the Region's Sustainable Transportation Strategy.</p>
STAT-21-078i	December 3, 2021	Joe Muller Senior Strategic Advisor, NEC joe.muller@ontario.ca	<p>Section 2.10 Niagara Escarpment: NEC staff notes that the preamble of this section describes the permitting authority of the NEP, and includes the following terms in italics: development, cultural heritage resources, and scenic resources. Please note that these terms are defined in the NEP and/or the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act (NEPDA). Therefore, it is the NEP definitions that are applicable, and not those found within the proposed OP. NEC staff suggests that this be corrected by removing the italics and including a note that explains that the NEP/NEPDA definitions apply. In addition, as the first paragraph of this section comprises its definition found in the glossary, those comments apply here as well.</p>	<p>As indicated in the preamble to the Glossary, where terms are in bold and italicized, the reader is referred to the relevant provincial plan or legislation for the definition, which in Section 2.10 would be the Niagara Escarpment Plan. It is recommended that the preamble be revised as follows</p> <p><u><i>The Niagara Escarpment is a provincially significant significant, 725 kilometre (450-mile) long geological and ecological feature in southwestern Ontario, a portion of which runs through Peel. It is a source of some of southern Ontario's prime rivers and streams, and contains some significant significant heritage features, rare plants and significant significant habitats which act to clean the air, provide drinking water and support recreational activities that benefit public health and overall quality of life. In 1990, the Niagara Escarpment's unique character was recognized by the United Nation's Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as a World Biosphere Reserve.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>The Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act, together with the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP), this Plan and the Town of Caledon Official Plan, permits development development through established land use designations, permitted uses and development criteria while protecting-protecting the important natural features, scenic resources and cultural heritage resources cultural heritage resources of the Niagara Escarpment. The boundary and land use designations for the NEP Area within Peel are shown on Schedule X8 of this Plan.</i></u></p> <p>Corresponding revisions above will also be included in the Glossary definition for the Niagara</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
				Escarpment
STAT-21-078ii	December 3, 2021	Joe Muller Senior Strategic Advisor, NEC joe.muller@ontario.ca	Section 2.14.24 Woodlands: As NEC staff noted previously, it would be helpful to note where NEP policies apply here. While the relation of the NEP to OP policy overall is acknowledged in the preamble to this OP, it would be helpful to note in specific sections of the OP like this where it is known that NEP policies are more restrictive, e.g., significant woodlands.	Staff do not recommend adding detailed Niagara Escarpment Plan policies or references throughout the Regional Official Plan. The Niagara Escarpment Plan key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features are listed as components of the Greenlands System to be protected in accordance with the Niagara Escarpment Plan. As the NEP is implemented by the NEC through the development control process and the NEP amendment process, rather than through municipal planning, it is not necessary to address the specific policies of the NEP in the ROP. Staff have proposed to add the following policy clearly stating that provincial plans and policies apply in the Greenlands System: <u>2.14.7 Only permit development and site alteration within the Greenlands System in accordance with the policies of this Plan subject to Provincial legislation, policies and applicable provincial plans.</u> In addition, Policy 2.14.39 a) directs the local municipalities to identify, <i>protect</i> , restore, and enhance natural heritage systems in their official plans in accordance with provincial policy and the Greenlands System policy framework of this Plan. Section 1.4 of the Plan states that where there is a conflict between the policies of the ROP and the policies of a provincial plan such as the NEP, the policies of the provincial plan take precedence. No changes are recommended.
STAT-21-078iii	December 3, 2021	Joe Muller Senior Strategic Advisor, NEC joe.muller@ontario.ca	Section 3.4.7 b) Mineral Aggregate Resources: NEC staff recommend insertion of Escarpment Natural Area here alongside the Escarpment Protection Area. While this prohibition is implicitly incorporated within the definition of "Core Areas of the Greenlands System" in 3.4.7.a, identifying the Escarpment Natural Area explicitly here makes this policy clear with respect to the NEP.	The Aggregate Resources Policy Review is a component of the Peel 2051 review but proceeding on a separate timeline. Staff will consider amendment to policy 3.4.7.a at that time.
STAT-21-078iv	December 3, 2021	Joe Muller Senior Strategic Advisor, NEC joe.muller@ontario.ca	Section 5.10.34 Regional Roads: NEC staff notes that where expansion is proposed for Regional roads through the NEP, such as Winston Churchill Boulevard, King Street, Old Base Line Road, Hurontario Street, Airport Road, Charleston Side Road et cetera, NEP policies may be more restrictive within the NEP Area of Development Control in general. In addition, NEP policies may restrict roadworks where proposed expansion is located in Escarpment Natural Areas, wetlands, key hydrologic features, or key natural heritage features. NEC staff recommends that wording be inserted in this section to reflect how NEP policy may affect proposed expansion of Regional roads.	Staff recommend the following policy modifications: <u>5.4.16 Ensure that planning for the development, optimization, or expansion of infrastructure, including infrastructure corridors and supporting facilities will, where applicable:</u> <u>c) address requirements in accordance with provincial policies and with the Greenbelt Plan, Niagara Escarpment Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.</u> <u>5.10.9 Minimize adverse social, environmental, health and resource impacts when developing and planning for transportation facilities, by ensuring consistency with the objectives and policies in this Plan. Work with the Province, the local municipalities and adjacent municipalities to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse social, environmental, health and resource impacts when developing and planning for transportation services, by ensuring consistency with the objectives and policies in this Plan and applicable provincial plan.</u>
STAT-21-	December 3,	Joe Muller	Section 7.4.9 Lot Creation and Lot Adjustments: NEC staff notes that	7.4.9.1 and 7.4.9.3 lot creation policies already specify that the implementation of lot creation

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
078v	2021	Senior Strategic Advisor, NEC joe.muller@ontario.ca	<p>where expansion is proposed for Regional roads through the NEP, such as Winston Churchill Boulevard, King Street, Old Base Line Road, Hurontario Street, Airport Road, Charleston Side Road et cetera, NEP policies may be more restrictive within the NEP Area of Development Control in general.</p> <p>In addition, NEP policies may restrict roadworks where proposed expansion is located in Escarpment Natural Areas, wetlands, key hydrologic features, or key natural heritage features. NEC staff recommends that wording be inserted in this section to reflect how NEP policy may affect proposed expansion of Regional roads.</p>	<p>policies in the local official plans and lot creation approvals are required to conform to provincial plans. There are lot creation policies in several provincial plans in Peel. It is not the Region's preference that each provincial plan be listed in every policy and instead refer to 'provincial plan' generally. No changes are recommended.</p>
STAT-21-078vi	December 3, 2021	Joe Muller Senior Strategic Advisor, NEC joe.muller@ontario.ca	<p>Glossary: NEC staff recommend amending wording to incorporate and specifically identify and differentiate between the cultural and natural categories of heritage. Further, with 2017 amendments to the Niagara Escarpment Plan, it would be appropriate to reiterate the Indigenous relationship to the Niagara Escarpment.</p>	<p>The Region has clarified the distinction between natural heritage features and areas and cultural resources and their relationship to indigenous communities broadly. The Region will defer to the NEP for the relationship between the Niagara Escarpment Plan and indigenous communities.</p> <p>No changes are recommended.</p>
STAT-21-078vii	December 3, 2021	Joe Muller Senior Strategic Advisor, NEC joe.muller@ontario.ca	<p>Official Plan Schedules: The NEP mapping provided in new Schedule X8 is using current mapping. NEC staff suggests some cartographic refinement to allow more legibility where roads overlap with NEP designations, and where multiple feature boundaries overlap. These comments have been provided to the Region of Peel by NEC staff in an effort to meet the City's timelines for its OP review. A copy of these comments will be provided at the next Commission meeting to ensure Commissioners are aware, and to provide them with an opportunity to make additional comments. Therefore, the NEC may make an additional submission, if necessary.</p>	<p>The road name labelling on Schedule X8 will be adjusted to avoid overlap with NEP designations where possible</p>
STAT-21-420i	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	<p>Include a definition for Major Facilities and Sensitive Land Uses.</p> <p>There is currently no existing or proposed definition for Major Facilities, Rail Facilities, or Sensitive Uses in the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>Section 5.10.35.8: Section 5.10.35.8 puts the responsibility of defining the term onto Mississauga and Brampton, which could lead to confusion and incongruous terms and usage. We recommend that the definitions of Major Facilities and Sensitive Uses found in the PPS be included in the Regional Official Plan.</p>	<p>Section 1.3 of the plan identifies that the definitions of terms provided in provincial plans and the Provincial Policy Statement applies to those terms that are used in the Region of Peel Official Plan, unless otherwise identified in the Glossary section of the Region of Peel Official Plan.</p>
STAT-21-420ii	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	<p>Review and reconsider the locations of several Planned MTSAs in proximity to rail facilities.</p> <p>Several MTSAs are planned for areas that would create conflict with existing rail facilities. While the geographic points for the MTSA are more than 300 metres from the railyards, the 800-metre area around those points would be within the area set out by provincial guidelines. Some preliminary mapping by the Region has also suggested that the MTSA</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The station locations of the 'planned' stations identified on draft Schedule Y6 reflects the Queen Street Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study undertaken by Metrolinx and the latest station locations from the 407 Transitway EA have been updated (including some stations being removed and adjusted labelling).</p> <p>The 'planned' stations are not proposed to be delineated at this time due to the need for</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>boundaries would be within 300 m of the rail facilities. The planned MTSAs in question are identified on the proposed draft Schedule Y7 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QUE-11, • QUE-12, • 407-8, • 407-9, and • 407-10. <p>The PPS requires that sensitive land uses be planned and developed to avoid any potential adverse effects, and land uses must be planned to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards, and procedures. The PPS outlines a test to demonstrate the situation in which avoidance is not possible, and this requires demonstrating amongst other matters that alternative locations have been evaluated and found that there are no reasonable alternative locations in addition to assessing mitigation.</p> <p>In the case of QUE-11, QUE-12, 407-8, 407-9 and 407-10, we suggest that these planned MTSAs and the proposed policy direction by the Region of Peel do not address the PPS policy requirements. Specifically, while the proposed policies anticipate a future land use planning exercise to delineate these areas, identify land uses and determine densities, based on the material provided the development potential in these areas do not justify an MTSA designation as it is not clear that sensitive land uses are needed in these areas.</p> <p>The proposed draft Regional Official Plan policies imply that sensitive land uses are an objective and/or requirement in all MTSAs (i.e., mixed use development and permitting residential without an amendment to the Region’s Official Plan), however, there has been no formal land use compatibility assessment per the PPS that demonstrates that sensitive land uses are feasible within the MTSAs outlined. Nor is there a formal requirement to complete a land use compatibility assessment per the PPS. Reviewed correspondence from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs (August 10th, 2021) and they specifically note that an MTSA can be developed with only employment uses.</p> <p>Furthermore, the PPS requires that when introducing a sensitive land use that a needs and alternatives test be completed, and based on the materials provided there are several reasonable alternative MTSAs that are not in proximity to a rail yard, and would be able to accommodate</p>	<p>additional land use planning work by the local municipalities or infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>The land use planning work to be completed by the local municipalities will have to satisfy the requirements of the Region’s policy 5.6.19.9, including addressing land use compatibility and the separation or mitigation of sensitive land uses. Delineation of an MTSA does not automatically permit sensitive land uses.</p> <p>To implement this work, a ROPA would be required to delineate the boundaries of the planned Major Transit Station Area, establish a minimum density target, and any applicable employment conversion requirements such as technical justification would be followed prior to the implementation of any sensitive land uses. Further, a local Official Plan Amendment would also be required to confirm the minimum densities and authorized uses by building and/or structure.</p> <p>Other benefits to designating transit stations or stops as MTSAs include requirements to plan for improved transit and active transportation connections to surrounding lands such as places of employment – ultimately benefitting the Peel workforce.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			<p>sensitive land uses.</p> <p>Recommended that these MTSAs be removed from the draft Regional Official Plan. In lieu of removal, the above noted MTSAs should be considered employment only MTSAs and contain no sensitive land uses with specific policy direction from the Region to that effect.</p>	
STAT-21-420iii	December 1, 2021	<p>Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail</p>	<p>The ROPA should include policy direction to clarify that new developments would be required to meet the Provincial Policy Statement requirements for land use compatibility.</p> <p>The PPS and Growth Plan requires that sensitive land uses be developed in a way that avoids major facilities. Sensitive land uses are only permitted if it can be demonstrated that there is a need for the use, that there are no reasonable alternatives and that impacts of adverse effects are mitigated. Adverse Effects may come from odour, noise, vibration, derailment in the case of rail and other contaminants. To further strengthen the Regional Official Plan’s conformity with these policies in the PPS, we recommend that statements be added to several policies to ensure that new developments are required to meet the PPS requirements for land use compatibility.</p> <p>Section 5.3.3: As it currently reads, proposed policy 5.3.3 provides direction to plan for major facilities and sensitive uses noting that they be appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent adverse effects from odours, noise, and other contaminants. While this policy provides a good foundation to ensure that land use compatibility is achieved, it does not reflect the new language of the PPS.</p> <p>Recommended that this policy be revised to read: “Major facilities and sensitive land uses shall be planned and developed to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks guidelines.”</p>	<p>Policy revised address comments, and the PPS definition of “major facilities” was added to the ROP as a defined term throughout the plan.</p> <p align="center">- To discuss</p> <p align="center">- To discuss</p>
STAT-21-420iv	December 1, 2021	<p>Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail</p>	<p>Section 5.8.31 and 5.8.32: Should be amended to include stronger land use compatibility policies that meet the policy requirements of the PPS. Specifically, we suggest that Policy 5.8.32 be amended to include language that requires that major facilities and sensitive land uses avoid adverse effects and that alternative locations be assessed, as required by the PPS. As currently drafted, it is our opinion that these policies do not meet the requirements for land use compatibility as set out in the PPS.</p>	<p>Policy updated to reflect stakeholder input.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
STAT-21-420v	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	<p>Section 5.10.36.9: Policy 5.10.36.9 concerning the railway network reads: Support a safe and efficient railway network by:</p> <p>a) Evaluating, prioritizing and securing grade separation of railways and major roads, in cooperation with Transport Canada and the railways; and, b) Ensuring that noise, vibration and safety issues are addressed for development adjacent to railway corridors and terminal facilities.</p> <p>This policy calls for the mitigation of adverse effects of major facilities and it can be strengthened to reaffirm PPS guidelines and reflect the priority to avoid land use conflicts with rail yards and other major facilities. We suggest the following language be inserted between a) and b), and b) be revised to include odour issues:</p> <p>a) Evaluating, prioritizing and securing grade separation of railways and major roads, in cooperation with Transport Canada and the railways; and, b) Requiring that the planning and development of a sensitive land use near or adjacent to a major facility be done in accordance with the PPS and provincial guidelines, standards and procedures; and, c) Ensuring that odour, noise, vibration and safety issues are addressed for development adjacent to railway corridors and terminal facilities.</p>	<p>Regarding proposed modification to policy a) – Section 1.4 of the Regional Official Plan explains that Regional Official Plan policies are based on legislation, policy statements, guidelines and provincial policy.</p> <p>Regarding proposed modification to policy c) – policy will be updated to reflect comment.</p>
STAT-21-420vi	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	<p>Amend policies to permit and encourage the development of non-sensitive land uses to serve as a transitional buffer with sensitive land uses.</p> <p>Section 5.6.16: Policy 5.6.16 states that it is policy to: Encourage local municipalities to develop employment and industrial uses near and adjacent to major goods movement facilities and corridors, including highways, rail facilities, airports, haul routes, and major truck terminals.</p> <p>This policy provides direction to use non-sensitive land uses as a transitional buffer to major facilities. However, the language used in the ROP should be strengthened to take away uncertainty and to reference the proposed definition for major facilities and to relate it to the PPS. We recommend that the policy be altered to read:</p> <p>“Require local municipalities to plan for and develop employment and industrial uses near and adjacent to major goods movement facilities and corridors and major facilities to serve as a transitional buffer with sensitive uses.”</p>	<p>A number of other policies throughout the ROP are existing and proposed which recognize that public health must be protected by minimizing or mitigating impacts of transportation system (section 5.10) and employment lands (section 5.8).</p> <p>Additional policies have been added regarding managing land use compatibility and transition from employment uses to sensitive uses.</p>
STAT-21-420vii	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP	<p>Strengthen Strategic Growth Area land use compatibility policies.</p> <p>Section 5.6.17.9 (e): Policy 5.6.17.9 e) states that it is policy to:</p>	<p>Policy will be updated to reference the applicable section of the PPS, 2020 on land use compatibility.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
		Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	<p>Encourage the local municipalities to complete comprehensive planning for Strategic Growth Areas that: e) considers land use compatibility;</p> <p>This policy can be strengthened by requiring land use compatibility be addressed in accordance with the PPS, provincial guidelines, standards and procedures. We recommend the following language:</p> <p>Encourage the local municipalities to complete comprehensive planning for Strategic Growth Areas that: e) addresses land use compatibility, in accordance with the PPS and provincial guidelines, standards and procedures. No sensitive land uses shall be permitted within Strategic Growth Areas unless the PPS land use compatibility policies have been satisfied, including reviewing alternative locations.</p>	<p>Consideration of the appropriateness of sensitive land uses and measures to mitigate and minimize potential adverse affects should be determined through the applicable studies and broader considerations for the context specific goals and objectives of the Strategic Growth Area.</p>
STAT-21-420viii	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	<p>Strengthen Major Transit Station Areas land use compatibility policies.</p> <p>Section 5.6.19.13: Policy 5.6.19.13 provides policy direction for proposed development in Major Transit Station Areas, where the local municipality has not yet established Major Transit Station Area policies. The objectives of this policy do not include ensuring land use compatibility. We recommend that the following policy language be added:</p> <p>Until such time as the local municipality has established Major Transit Station Area policies in accordance with Section 16(16) of the Planning Act, proposed developments within a Major Transit Station Area identified on Schedule Y7 shall be reviewed with consideration to the objectives of this Plan to ensure the proposed development: i) Avoids potential adverse effects to major facilities and sensitive land uses, and addresses land use compatibility in accordance with the PPS and provincial guidelines, standards and procedures.</p>	<p>Major Transit Station Areas are not a land use designation. The existing local land use planning designations and policies will guide the permitted uses and requirements for the development review process. Further consideration will also be required for Provincial and Regional policies to convert employment land as applicable.</p> <p>Policy has been updated to add reference to the consideration of land use compatibility in accordance with the requirements of the PPS, 2020.</p>
STAT-21-420ix	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	<p>Section 5.6.19.9 (h): Policy 5.6.19.9 h) states that it is policy to: Direct the local municipalities to establish policies in their official plan and other implementation documents for each Major Transit Station Area delineated on Schedule Y7 to the satisfaction of the Region that addresses the following: h) land use compatibility and the separation or mitigation of sensitive land uses;</p> <p>Policies in the Regional Official Plan should be consistent with or reference the PPS land use compatibility policy requirements. In our opinion, mitigation alone is not the sole test for land use compatibility as the PPS and Growth Plan both call for avoidance. Where avoidance is not possible, and no reasonable alternatives exist, minimization and mitigation should apply to both the sensitive land use and the industrial and/or major facility. We recommend that the policy be altered to read: h) land use compatibility per the requirements of the PPS and provincial</p>	<p>Policy updated to reference applicable PPS Section.</p>

**Peel 2051 Statutory Consultation Comments:
Agency Comments**

#	Date	Contact	Comment Summary	Response Summary
			guidelines, standards and procedures. This shall include an assessment of need for the proposed sensitive land uses and alternative locations in the municipality.	
STAT-21-420x	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	Section 5.6.19.9 (n): Policy 5.6.19.9 n) states that it is policy to address: n) land use in Major Transit Station Areas that overlap with Employment Areas which are identified on Schedule Y6 and subject to policy 5.8.32. We recommend that these policies be more comprehensive to specifically address lands that are within an MTSA and within the Area of Influence of a major goods movement facility and corridors or major facilities that are outside of the MTSA. This policy should acknowledge the policy requirement of protecting these facilities from adverse effects of sensitive land uses, in accordance with the PPS.	The requirements for employment conversions will have to be addressed in accordance with the applicable provincial requirements to introduce non-employment uses.
STAT-21-420xi	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	Include missing Major Transit Station Areas on draft Schedule Y6. In the case of the Major Transit Station Areas QUE-11, QUE-12, 407-8, 407-9 and 407-10, we recommend that these MTSA be identified on draft Schedule Y6. These MTSA are located within Employment Areas and should be considered as Major Transit Station Areas Subject to a Flexible Employment Policy.	Noted, all Queen Street BRT MTSA from Torbram Rd and east to Highway 50 are identified on schedule Y6 to provide the policy framework to examine if mixed uses may be appropriate to introduce as per policy 5.8.32. It is not the Region’s intent to provide flexibility for the introduction of mixed land uses to be studied via policy 5.8.32, therefore MTSA on the 407 Transitway have not been identified on Schedule Y6.
STAT-21-420xii	December 1, 2021	Chad B. John-Baptiste Director, Planning – Ontario, WSP Chad.John-Baptiste@wsp.com on behalf of CN Rail	Add major facilities to a schedule. The boundaries of the Urban Growth Area and the MTSA area of QUE – 2 shown in draft Schedules Y6 and Y7 respectively, potentially fall within the 300 metre Area of Influence of the Brampton Yard. The provincial guidelines, standards and procedures measures this distance from the property line of the industrial land use and this proximity and the ambiguity of the property line of the rail yard is a concern. These areas are already designated for urban growth and intensification, but intensification targets can be reached through non-sensitive uses, such as employment. Existing policies in the OP act to protect major facilities and reduce land use conflicts. However, there is no clear identification or way to identify this potential conflict in the Official Plan. Recommend identifying rail facilities in a schedule of the Official Plan, such as on draft Schedules Y6 and Y7. Identifying their boundaries will reduce the uncertainty for planning and developing sensitive land uses, and it will help to identify and avoid land use conflicts for those areas that are already designated for intensification and growth.	Noted. Strategic Growth Areas such as Urban Growth Centres and Major Transit Station Areas are not land use designations. While a significant share of growth is directed to these areas to meet minimum density requirements, the land use designations and corresponding development regulations are determined in the official plan and zoning by-law of the local municipalities. Staff intend to label the intermodal facilities on Schedule Y6 - Employment Areas and Figure Y6 – Strategic Goods Movement Network.