

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <small>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</small>	Response (as of January 2026)
1	Metrolinx		13-05-2025	In review, Metrolinx provides the following proposed General Zoning By-law Provisions for consideration. Of note, engagement of Metrolinx and its Technical Advisor, where applicable, will require all related fees to be borne by the owner/applicant.	Noted.
2				Development within 300m of the Metrolinx Rail Corridor shall require an Acoustical Study, which shall include the current rail traffic data and the Standard Metrolinx Noise Warning Clause	Noted. Comment passed to staff for consideration. Studies are not directly required by the Zoning By-law so no change to the document is recommended.
3				Development within 75m of the Metrolinx Rail Corridor shall require a Vibration Study.	Noted. Comment passed to staff for consideration. Studies are not directly required by the Zoning By-law so no change to the document is recommended.
4				Development adjacent to the Metrolinx Rail Corridor shall not alter any drainage patterns, flows and / or volumes, absent review and approval by Metrolinx and its Technical Advisor.	Noted. Comment passed to staff for consideration. Studies are not directly required by the Zoning By-law so no change to the document is recommended.
5				Development adjacent to the Metrolinx Rail Corridor shall require execution of agreements with Metrolinx as deemed applicable.	Noted.
6				Development within 300m of the Metrolinx Rail Corridor shall require registration of an Environmental/Operational Easement in favour of Metrolinx, over the subject lands.	Noted.
7				Development adjacent to the Metrolinx Rail Corridor shall provide the standard setback and safety barrier (berm) or receive approval of an alternative per a Rail Safety Report, to be reviewed and approved by Metrolinx and its Technical Advisor.	Noted.
8				Work within 30ft or beyond (depending on the nature of the equipment) from the closest edge of Metrolinx rail shall require a Metrolinx Work Permit.	Noted.
9				Vegetation within 3.5m of the mutual property line with Metrolinx shall be restricted to low lying vegetation only.	Noted.
10				Development adjacent to the Metrolinx Rail Corridor shall install the Metrolinx Standard Security Fence along the mutual property line, save and except for, where substitutes are deemed satisfactory by Metrolinx.	Noted.
11				That any adjacent development within 60m of Metrolinx Light Rail Transit shall require that a Technical Review be conducted by Metrolinx or its Technical Advisor, with all costs to be borne by the owner / applicant.	Noted.
12	D.J.K. Land Use Planning on behalf of Fifth Avenue Group	83 Wilson Avenue, 14 & 16 Centre Street North, 44 & 45 Wellington Block	12-05-2025	Request to retain site specific exception as it relates to setbacks (etc.) and to only have the following from the new by-law apply: Maximum number of units; Building Height; Maximum Floor Space Index. Request to meet and discuss options.	If the prezone is to be applied, the City would prefer to lean on the new MH zone and the applicable provisions to meet the City's new standards and design requirements. Alternatively, the prezone may be removed if you prefer to retain the existing zoning and exception zone. If a hybrid of prezone and existing standards is preferred then an application would be required. We would be pleased to discuss further but these are the options under consideration in the scope of the CZBLR.
13	GWD		14-05-2025	A review of the third draft of the new CZBL illustrates the permitted use 'Residential Care Home' is defined as: "a building or place offering supervised living accommodation that may include associated support services, accessory uses and amenities, and: 1. Is licensed or funded under Federal or Provincial legislation; 2. Is for persons requiring semi-independent or supervised group living arrangements; and 3. Is for more than 10 residents, exclusive of staff". We kindly request clarification on whether any additional permitted uses within the new CZBL would support the development of a retirement or a senior's home.	The zoning by-law does not distinguish seniors' residences/retirement homes, and instead they are considered residential uses and permitted in accordance with the permitted dwelling types. For example, seniors' residences consisting of apartments or similar would be allowed in the R3 zone. The Residential Care Home definition was intended to refer to long-term care homes with supportive medical services and Provincially licensed, so it is permitted in a range of higher intensity zones such as the R3 zone.
14				Exterior edge of a window well needs to be 1.2 m (4ft) setback from property line. Safety concern with egress windows not being useable in inclement weather.	The final zoning by-law was updated to no longer permit window well encroachments into the interior side yard.
15				100 sm garden suites will increase the lot coverage and result in infill garden suites that are too large. This level of intensification should only be permitted with new construction not in existing neighbourhoods.	The size of the garden suites is contingent on meeting all setbacks and height requirements which will address compatibility. No changes are recommended.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
16	King Consultants on behalf of 1580610 Ontario Limited	0 Highway 50, Brampton	12-05-2025	Concerns with enforcement of PRA-1, 2 and 3. Will the parking ticket rates be evaluated?	The min parking standards are largely implemented at the time of development, when a building permit is sought and through site plan control. The Parking Regulation Areas do not affect the enforcement of on-street parking and are about setting out parking needs on-site. The rates in the Parking Regulation Areas are intended to reflect changing mobility characteristics in the City. In the final Zoning By-law, PRA 1 includes an exemption on minimum parking, but some low density uses (e.g., single detached dwellings) will have a minimum parking rate outside of Protected Major Transit Station Areas.
17				Can a user-friendly document be provided which allows for residents to compare between the old and new by-law.	City staff have responded to this inquiry separately.
18			07-05-2025	Concerns with existing and future window well setbacks and concerns with the publics ability to review and understand the changes from the old by-law to the new by-law.	The prior window well encroachment permission was removed from the final zoning by law.
19			23-05-2025	Request to confirm inclusion of zoning provisions ensuring a minimum 4 ft setback from window wells, prohibiting front-facing ARU entrances, limiting garden suite size, restricting garage conversions, and enforcing clean fill requirements for pool removal. Additional concerns raised regarding inadequate public notification, need for baseline documentation, and preservation of Mature Neighbourhood protections.	The prior window well encroachment permission was removed from the final zoning by law. No other changes have been made in relation to the comments.
20	MHBC on behalf of Home Depot	49 First Gulf Boulevard, Brampton	12-05-2025	Proposed designation under the propose new Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2nd draft is not consistent with the Secondary Plan and area context. Request that Council and Staff consider more suitable designation for the subject lands such as the Highway Commercial - HC designation under the new proposed Zoning By-law.	City staff have met with this landowner to discuss. The zoning for the site is carried forward from the existing zoning, LC is the replacement for the old SC zone. The exception zone is retained. Reviewing site-specific rezoning in greenfield areas is outside the scope of the project and the applicant should seek a rezoning/application consultation process with the City as there may be required studies to support the request.
21			21-04-2025	Notwithstanding the overarching policies of the Province, Region and local municipal Official Plan, the Subject Site is zoned Service Commercial SS 1526 carried forward from the former Township of Toronto Gore Zoning By-law (Historical Atlas of Peel County – Walkers & Miles 1877). Previously, a structure on the Subject Site contained a dwelling and accessory commercial uses as per SS 1526 (illustrated on Schedule A Sheet 6 – By-law 56-83); the site is currently vacant.  The CBZL proposes to zone the Site from Service Commercial to the new Local Commercial designation. (Appendix D) The Technical Memo – Commercial Areas that informs this CBZL exercise suggests that the Local Commercial zone structure is to “serve the everyday needs of adjacent to residential uses and neighbourhoods” whereas the Subject Site is not in proximity to Neighbourhood Areas.  Given the area context and the nature of the Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan, employment area policies and the proposed land uses in the surrounding area, the Highway Commercial designation is more suitable for the Subject Site. (Appendix E)	See response above.
22	MHBC on behalf of Home Depot	49 First Gulf Boulevard, Brampton	12-05-2025	We understand that the current recommendation is to rezone the site to Prestige Employment zone, which excludes retail permissions. This is of particular concern to our client as the absence of appropriate retail permissions under the proposed zone would substantively impact and impede their ability to operate effectively. We respectfully request that City staff address these concerns for the Home Depot store located at 49 First Gulf Boulevard (Store #7006) by recognizing the existing uses as “legal conforming” under the new Zoning By-law. Alternatively, we propose that this location be zoned to General Commercial, which is consistent with the zoning of the Home Depot stores located at 60 Great Lakes Drive and 9515 Mississauga Road.	The site at 49 First Gulf Blvd appears to be subject to exception 2700 which permits retail warehouse. The exception was proposed to be retained in draft 3. Please advise of the concern about lost permission. If the base zone was changed from PE to GC, exception 2700 would still list the explicitly permitted uses. The PE zone was the replacement for the existing M4 zoning.
23	Weston Consulting on behalf of Sunfield Investments (Church) Inc.	172 Church Street East, Brampton	12-05-2025	The site-specific exception has not been carried over into the Third Draft By-law in accordance with approved By-law 116-2022. The Third Draft By-law still proposes to zone the site as the Residential Third Density – Mid Rise R3M(H)12, which does not permit back-to-back townhouses, stacked back-to-back townhouses, or semi-detached dwellings. This represents a significant deviation from the current approved zoning permissions in By-law 116-2022 and the built form approved through the SPA process for the subject property. The inclusion of the approved site-specific exception would not impact the City's intent to pre-zone MTSAs given the site-specific zoning is recent and the construction of the associated development is underway. Given the above, we respectfully reiterate our request that site-specific Zoning By-law 116-2022 (Exception 3626) be reinstated into the final CZBL for the subject property.	We agree with maintaining the exception zone and this was completed prior to Council adoption. Exception 3626 was renumbered to 2821.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
24	Arcadis Professional Services on behalf of First Gulf	475-495 Charolais Blvd 5-35 Worthington Ave & 20-30 Brisdale Dr 59 First Gulf Blvd 535-547 Steeles Ave E 20-70 Biscayne Cres 225-245 Castle Oaks Crossing 10568 Coleraine Drive	02-06-2025	The Client had initially provided correspondence to the City of Brampton on July 15, 2024, expressing their interest in participating in the City's CZBR. In that letter, the Client had also requested that the permitted uses and site-specific provisions for the sites identified above be maintained through the proposed iterations of the proposed zoning by-law. These comments are intended to protect the existing tenants on these sites and minimize the creation of any legal non-conforming uses. Since writing their initial comment letter requesting to retain all permitted uses, Arcadis notes that the site-specific provisions for the Clients' lands have successfully been carried over into the third draft of the CZBR. Nevertheless, a number of uses have been removed from the various sites, and as such, the client remains interested in participating in the CZBR. Arcadis would like the opportunity to meet with Planning Staff to discuss the proposed changes and how it may impact the Client's lands and the associated tenants' ability to remain and conform with the proposed CZBR. Based on our review of the third draft, potential conflicts as it relates to the permitted uses and parking provisions may arise.	Some minor changes to the exceptions have been completed as part of the Final Draft Zoning By-law such as section reference updates. We also note that the Transition provisions have been updated to enable transition of zoning by-law amendments which are now subject to an exception zone. It appears the sites referenced in the letter are subject to exception zones which have been retained in Chapter 12 of the By-law.
25	Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD)		02-06-2025	In the last response matrix, we received from the City, dated April 23, we agree that in some instances we were able to reach an agreeable solution, however there are still some standards that we do believe require more conversation. After speaking with some of our members BILD is informing the City that member companies will be submitting their own individual feedback, as many of the remaining considerations are now site or area specific in nature. While we support this next phase of dialogue between individual stakeholders and City staff, we would like to reiterate the importance of maintaining flexibility, particularly in the new greenfield zoning, to ensure the by-law remains responsive to a variety of development contexts and evolving market conditions.	This is noted and other discussions have occurred to gather the specific comments.
26	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Castleclark Development Inc	0 Clarkway Drive	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 103-2024 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.5m for single detached and 14m for townhouses, while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	
27				Site Specific By-law 103-2024 stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 3.0m while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 4.5m.	
28				Site Specific By-law 103-2024 stipulates a minimum lot area of 117m <sup>2</sup> for interior lots and 143m <sup>2</sup> for corner lots for townhouses, while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates minimum areas of 135m <sup>2</sup> and 150m <sup>2</sup> , respectively.	
29				Site Specific By-law 103-2024 stipulates a minimum lot width of 4.5m for interior lots and 5.5m for corner lots for townhouses, while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates minimum lot areas of 5.5m and 6.5m, respectively.	
30				The site is subject to Exceptions 3788 and 3792. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 103-2024. Exceptions 3788 and 3792 are not found in the Exception tracking spreadsheet.	We have retained the exception as indicated in the exception tracking sheet. It appears these were included in the third draft exception tracking sheet.
31				We ask the city to retain Exceptions 3788 and 3792 permissions in accordance with By-law 103-2024 as the exceptions are needed to maintain existing permissions/standards.	We have retained the exception as indicated in the exception tracking sheet.
32	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Dbrand Investment Corporation	11772 McLaughlin Road North	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 182-2022 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 14.0 for townhouses while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	
33				Site Specific By-law 182-2022 stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 3.0m for single detached while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 4.5m	
34				Site Specific By-law 182-2022 stipulates a minimum rear yard setback of 6.0m for single detached while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum rear yard setback of 7.0m.	
35				Site Specific By-law 182-2022 stipulates a minimum lot area of 130m <sup>2</sup> and 125m <sup>2</sup> for corner lots for townhouses, while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum area of 135m <sup>2</sup> .	
36				Site Specific By-law 182-2022 stipulates minimum exterior yard setbacks of 1.5m to a private road for townhouses while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum exterior yard setback of 3.0m	
37				Site Specific By-law 182-2022 stipulates No Requirement for minimum landscape areas for townhouse blocks while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum landscape area of 25%.	
38				The site is subject to a number of Exceptions; Exceptions 3648, 3649, 3650, and 3651. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 182-2022. The Exception tracking spreadsheet further notes that all the exception will be retained as the exceptions have recently been passed (since 2020) and is needed to retain existing permissions	We have retained Exceptions 3648, 3649, 3650 and 3651.
39				Site Specific By-law 20-2025 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.0m for single detached while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
40	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Opal Valley Development	11185 Airport Road	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 20-2025 stipulates a minimum rear yard setback of 3.6m for Exception 3813 while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum rear yard setback of 6.0m.	
41				The site is subject to Exceptions 3811, 3812, 3813 and 3815. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 20-2025. Exceptions 3811, 3812, 3813 and 3815 are not found in the Exception tracking spreadsheet. We ask the city to retain Exceptions 3811, 3812, 3813 and 3815 permissions in accordance with By-law 20-2025 as the exceptions are needed to maintain existing permissions/ standards.	The exceptions were missed in the tracking sheet likely due to the data not being in sync with the most recent Council decisions and by-laws coming into effect. All of these exceptions were brought into the Final Zoning By-law as they are recent.
42	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Siva Rama Krishna Prasad Ari	11038 The Gore Road	31-05-2025	Site Specific by-law 83-2025 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.0m for single detached while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	
43				The site is subject to Exception 3838. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 83-2025. Exception 3838 is not found in the Exception tracking spreadsheet. We ask the city to retain Exception 3838 permissions in accordance with By-law 83-2025 as the exception is needed to maintain existing permissions/standards.	The exception was missed as it was very recent. As above, the exception was retained and carried into the new Zoning By-law prior to adoption.
44	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Senwood Developments Inc.	10159 The Gore Road	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 29-2025 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.5m for single detached and townhouses, while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	
45				Site Specific By-law 29-2025 stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 3.0m for single detached while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 4.5m	
46				Site Specific By-law 29-2025 stipulates a minimum lot area of 126m <sup>2</sup> for interior lots for townhouses, while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum area of 135m <sup>2</sup> .	
47				Site Specific By-law 29-2025 stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 3.0m to a public road and 1.0m to a private road for condominium townhouse blocks, while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 3.0m	
48				Site Specific By-law 29-2025 stipulates a minimum rear yard setback of 2.6m, 3.0m and 4.0m for apartment blocks, while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum rear yard setback of 10m to a residential zone, 6.0m to OS zone and 7.0m for all other cases.	
49				Site Specific By-law 29-2025 stipulates a minimum interior yard setback of 2.5m and 3.0m for apartment blocks, while related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum interior yard setback of 7.5m to residential zones and 3.0m for all other cases.	
50				The site is subject to Exceptions 3737, 3817, 3818, 3824, 3819, 3820, 3744, 3821, 3822, and 3823. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 29-2025. The Exception tracking spreadsheet further notes that all the exception will be retained as the exceptions have recently been passed (since 2020) and is needed to retain existing permissions.	We will continue to retain the exceptions as indicated in the 3rd draft. Some of the exceptions were not included in the tracking sheet as they were too recently passed, but have been integrated into the new by-law prior to Council adoption.
51	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Sunfield Bramalea JV Inc.	10764 Bramalea Road	31-05-2025	Both Site Specific By-laws stipulate a Minimum Rear Yard Setback of 4.5 metres to private road and Maximum Building Height of 13m while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a Minimum Rear Yard Setback of 6 metres and Maximum Building Height of 11 metres or 3 storeys.	
52				We do note that Exception 2910 does maintain the provisions stipulated within both Site-Specific Bylaw, however, as mentioned above, By-law 303-2019 lifted the hold provision within By-law 7-2019. The Exception tracking spreadsheet further notes that Exception 2910 will be retained as the exception is required due to the land being subject to a holding provision which should be retained. The exception does not take into account the removal of the hold provision through By-law 303-2019. Exception 2910 should be modified to reflect the passing of By-law 303-2019 lifting the holding provision by deleting section 2910.2.4.	Thank you for noting the hold was lifted; this information was not available in our data. We have synced the data with the City's latest records of holding by-laws, and will continue to retain exception 2910 (now number 2197). We have updated the Exception text to acknowledge the hold was removed prior to Council adoption.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
53	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Sunfield Investments (McMurphy) Inc.	57 McMurchy Avenue South	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 187-2018 stipulates a Lot Area Minimum of 120 square metres, Minimum Rear Yard Setback of 4.5 metres to private road and Maximum Building Height of 13m while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a Lot Area Minimum of 133 square metres, Minimum Rear Yard Setback of 6 metres and Maximum Building Height of 11 metres or 3 storeys.	
54				We do note that Exception 2899 does maintain the provisions stipulated within By-law 187-2018. The Exception tracking spreadsheet further notes that the exception will be retained as the exception is required to maintain existing permissions/standards.	We have carried forward and integrate exception 2899 prior to Council adoption. It is now 2311.
55	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of TACC Developments (Gore Road) Inc.	9459 The Gore Road	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 64-2022 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.5 while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	
56				The site is subject to a number of Exceptions; Exceptions 3620, 3621, 3622, 3629, 3624. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 64-2022. The Exception tracking spreadsheet further notes that all the exception will be retained as the exceptions have recently been passed (since 2020) and is needed to retain existing permissions	We have maintained the exceptions. We note that by-law 64-2022 does not contain exception 3629 but rather it contains exception 3623.
57	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Trinison Management Corporation	10647 The Gore Road	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 26-2024 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.0m for single detached while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys	
58				Site Specific By-law 26-2024 stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 3.0m while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 4.5m.	
59				The site is subject to Exceptions 3747, 3749, 3750 and 3766. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 26-2024. . Exceptions 3747, 3749, 3750 and 3766 are not found in the Exception tracking spreadsheet.	It appears all of these exceptions are retained per the exception tracking sheet, and have been carried forward into the final by-law for adoption. We also note that by-law 26-2024 includes exception 3748 which is also being carried forward.
60	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Trinison Management Corporation	10797 The Gore Road	31-05-2025	Site Specific By-law 27-2024 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.0m for single detached while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	
61				Site Specific By-law 27-2024 stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 3.0m while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a minimum front yard setback of 4.5m.	
62				The site is subject to Exceptions 3747, 3749, 3750 and 3766. We do note that the Exceptions are in line with the provisions stipulated within By-law 26-2024. Exceptions 3747, 3749, 3750 and 3766 are not found in the Exception tracking spreadsheet.	All of these exceptions have been carried over into the final zoning by-law for adoption. It appears all of these exceptions are in the tracker and noted to be retained.
63	Candevcon Group Inc. on behalf of Your Homes Development (Ebenezer) Inc.	4316 Ebenezer Road	31-05-2025	City mapping on the Brampton website currently zones the property as R3B-3550. Site Specific By-law 152-2021 zones the property as R3A-3550	
64				Site Specific By-law 152-2021 stipulates a maximum height restriction of 13.5 or 3.5 storey whichever is greater while the related zoning in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law stipulates a maximum height of 11m or 3 storeys.	
65				We do note that the Exception 3550 does maintain the provisions stipulated within By-law 152-2021. The Exception tracking spreadsheet further notes that the exception will be retained as the exception was recently passed (since 2021) and is needed to retain existing permissions.	We have carried over this exception into the final zoning by-law for council adoption.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
66	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)		29-05-2025	<p><b>Floodplain Overlay Zones</b></p> <p>CVC staff recognize that Section 3.3 is dedicated specifically to the Downtown Floodplain Overlay Zone, and that generally floodplains should be zoned within the Natural System (NS) Zone. However, the floodplain is not always contained within the NS Zone. CVC staff continue to recommend a general floodplain overlay to highlight that some lands outside of the Open Space (OS) and NS Zones are hazardous. This approach endeavors to prevent inappropriate land use or development and inform the public of the potential site constraints and additional requirements (i.e. Conservation Authority regulation). CVC staff continue to recommend that a city-wide floodplain overlay is maintained in the Zoning By-Law to avoid confusion and direct applicants to the Conservation Authority for discussion and pre-consultation of permitting requirements.</p> <p>Alternatively, inclusion of Conservation Authority Regulation Limits as a layer within the City's interactive zoning maps, with reference to Section 3.2 of the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw, could be considered. This approach highlights the importance of consultation with the applicable Conservation Authority for more information if development or a change to zoning is proposed in these areas.</p>	<p>It is the City's preference to utilize the regulation limit in the interactive map for information purposes.</p>
67				<p><b>Chapter 3 – General Provisions</b></p> <p><b>Section 3.2 – Conservation Authority Regulation Limit</b></p> <p>The new section regarding the Conservation Authority Regulation Limit mentions the potential requirement for a CVC permit and the prohibited uses in accordance with the PPS, 2024. It is recommended that Section 3.2 is updated to reflect that early pre-consultation with the applicable Conservation Authority should be undertaken to confirm feasibility of any proposed development within the Regulation Limit. As per the above, it is recommended that the inclusion of Conservation Authority Regulation Limits as an overlay within the interactive zoning maps, with reference to Section 3.2, be considered to provide additional information.</p>	<p>We added some explanatory language into a notation to provide this language but the language around conducting early consultation would not be appropriate as a zoning regulation and not enforceable. It is the City's preference to add the regulation limit as an informational layer in the interactive map and not part of the by-law.</p>
68				<p><b>Chapter 5 Residential Zones</b></p> <p><b>Section 5.2C – Additional Residential Unit (ARU)</b></p> <p>CVC staff support the restriction on ARUs located in the OS and NS Zones (as per Section 5.2.C.5) and recommend that this restriction is also applied to hazardous lands and hazardous sites, or as determined through consultation with the applicable Conservation Authority (per Section 3.2). It is important to note that there are existing lots having residential zoning that are within hazardous lands (e.g., floodplain, erosion, etc.); however, this is not reflected in the current or proposed zoning (i.e., the natural hazards are not always reflected in the NS and OS Zones). These sites should be restricted in terms of what development can occur, including intensification and ARUs.</p>	<p>The City is concerned that prohibiting a use in hazardous lands/sites (which are not completely mapped) will create uncertainty to landowners and it is preferred that the City rely on the permitting process to assist in identifying these areas. As noted, over time, the NS zone will be used to incorporate hazardous lands and limit development.</p>
69				<p><b>Section 5.2.E – Below Grade Stairs and Windows</b></p> <p>CVC staff recommend referencing that restrictions within floodplains for new below-grade stairs and windows or larger below grade openings may apply. Alternatively, specific reference to Section 3.2 may be provided to highlight that the applicable Conservation Authority should be contacted if the proposed works are within the Regulation Limit.</p>	<p>All sections of the by-law apply and the inclusion of cross-references as suggested will create some confusion, as it would be difficult to be comprehensive about what other sections will also apply.</p>
70				<p><b>Section 5.2K – Holding (H) Provision for Development of 4-10 Dwelling Units on a Lot in any Residential Zone</b></p> <p>CVC staff recommend including a reference to Section 3.2 with a point that approval or clearance by the applicable Conservation Authority is required for lots within the Regulation Limit.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
71				<p><b>Chapter 7 Mixed-Use Zones</b></p> <p><b>Chapter 8 Employment Zones</b></p> <p>CVC staff recognize that a child care centre use is permitted within mixed use zones and generally have no concern with this; however, there are instances where existing mixed-use zones may be subject to the natural hazards. It is also understood that employment zones permit sensitive uses, such as emergency services, hazardous waste processing/transfer use, etc. It is recommended that a restriction be placed on sensitive institutional uses (as per Section 3.2.2) as they should not be permitted within hazardous lands (or floodplain overlay). It is recommended that the City include a city-wide floodplain overlay to capture these areas, or provide an exception on certain uses if located within hazardous lands (e.g., add a general reference to the exceptions noted in Section 3.2.2, or for specific uses in Tables 7.1.1 and 8.1.1 reference Section 3.2.2 under "Use-Specific Standards")</p>	<p>As above, the City relies on the Regulation Limit and the permitting process to help address hazardous lands/sites if they are not already zoned in NS or another category.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
72				<b>Chapter 9 Institutional Zones</b> Similar to the above, there are certain uses prohibited within hazardous lands as per the PPS, 2024 and reflected in Section 3.2.2 of the proposed Zoning By-Law. These include several institutional uses (e.g., childcare centre, elementary or secondary school, emergency services, hospital, residential care home, etc.). CVC staff recommend including a point regarding the restrictions in the zoning (e.g., making reference to Section 3.2.2). As noted above, the inclusion of a city-wide floodplain overlay or the Regulation Limit as an overlay, that would also capture existing institutional uses located within hazardous lands, is recommended	Please see above. The bylaw includes the regulation limit as an overlay and the city would prefer to adopt this approach for flagging potential areas where a permit would be required.
73				<b>Chapter 10 Park, Open Space, and Natural System Zones</b> Chapter 10 now outlines new provisions for OS and NS Zones. In Section 10.1.C, a building height is identified for the NS Zone. As new buildings and structures are not typically supported within the natural systems, the reason for building height criteria is unclear. If this is to acknowledge existing infrastructure, it would be helpful to clarify that the criteria applies to existing buildings and structures as opposed to any new proposed development.	The permitted uses are regulated separately and not affected by the building requirements. The building requirements do not allow uses/structures not associated with the permitted uses. Most lands incorporated into these zones will be publicly owned.
74	The Daniels Corporation	108 & 112 Sky Harbour Drive	02-06-2025	Supports the retention of existing site specific zoning exceptions (R4A-3661 and R4A-3662) and requests clarification and revisions to the Mixed Use High Rise provisions, including building height limits, rear yard amenity area restrictions, and upper storey floor plate regulations. A ZBLA has been submitted to facilitate a revised development concept and seeks relief from minimum commercial GFA and residential parking standards. Additional concerns relate to parking, amenity space, EV and bicycle requirements, where current standards may impact feasibility and do not reflect Brampton's existing urban context.	We confirm we will retain the exceptions. We would be amenable to discuss tweaks to the exceptions. The EV parking was removed from the final zoning by-law, and the bicycle parking requirements have been reduced. City prefers to retain the amenity requirements as shown. We note that further changes could be requested through the ZBLA process. Please advise if there are further concerns or if a call is helpful.
75	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.) on behalf of 2424203 Ontario Ltd.	0 McLaughlin Road	02-06-2025	The Owner is advancing a 10-storey, 97-unit apartment building previously approved under site-specific zoning (R4A-3801). The site-specific exception was not included in the April 2025 Exceptions Tracking Sheet. We request its inclusion in the updated Zoning By-law. Additionally, concerns are raised regarding the draft Transitional Provisions (Section 1.7), which may jeopardize previously secured approvals. We request that the City maintain in-force the site-specific provisions of Zoning By-law 270-2004 in perpetuity for such properties. Clarification is also sought regarding the applicability of new Residential Zones (R3M, R3H), particularly in the absence of defined Primary Urban Boulevards (Schedule K), and the exclusion of apartment parking standards in the Third Draft. Further comments will follow under separate cover.	Please note the exception was omitted from draft 3 as it was recently passed and not included in our information, but it was included in the final document before adoption. The final draft zoning by-law includes updated and expanded Transition provisions which will retain the standards of 270-2004 for any site with an exception zone for up to 10 years.
76				At the time of writing this Letter, the City of Brampton has not identified "Primary Urban Boulevards" under Schedule K. This information is important to determine which Residential Zone is appropriate to apply to the Subject Property under the updated Zoning By-law. Furthermore, Parking Space Requirements for Apartment Dwellings are not provided under the Third Draft. We request the City updates its Third Draft to address these discrepancies, and we kindly request additional time to review these revisions.	We understand the need for clarity. The text of the by-law has been updated to simply refer to "boulevard" which was defined, and remove reference to "Primary Urban". The features identified in the legend as "Boulevard" under Schedule K in the interactive map are the boulevards and should encompass planned and existing, except the conceptual planned boulevards (e.g., in Bram West where zoning is currently agricultural/future development). The omitted parking space requirement for apartments was an error with track changes; intent was to retain what was shown in the 2nd draft and this is included in the final zoning by-law. - PRA1 no min, 2 per unit max (no visitor parking max) - PRA 2, min 0.75 per unit + 0.15 for visitor (no max) PRA3: min 1 per unit + 0.20 for visitor (no max)
77	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.) on behalf of Newmark Developments Limited	157 Steeles Avenue West	02-06-2025	As staff will be aware, our client has been involved in the process associated with the City Council endorsed Tertiary Plan for this area. Further to our client's interest and participation in the Tertiary Plan process, we make this submission on behalf of our client to ensure that the proposed Pre-zoning of our client's lands being considered through the City's Comprehensive Zoning By-law review initiative is consistent with the Council endorsed Tertiary Plan.  In addition to our client's participation in the Tertiary Plan process, our client has also been involved through the public engagement process on the recently approved Planning Application for the lands municipally addressed as 137 Steeles Avenue West (City File: OZS-2023-0018) which put in place zoning to permit redevelopment of those lands. We would request that the portion of our client's lands fronting Steeles Avenue West be zoned as follows (consistent with the approvals granted for 137 Steeles Avenue West): Residential Third Density – High Rise – Special Section 3736 for the portion of the site along the Steeles Avenue West frontage; & Third Density Low Rise (R3L).	The City is not supportive of changing the zoning in accordance with the adjacent property. The proposed heights as determined through the City's MTSAs planning work are intended to be lower than what has been proposed for 137 Steeles Ave W. An application may be sought for any further changes.
78	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.) on behalf of Soneil Brampton Inc.	75 Clarence Street	30-05-2025	Request to align proposed zoning with approved OLT decision (RA-3765). GSAI notes that the proposed Local Commercial zoning is inconsistent with the Ontario Land Tribunal's October 18, 2024 decision, which rezoned the lands to Residential Apartment A – Special Exception 3765 (RA-3765). The Exception Zone is also missing from the Site Exception section of the draft Zoning By-law. Request that the City update the mapping and exception schedule to reflect the approved RA-3765 zoning.	Thanks for noting. The information was not made available to the team in time for completing the 3rd draft. The final by-law was updated to include the updated zoning and exception zone 3765 (now exception 2817).

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
79	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.) on behalf of Argo Summer Valley Ltd.	12197 Hurontario Street	29-05-2025	<p>For context, the Owner is advancing registration of an approved plan of subdivision (File 21T-22011B) consisting of eight (8) residential detached dwellings, an internal road network and open space buffer on the Subject Property. On March 27th, 2024, the Owner obtained approval to rezone the subject property from Agricultural (A) to the following zones below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential Single Detached F-12.0 – Section 3767 (R1F-12.0-3767)</li> <li>• Residential Single Detached F-12.0 – Section 3768 (R1F-12.0-3768)</li> <li>• Residential Single Detached F-12.0 – Section 3771 (R1F-12.0-3771)</li> <li>• Open Space (OS)</li> </ul> <p>The lapse of transitional provisions may alter the approvals that have taken years to obtain and adversely affect housing delivery, forcing developers to seek new approvals later. More broadly, the adverse impact expected to be caused by the transitional provisions are counterproductive to the Province's goal of accelerating housing construction. We request that the City amends the above Transitional Provisions to recognize the current parent zones and general provisions which applied when the site-specific Zoning By-law was approved. We request that the Brampton Zoning By-law 270-2004 continues to stay in-force for properties with site-specific zoning and preclude these properties from new zoning standards under the updated Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>The exceptions were missed in the tracking sheet likely due to the data not being in sync with the most recent Council decisions and by-laws coming into effect. All of these exceptions were retained and brought into the Final zoning by-law as they are recent. Transition provisions have also been expanded/updated in the final draft zoning by-law.</p>
80	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.) on behalf of multiple landowners	Area 47 in the City of Brampton 10263 The Gore Road 10309 Clarkway Drive 10431 The Gore Road 4538 Castlemore Road 10365 The Gore Road 10307 Clarkway Drive	06-06-2025	<p>The landowners have secured site-specific zoning approvals through Council-adopted by-laws to facilitate a coordinated Block Plan community supported by critical servicing infrastructure. The submission raises two key concerns: (1) the proposed transition provisions may jeopardize long-standing development approvals and hinder housing delivery, contrary to provincial goals; and (2) the proposed electric vehicle (EV) parking requirements should be removed and left to market demand due to coordination challenges with utility providers. The landowners request that their site-specific zoning remain in force under the new by-law to ensure implementation continuity.</p>	<p>We confirm that the exceptions under the referenced by-laws were retained in the final Zoning By-law prior to Council Adoption. The EV requirements have been removed from the final draft zoning by-law, and the transition provisions have been expanded and updated as well.</p>
81	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.)	0 & 8265 Churchville Road	03-06-2025	<p>Schedule A – Zone Map</p> <p>CZBL proposes to zone the subject lands 'Agriculture (A)'. The subject lands are to be zoned 'Residential First Density (R1)', 'Open Space (OS)', and 'Natural System (NS)'. Existing site specific exception 3814 is to be carried forward taking priority over the parent CZBL where there are conflicting standards</p>	<p>We confirm that exception 3814 (now exception no. 1968) and its text was incorporated into the by-law's schedule A and Chapter 12 prior to adoption, as the exception was recent.</p>
82	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of 2391057 Ontario Inc.	0 Father Tobin Road, 10819 & 10833 Bramalea Road	02-06-2025	<p>By way of background, on May 12, 2025 a Report was considered by the City's Planning and Development Committee recommending approval of an application to re-designate and rezone the subject site to permit the development of 131 stacked and back-to-back townhouses units. By-laws 93-2025 and 94-2025 were subsequently passed by City Council on May 14, 2025. We are writing to advise that our office has had an opportunity to review the April 23, 2025 Information Report and new Comprehensive Zoning By-law ("CZBL") [3rd Draft April 2025]. Initial observations and recommended modifications are listed below: Schedule A – Zone Map CZBL proposes to zone the subject site 'Residential Second Density – Townhouses – Special Section 1929 (R2-1929)' and 'Agricultural (A)'. The subject lands are to be zoned 'Residential Second Density – Stacked Townhouses'. Existing site specific exception 3834 is to be carried forward taking priority over the parent CZBL where there are conflicting standards.</p>	<p>Exception 3834 was too recent and was thus missed in the April 2025 tracking sheet but has been included in the version for Council adoption. It was renumbered 2761.</p>
83	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of 2811135 Ontario Inc. & 2803832 Ontario Inc.	1286, 1298, 1300 & 1306 Queen Street West	02-06-2025	<p>By way of background, on December 9, 2024 a Report was considered by the City's Planning and Development Committee recommending approval of an application to re-designate and rezone the subject site to permit a 12-storey, 265 unit, residential apartment building. By-laws 16-2025 and 17-2025 were subsequently passed by City Council on February 5, 2025 and are now in effect. We are writing to advise that our office has had an opportunity to review the April 23, 2025 Information Report and new Comprehensive Zoning By-law ("CZBL") [3rd Draft April 2025]. Initial observations and recommended modifications are listed below: Schedule A – Zone Map CZBL proposes to zone the subject site 'Residential Estate (RE)' reflecting the former residential hamlet zoning. The subject site is to be zoned 'Residential Third Density – Mid Rise (R3M)'. Existing site specific exception 3804 is to be carried forward taking priority over the parent CZBL where there are conflicting standards.</p>	<p>We confirm that the recent approvals were carried forward into the new by-law. Exception 3804 was too recent and was thus missed in the April 2025 tracking sheet. It was renumbered 2764.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
84	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of 2872374 Ontario Inc.	1206 Steeles Avenue West	03-06-2025	<p>On November 4, 2025 a Report was considered by the City's Planning and Development Committee recommending approval of an application to rezone the subject lands to permit the development of eighteen (18) townhouse units, a buffer block, and the extension of Royal Vista Road. By-law 178-2024 was subsequently passed by City Council on November 20, 2024 and on December 26, 2024 the plan of subdivision was Draft Approved. We are writing to advise that our office has had an opportunity to review the April 23, 2025 Information Report and new Comprehensive Zoning By-law ("CZBL") [3rd Draft April 2025]. Initial observations and recommended modifications are listed below: Schedule A – Zone Map CZBL proposes to zone the subject lands 'Residential Second Density – Townhouses (R2)' and 'Residential First Density – Fourplexes (R1A)'. The subject lands are to be zoned 'Residential Second Density – Townhouses (R2)' and 'Open Space (OS)'. Existing site specific exceptions 3798 and 3799 are to be carried forward taking priority over the parent CZBL where there are conflicting standards</p>	<p>The referenced exceptions were retained. Exception 3799 was missed in the April 2025 tracking sheet as it was recent but has been added and integrated prior to council adoption. It was renumbered 623.</p>
85	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Creditview 4-P Holding Inc.	7614, 7624, 7650, 7662 Creditview Road	02-06-2025	<p>The subject site was Draft Plan Approved by the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) on August 27, 2024 to permit a residential development consisting of thirteen (13) single detached dwellings, a public park, two (2) servicing blocks, an open space block, and a new local road extension terminating in a cul-de-sac (Files: T04W14.015, 21T-16019B). We are writing to advise that our office has had an opportunity to review the April 23, 2025 Information Report and new Comprehensive Zoning By-law ("CZBL") [3rd Draft April 2025]. Initial observations and recommended modifications are listed below: Schedule A – Zone Map CZBL proposes to zone the subject site 'Residential Hamlet (RE)', 'Open Space (OS)', and 'Natural System'. Existing site specific exceptions 3694 and 3695 are to be carried forward taking priority over the parent CZBL where there are conflicting standards.</p> <p>According to the Matrix of Exception Zone (Special Section) Review (April 2025) the text for 3694 and 3695 is missing and further review is required</p>	<p>Exceptions 3694 and 3695 were integrated into Chapter 12 of the by-law before council adoption. They are now numbered 2807 and 2806, respectively.</p>
86	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Rotary Club of Brampton Glen Community Centre ("Rotary")	1857 Queen Street West	02-06-2025	<p>By way of background, OZS-2021-0018 was filed on May 17, 2021 and deemed "Complete" on June 30, 2021. On March 28, 2023 the Application was appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT). A six (6) day Hearing commenced on April 22, 2024 and on June 19, 2024 the Tribunal issued an Order allowing the Appeals in part, on an interim basis. A final Order was issued on February 13, 2025 approving site specific Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.</p> <p>We are writing to advise that our office has had an opportunity to review the April 23, 2025 Information Report and new Comprehensive Zoning By-law ("CZBL") [3rd Draft April 2025]. Initial observations and recommended modifications are listed below: Schedule A – Zone Map CZBL proposes to zone subject site 'General Commercial – Special Section 349 (GC 349)' reflecting the former highway commercial zoning. The subject site is to be split zoned 'Residential Third Density – Mid Rise (R3M)', 'Open Space' and 'Natural System'. Existing site specific exceptions 3641 and 3642 are to be carried forward taking priority over the parent CZBL where there are conflicting standards</p>	<p>Exception zones 3641 and 3642 were incorporated into the final by-law before council adoption. They were likely missed in Draft 3 as they were recent. They are now numbered 2812 and 1551 respectively.</p>
87	KLM Planning on behalf of DG Group		02-06-2025	<p>The commenter raises various comments about the third draft Zoning By-law dated April 2025. They request a 10-year transition period for previously approved applications, like Vaughan's approach. They note several technical inconsistencies and dimensional challenges related to yard encroachments, parking ratios, lot sizes, garage setbacks, and landscaped open space—particularly for townhouses, lane-based dwellings, and back-to-back units. The submission also highlights definition conflicts (e.g., "main wall," "basement," "storey"), seeks greater clarity in driveway/walkway regulations, and asks for specific exemptions and revisions to reflect urban design realities, referencing other municipal standards (e.g., Richmond Hill). Lastly, they suggest improved clarity for POTL, common element condos, and edge conditions near parks and SWM blocks. Refer to letter.</p>	<p>The transition framework has been updated along with various other changes to the zoning by-law in consideration of comments. A meeting was held with KLM to discuss and we would be pleased to have a follow up discussion.</p>
88				<p>Exception Comparison Chart of By-Law Review</p>	<p>Given the transition framework and other changes have been made to the final zoning by-law, many of the requested changes to the exceptions should not be required but we would be pleased to discuss further if there are specific modifications. Further changes of a corrective nature or to give clarity can be made to the exceptions prior to Council adoption but should be limited given the transition framework updates.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <small>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</small>	Response (as of January 2026)
89	KLM Planning on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc.	4320 Queen Street East	02-06-2025	<p>KLM reiterates comments from their November 1, 2024 letter regarding the Second Draft, noting that their concerns were not addressed in the Third Draft of the City's Comprehensive Zoning By-law. They emphasize the importance of retaining site-specific zoning permissions to support ongoing site plan applications. KLM also highlights discrepancies in the online zoning mapping, which shows altered parcel boundaries and zoning categories inconsistent with approved zoning. They request corrections and incorporation of existing permissions to avoid compliance issues, and ask to be notified of future updates or public meetings.</p>	<p>The 4 exceptions (3616, 3617, 3618, 3619) were retained in the 3rd draft, as indicated in the Exception Tracking Sheet. We note the site previously zoned M4-1751 is now zoned PE to implement the City's MTSAs planning work. The base zone categories have to change, because the old by-law is being replaced with a new by-law containing a range of new zones. The exceptions would apply, and transition would apply to grant any site plan the ability to continue to construction. In the Final Draft Zoning By-law, transition provisions were updated to enable transition of approved zoning by-law amendments which are now subject to an exception zone meaning development can proceed in accordance with the prior zoning by-law amendment and prior 270-2004.</p>
90	KLM Planning on behalf of Forestside Estates Inc.	8840 The Gore Road	02-06-2025	<p>We have reviewed the Third Draft of the CZBL and would like to note that there are impending development applications for the Subject Lands that are based on a revised site plan, differing from the previously approved development application under Exception 2873 of the City of Brampton Zoning By-law 270-2004.</p> <p>A meeting was held with City of Brampton Staff members, Alex Sepe and Nitika Jagtiani, on April 25, 2025, to discuss the revised development proposal. The revised concept consists of an eighteen (18) storey apartment building, including one-hundred-and-thirty dwelling units ranging in size from one- to three-bedroom units. The proposed development also includes one-hundred-and-forty-eight (148) parking spaces distributed at-grade and within a two (2) level underground parking garage. Currently, the CZBL zones the Subject Lands as Mixed-Use Mid-Rise. We respectfully request that the CZBL zoning designation for the Subject Lands be reflective of the proposed development</p>	<p>We do not have the ability to replace a site-specific process that is occurring. The Mid-Rise Mixed Use designation was applied in accordance with the MTSAs team's planning work. Exception 2873 was proposed to be deleted per the MTSAs team recommendations. We note that an application may be submitted to allow 18 storeys, noting that the Official Plan only permits mid-rise. At this time we proposed deleting the exception to allow 12 storeys as contemplated by the MM zone.</p>
91	KLM Planning on behalf of McVean Community Landowners Group Inc. (the "LOG") which is comprised of Boston Group Genesis Ltd., West Humber River Developments Inc., S.Del Degan Contractors Ltd., and 1917803 Ontario Limited	Gore Meadows Secondary Plan Area 56	02-06-2025	<p>KLM references the City's September 2024 decision to approve an alternative planning process for the Gore Meadows Secondary Plan Area, allowing privately initiated applications through Sub-Area Precinct Plans. In reviewing the Third Draft of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law (CZBL), KLM notes that the subject lands are currently zoned with designations that may not reflect future development intentions. Given that forthcoming planning applications are under discussion, KLM requests that zoning not be assigned to these lands in the CZBL, as doing so would be premature.</p>	<p>The zoning proposed in draft 3 was carried over or is equivalent from the existing zoning so we do not view it as premature. The City prefers to keep these lands in the new ZBL, and the zoning may be amended when development moves forward. The ZBLA will need to be a ZBLA to the new zoning by-law so it would be best to include them. We are open to changes such as applying a Future Development zone but otherwise prefer to retain the zoning.</p>
92	KLM Planning on behalf of Denford Estates Inc.	1402 & 1420 Queen Street West	02-06-2025	<p>There are impending development applications for the Subject Lands. The overall concept for the site is still being contemplated by the owner but is currently reflective of a medium density development in the form of stacked townhouse dwellings with associated parking. The existing single-detached dwelling located at 1402 Queen Street West is proposed to remain, including the wooded area in the east and north portions of the Subject Lands. As such, we respectfully request that the CZBL zoning designation for the Subject Lands be reflective of these changes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Subject Lands are located within the Springbrook Tertiary Plan (the "Tertiary Plan"), which designates the property as "Medium Density Residential (Mid-Rise)", "Low Medium Density Residential", "Valleyland/Watercourse Corridor", and "Woodland". We respectfully request that the CZBL zone designation be reflective of the Tertiary Plan, the Credit Valley Secondary Plan, and the 2006 and 2024 City of Brampton Official Plan.</p>	<p>Prezoning for development in this area is outside the scope of the CZBLR, and the draft zoning is based on the current zoning. The development application should proceed to a conclusion and implement zone changes that reflect this work. We are open to applying "FD zoning" in the mapping to indicate future changes are forthcoming, as an option but had not heard further.</p>
93	KLM Planning on behalf of West Humber River Developments Inc.	10350 The Gore Road	02-06-2025	<p>We have reviewed the Third Draft of the City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law (the "CZBL") and would like to note that Applications for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision have been submitted to the City of Brampton and are currently under review.</p> <p>The applications were originally submitted in October 2024 with a second submission containing revised materials and responses to City, Region and agency comments submitted to the City in April 2025. The Zoning By-law was approved by City Council on May 28th, 2025. The applications have been submitted to facilitate the creation of a residential and mixed-use development consisting of street townhouses, back-to-back townhouses, as well as low and high-rise apartment buildings accessed via new public roads. A public park and stormwater management pond have also been proposed as part of the overall development concept. As such, we respectfully request that the CZBL zoning designation for the Subject Lands be reflective of the recently approved Zoning By-law Amendment</p>	<p>We have incorporated the recently approved ZBLA into the new ZBL, prior council adoption, including Special Sections 3837 and 3838 (now Exceptions 2762, 2763). These exceptions were recent so they were missed in the April 2025 exceptions tracking sheet.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <i>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</i>	Response (as of January 2026)
128	Korsiak Urban Planning on behalf of Mattamy Homes		Thursday, February 6, 2025	General Comments 1. I was unable to find Schedule H online.	Schedule H is available on the interactive map, but is located under "Other" in the legend on the right side.
129				Chapter 2: Definitions 1. Street townhouse definition: Revise to "public or private street"	We are supportive of this and implemented the change.. This would cover circumstances where townhouses are on individual lots but face a private road.
130				Chapter 3: General Provisions for All Zones 1. Table 3.10.1: Window bays: Revise to a maximum width of 4m instead of 3m. Add "with or without side windows".	This was discussed internally and some tweaks to the projections have been updated to reflect the City's preference.
131				2. 3.12.2: Reserve should also count for depth and frontage measurement.	This change was not implemented.
132				3. 3.15.1: Revise to any "habitable" building or structure.	This language was preferred by CN and accepted by the City through previous revisions.
133				4. 3.18.1: Suggest revising to the way Milton treats through lots, having two front yard setbacks: Where a lot, which is not a corner lot, abuts a street line on more than one side, the minimum front yard setback of the Zone shall apply to all street lines and lot depth requirements of the Zone shall apply.	This language is retained from the current ZBL. The City preferred to retain discretion over interpretations.
134				Chapter 4: Access and Parking Standards 1. 4.2.B.1: Revert back to 4.5 metres as in the 2nd draft.	Driveway separation from intersections. City traffic staff strongly prefer 6 m as being required to accommodate a stop sign, crossing, etc. which is what drove the revision.
135				2. Table 4.4.1: "Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Equipped with Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment" - delete this requirement (and allow it to be market driven) for all uses and building types.	The EV requirements have been removed from the final draft zoning by-law.
136				3. 4.5.B.2: Revise to allow bicycles to be stored in a storage locker provided that the minimum bike storage space requirement is provided plus additional space for storage.	Not allowing min bicycle parking to be met in storage lockers was preferred by City staff.
137				4.5.C.1: Remove.	This provision was supported by City staff and no change made.
138				Chapter 5: Residential Zones 1. Table 5.1.1. Add live/work townhouses.	Currently live-work is only allowed in the M zones so no change has been made.
139				2. 5.1.B: Lot Requirements - Table 5.1.2 a. Reduce lot area for back-to-backs to 80m <sup>2</sup> .	WSP is supportive as the other standards would have to be met (E.g., front yard).
140				b. Back-to-back townhouse dwelling width should revert back to 5.75m as in the 2nd draft.	Through discussions with UD, the preference was 6.5 m, as the A/C/utilities would need to be accommodated in the front. In the final draft we reduced slightly to 6.0m.
141				3. 5.1.C: Building Height and Form – Table 5.1.4 a. Reduce front yard setback for all R2G uses to 3 metres.	Through discussions with UD, the City strongly prefers 4.5 m front yards, to facilitate some green space and tree planting.
142				b. Exterior side yard – revise to 2.0 metres.	We have reduced to 2.0m in the final draft.
143				c. Rear yard – revise singles and semis to 6 metres or add the 6m exception to abutting NS zone as well.	Agree - we will add the 6 m exception to the NS zone consistently for singles/semis. The City prefers 7 m in all other cases, for privacy/separation and amenity space.
144				d. Lane-based singles, semis, and towns – revise minimum rear yard to 0.6 metres.	Through UD discussions, 1.0 m was preferred as the minimum to create a small amount of space for garbage and functionality.
145				4. Table 5.1.5: For mixed use buildings, setbacks should be 0m for front and 2m for exterior side yard.	City strongly prefers 4.5 m where residential uses are located at grade. Generally the mixed-use buildings would be under the M zones.
146				5. Table 5.1.6: a. Revise maximum height to 13 metres for R2, R2A, R2G zones to accommodate three storey townhouse forms.	The concerns with the requested change is that it would allow for effectively four storeys.
147				b. R2A maximum height should be 4 storeys, stacks are at least 3.5 storeys.	3 Storeys is intended to support the Official Plan's height limit in some areas. Four storeys is permitted only in some cases. The ZBL can set out a different height on the schedules.
148				6. Table 5.1.7: Minimum 4.5m ground floor height should be for mixed use buildings, not all apartments.	The City preferred 4.5 m min height for all uses to create some flexibility in the future for conversion and contribute to streetscape design objectives.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
149				7. Table 5.1.8: Revise minimum lane-based front yard landscaping to 60%.	The 70% requirement should be achievement given there would be no driveways in this context so it has been retained.
150				8. 5.2.D.3: Setback to a garage door - revise to 5.6 m.	The City strongly prefers a 6.0 m setback for parking spaces, to accommodate most vehicles (e.g., smaller SUVs are 5.4m, pick up trucks at 6.0m) and create a bit of space for unloading without obstructing the sidewalk as much as possible.
151				9. 5.2.D.5: Revise to "the garage door opening shall be located at least 1.0 m further from the street than the porch or main wall, whichever is closest to the street".	The intent was to locate the garage behind the main wall and not just the porch, which is allowed to encroach.
152				10. 5.2.D.6: Revise to 65% of the dwelling width for lots 11m and wider.	We have updated to 65% for lots under 12 m and 60% for lots over 12 m.
153				11. 5.2.G: Amenity Space Requirements a. Confirm this section does not apply to freehold or POTL back-to-back townhouses as they would be considered only 1 unit on a lot.	We confirm that amenity area is not required for any dwelling types that are on their own individual private lots (assuming this is what is being described as POTL B2B).
154				b. Revise requirement in .2 for to 4m2 per unit.	The City prefers 5 m <sup>2</sup> but an application can be sought on a case by case basis if there are site specific considerations.
155				12. 5.2.D.8, 5.2.D.9: Minimum dimensions of any parking space in an attached private garage – revise to 2.9m x 6m.	These provisions were established through some prior workshops and the City would prefer to retain the standards shown in Draft 3. The intent is to facilitate some space for storage/waste and create a functional space for vehicles.
156				13. 5.2.I: Add a provision to allow for attached garages and driveways to span the dwelling width for lane-based singles, semis, and townhouses.	We agree with the suggested clarification.
157				14. 5.2.Q.1: Remove.	This provision is an evolution of an existing requirement in the ZBL but has been removed in the final draft.
158				Chapter 7: Mixed-Use Zones 1. Table 7.1.3: Suggest 0m for front and 2m for exterior side yard.	The intent of a min 3 m front yard is to facilitate opportunity for public space but we understand the desire for flexibility to the site design process.
159				2. Table 7.1.3 needs to include standards for live/work townhouses – 3m front yard, and 0.6 m rear yard.	The standards were intended to work for all uses. Imagine the 0.6 m rear yard is intended to address rear lanes with garages which we agree is a gap and can be added.
160				3. 7.2.C.2: Revise to read "any part of a required rear yard".	We agree with this change as it will add some flexibility.
161				4. 7.2.D.1: Suggest allowing parking in interior side yard in mixed use zones.	Through discussions with City urban design staff it was decided that parking be directed to the rear yard only in these zones. If there are examples of side yard parking in the transit station areas we would be pleased to review further.
162				5. 7.2.D.4: Remove or revise to a public street with a right-of-way greater than 24 metres	The city would prefer not to allow private garages to face streets in any mixed use zones and only allow in rear lane configurations. If there are some examples/exemptions we would be pleased to review further.
163	Metrolinx		30-05-2025	To ensure there is compliance with Section 3.4 and Section 3.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and Section 2.1.2.39 of the City of Brampton Official Plan. Refer to accompanying table for proposed text revisions.	The proposed provisions cannot be included in the zoning by-law, as the zoning by-law cannot direct or require studies to be prepared. The city would implement these requirements through other means.
164	Metrolinx	PIN 142540220	30-05-2025	Metrolinx is the owner of a property just outside of the Mount Pleasant GO MTSA (PIN 142540220), which is proposed to be zoned as "HC – Highway Commercial". Metrolinx requests that the City consider zoning the property as "MH – Mixed-Use High Rise" on Schedule 13 to align with the zoning of the adjacent Metrolinx-owned property (PIN 143640067), as both properties would likely be developed as a single site.	This site is not included in the MTSA so prezoning was not contemplated. The exception was proposed to be deleted because it permits a limited range of uses (only a hotel).

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <small>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</small>	Response (as of January 2026)
165	MHBC Planning on behalf of Morguard Corporation & Bramalea City Centre Equities Inc.	25 Peel Centre Drive	02-06-2025	Transition Policies and Existing Functionality: MHBC stresses the need for appropriate transition policies that allow BCC to evolve gradually without jeopardizing its existing commercial, employment, and recreational roles. They request a Site-Specific Exception be applied to recognize BCC's current uses and operations.	The final zoning by-law maintains Exception 416 (now #466) with respect to lands subject to a site plan. The balance of the lands are prezoned and subject to Exception 642 and holding requirements.
166				SPA Area Zoning Inconsistencies: The SPA area, proposed for a 1,000-unit residential development, is zoned as General Commercial (GC), which conflicts with planned residential use. MHBC recommends applying the Mixed Use High Rise (MUHR) zone and assigning appropriate height (50 storeys) and FSI (8) limits to match development plans.	
167				Holding Symbol Concerns: MHBC objects to the current Holding Symbol as it restricts shopping centre development across over half of the BCC lands. They propose a site-specific Holding Symbol that still permits commercial evolution while deferring residential intensification until necessary. They also argue against requiring gratuitous land conveyance for parks/community hubs without proper study and existing needs assessments.	
168				Active Frontage Requirements: MHBC finds the 50% and 70% active frontage requirements excessive given the site's commercial nature and existing mall layout. They request more flexibility in applying these provisions, particularly in areas not suited to new commercial frontages.	
169				Maximum FSI: MHBC notes a discrepancy between permitted building heights and FSI. They request increased FSI limits to align with the increased heights and to reflect built form examples from the City's Precinct Area Plan Guidelines.	
170				Maximum Building Heights: MHBC requests higher building height permissions throughout BCC, especially along Queen Street. They argue the current height permissions (limited to 50 storeys only for properties directly on Queen Street) do not reflect the site's potential as a major Urban Centre. Their proposal includes a wider band of taller heights to support transit-oriented intensification and reflect the area's existing and planned infrastructure.	
170	MHBC Planning on behalf of Glenshore Investments Inc.	5203 Old Castlemore Road	29-05-2025	<p>The Subject Lands are currently zoned site-specific Industrial Business (MBU-3558). The MBU-3558 zone permits a mix of retail and light industrial uses, such as warehouses, manufacturing and processing. A small area of the Subject Lands, centrally located, adjacent to the western lot line nearest Rainbow Creek, has been zoned as Floodplain (F) for the purpose of accommodating a stormwater management pond. During the City's current review of the SPA-2022-0051 application, it was determined that the proposed pond could be replaced by a private stormwater tank. As a result, the OZS-2023-0038 application was submitted to rezone the Floodplain (F) zoned area (identified as a portion of Block 1, conditionally draft approved plan 21T-20003B) into the Industrial Business (MBU-3558) zone to align the extent of the lands under one zone district. The supporting Zoning By-law Amendment was approved at council on May 28, 2025 as By-law 96-2025. The approved By-law has been attached to this letter as information. We have had a chance to review the comment response table, and exception tracking table prepared by the City in support of Draft #3, and note that exception 3558 is intended to be carried forward for the Subject Lands. Given the recent changes and approvals to the Subject Lands through OZS-2023-0038, we ask that the revised provisions and uses found in the attached by-law be carried forward. These changes include the addition of 'Flood and Erosion Control' as a permitted use, and provisions allowing increased lot coverage, floor space index and height.</p>	This is noted and we have updated special section 3558 (now Exception #684) to incorporate the recent amendment.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
171	MHBC Planning on behalf of Catholic Cemeteries & Funeral Services - Archdiocese of Toronto (CCFS)	11175 Heritage Road & 39 Centre Street South	28-01-2025	The second draft of the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law proposes to re-zone St. Mary's Cemetery to Mixed Use High Rise (MH-H(25)-D(3)) and maintain the Agricultural (A) zoning of the Heritage Road property. The draft also contains definitions for Cemetery, Crematorium and Funeral Home. Based on our review of the second draft of the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law, we wish to provide the following comments and requested revisions for your consideration:	
172				1. To recognize the St. Mary's Cemetery site's longstanding use and the practical reality that it will continue to so be used, CCFS requests that the lands be zoned as Mixed Use High Rise (MH-H(25)-D(3)) with a site-specific exception to include Cemetery as a permitted use	Through discussion with the MTS team, the preference is to update the zoning to OS to reflect/permit the cemetery use more clearly. This is reflected in the final Zoning By-law for Council adoption.
173				2. The Heritage Road site falls within the Heritage Heights Secondary Plan, which CCFS has appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal. The City has already agreed to recognize cemetery uses as permitted on these lands in further modifications to the Secondary Plan. As a result, CCFS requests that the Heritage Road site be zoned Agricultural (A) with a site-specific exception to include Cemetery as a permitted use	As there are ongoing discussions regarding this Secondary Plan process, we have retained the current zoning as Agriculture in the final draft. Zoning changes should be completed upon completion of the Secondary Plan process.
174				3. To ensure greater and continued alignment with the overall provincial intent respecting cemeteries as set out in the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, CCFS requests the following underlined additions to the definitions of Cemetery, Crematorium and Funeral Home: Cemetery: shall mean premises used for the interment of human remains and includes a mausoleum, columbarium or other structure intended for the interment of human remains, and shall include a Cemetery as defined in the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, its successor or replacement legislation. Crematorium: shall mean premises used for the purposes of cremating human remains and is licensed in accordance with the requirements of the Province, and shall include a Crematorium as defined in the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, its successor or replacement legislation. Funeral Home: shall mean premises used for the provision of funeral and memorial services to the general public, including the temporary interment of human remains under the supervision of a Provincially authorized or licensed person, as well as the storage, display and sale of funeral supplies, but does not include a crematorium, and shall include a Funeral Establishment as defined in the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, its successor or replacement legislation	We agree with the requested changes and revisions have been made to the By-law.
175			01-06-2025	Charter Violation – Freedom of Religion - The proposed zoning imposes onerous restrictions on building houses of worship in residential areas (e.g., minimum lot size of 8,000 m <sup>2</sup> ). This disproportionately burdens religious groups, especially newer and smaller Protestant congregations, effectively infringing on Charter rights (Section 2(a) – freedom of religion). Many existing churches wouldn't comply under the new by-law and couldn't even qualify for a minor variance	Places of worship are intended to fall within the Institutional zone in the future. At this time we have reduced the minimum lot area requirement given the floor area size is capped in these zones to manage intensity.
176				Non-Conformity with the Official Plan  The 800 m <sup>2</sup> floor plate cap makes it difficult to deliver 2+ bedroom apartment units (as required in OP Policy 3.3.1.55). The result is fewer family-sized units, which goes against the City's livability and housing diversity goals. Floor plate limits are said to necessitate buildings of 40+ storeys to be viable, while zoning caps height at 30 storeys—triggering unnecessary rezoning applications.	The floor plate cap aligns with the Urban Design Guidelines. It is intended to implement design guidelines and helps to limit shadow and sky view impacts.
177				Conflict with Housing Accelerator Plan (HAP)  City committed to allowing 4+ storey buildings within 800m of support corridors. In practice, even lands directly on support corridors are often zoned too restrictively (e.g., Vodden zoned R1A with a 3-storey, 11m limit—contradicting the 4-storey allowance). City is not aligning zoning with stated intensification goals or Council commitments under the HAP.	The ZBL implements the Official Plan which allows for 4-units adjacent to corridors, in line with the City's Housing Accelerator Fund agreement. The Secondary Plans still apply and will need to be updated by the City in the future to reflect any new height requirements. In large part the zoning in these areas is carried forward from existing zoning and reflects the uses that were developed.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <small>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</small>	Response (as of January 2026)
178				<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Parking and Transportation Issues</b></p> <p>Unclear parking standards for apartment units (Table 4.1.1).</p> <p>Parking minimums remain too high for fast food-style restaurants, especially in transit-served areas or where delivery apps dominate.</p> <p>Shared parking between lots is prohibited, contradicting OP policies which encourage it.</p> <p>Bike parking requirements (especially in PRA1 &amp; PRA2) are excessive, based on Toronto's oversupply evidence.</p> <p>PRA2 standards don't reflect the increased transit accessibility in areas served by two major transit lines—parking requirements should be further reduced in such locations.</p>	<p>Parking standards for apartments have been updated in the Final Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Parking rates in PRA 2 are a slight reduction to the PRA3 rates to recognize the local transit service. Overall rates have been largely reduced over existing rates. Over time the City will monitor the performance of parking standards and make revisions as the areas intensify and the mobility context evolves.</p>
179	SGL Planning on behalf of Hampton Development Corp	241 Queen Street East	28-05-2025	<p>Hampton supports the inclusion of previously approved site-specific zoning exceptions (3780, 3781, 3782) but raises several concerns:</p> <p>The current 3-year transition period for in-process applications is too short given the scale and timeline of the proposed development.</p> <p>The by-law does not account for future building permit or planning applications that implement transitioned developments.</p> <p>Some site-specific provisions refer to outdated sections of the existing zoning by-law without clear context.</p> <p>Certain language in the provisions referencing loading requirements should be updated to align with the structure of the new by-law.</p>	<p>The transition provisions have been expanded in consideration of comments in the Final Draft Zoning By-law. The exceptions are not able to refer to the old, repealed by law and must only reflect exceptions to the new by-law. However the updated transition provisions now allow development to proceed under the prior zoning by-law amendment and bylaw 270-2004 as an option, for up to 10 years. The section references in exceptions are noted and were updated prior to Council adoption.</p>
180	Weston Consulting	2110 - 2160 Williams Parkway East 1925 Williams Parkway East 25 Bramtree Court 35 Bramtree Court 40 Bramtree Court 400 Chrysler Drive 100 Sandalwood Parkway West 350 Parkhurst Square 2 Bramkay Street 35 Regan Road 2 Colony Court 10 & 20 Whybank Drive 240 Summerlea Road 1195 Clark Boulevard 156 Parkshore Drive 175 Westcreek Boulevard 201 Westcreek Boulevard 109 Summerlea Road 735 Intermodal Drive 75 Summerlea Road 7 Kenview Boulevard 10 Auction Lane 390 Chrysler Drive 111 Van Kirk Drive 8495 Goreway Drive 35 Automatic Road	30-05-2025	<p>We support the continued application of the site-specific exceptions for the subject properties that currently have such site-specific exceptions under Zoning By-law 270-2004. We agree with the City's approach to carrying these site-specific exceptions forward.</p> <p>2. Overall, we agree with the proposed zones identified for the subject properties as they reflect the appropriate uses for the lands.</p> <p>Based on our review of the 3rd Draft CZBL, we do not have any concerns as they relate to the subject properties. We respectfully request that City Staff maintains the proposed zoning, as currently outlined, as they prepare the final draft of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law for Council consideration</p>	<p>Noted. The exceptions have been retained for adoption (1513, 1548, 366, 1555, 157, 156, 2687, 2716, 1792, 335, 2615, 1799, 366, 157, 1566, 1513, 3158, 2684, 366, 2717)</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
181	Weston Consulting on behalf of Bovaird Commercial Centre Ltd.	Northwest corner of Bovaird Drive West and Creditview Road, south of Lagerfeld Drive	30-05-2025	<p>The subject property is currently zoned C3-3525 through an OMB decision, allowing for mixed-use mid-rise or low-rise commercial uses. Variances to support a proposed development were approved by the Committee of Adjustment in December 2023 and became final in January 2024. While the third draft of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law rezones the site to MM-3525 and maintains site-specific exception 3525, it does not incorporate the recently approved variances from application A-2023-0365. Weston Consulting requests that these variances be integrated into the updated zoning to ensure the approved development is fully supported.</p>	<p>We have integrated the variance as requested into existing exception 3525 (renumbered to 771). Note that the adjacent lands were also renumbered and their references are up to date in Exception 771.</p>
182	Weston Consulting on behalf of Mayfield Commercial Centre Ltd.	Southeast corner of the intersection of Airport Road and Mayfield Road	30-05-2025	<p>The site-specific exception #3656 is proposed to be copied verbatim, which raises a new concern for the Phase 1 Lands. Currently, Commercial School is a permitted use for the Phase 1 Lands. This use was approved through minor variance application A-2024-0466. Although Commercial School is also a permitted use within the LC – Local Commercial zone of the 3rd Draft CZBL, the wording of the site-specific exception would have the unintended effect of not permitting this use on the Phase 1 Lands. Exception #3656 includes the following provision: 12.3656.1 The lands shall only be used for the following purposes: 1. a retail establishment having no outside storage; 2. an office, including medical, dentist and a drugless practitioner; 3. a service shop; 4. a personal service shop; 5. a bank, trust company and finance company; 6. a dry cleaning and laundry distribution station; 7. a laundromat; 8. a dining room restaurant, a convenience restaurant, a take-out restaurant; 9. a printing or copying establishment; 10. a garden centre sales establishment; 11. a health or fitness centre; 12. a parking lot; 13. a community club; 14. a supermarket; 15. a custom workshop; 16. an animal hospital; 17. a place of worship; 18. a day nursery; 19. Supportive Housing Residence Type 2; 20. a lodging house; 21. purposes accessory to the other permitted uses. The above list of permitted uses does not include Commercial School and due to the wording of the provision, which states "The lands shall only be used for the following purposes", the permission for a Commercial School provided by the parent LC – Local Commercial zone would also be overridden by the site-specific exception. We believe that this is an unintentional consequence of carrying forward the existing exception #3656 without considering the minor variance application approval which occurred after the rezoning application for the Phase 1 Lands was approved. We kindly request that Staff revise provision 12.3656.1 of site-specific exception #3656 to add Commercial School to the list of permitted uses, as it is an approved use</p>	<p>We are supportive of modifying the exception to add the commercial school use as it is similar to other uses and/or permitting all the uses permitted in the local commercial zone. Otherwise minor variances are subject to the transition clauses of the by-law. We have addressed this change to the Exception in the version being brought forward for Council adoption.</p>
183	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. on behalf of CP REIT Ontario Properties Limited and CPH Master Limited Partnership (collectively referred to as "Choice")	1 Presidents Choice Circle 35 Worthington Avenue 25 Cottrelle Boulevard 250 First Gulf Boulevard 55 Mountainash Road	30-05-2025	<p>New zoning standards may affect the operation and future redevelopment of existing sites.</p>	<p>The City prefers not to permanently legalize all instances of legal non-compliance through a general provision. The by-law grants allowance for expansions and alterations to occur even where buildings/structures are non-complying. The team is unclear on what types of activities on the site are going to be constrained by the new by-law. We would request more explanation of what the impacts are to the sites or future plans so that we can propose solutions. The team is amenable to integrating minor variances into existing exceptions or other edits to the exceptions such as legalizing on a case-by-case basis. We note that the commenter is referring to a number of sites, in which the existing exception zone is being retained but we are unclear on whether the commenter has reviewed this in the 3rd draft. We note that in the Final Draft, the Transition provisions have been expanded.</p>
				<p>Existing drive-throughs and seasonal garden centres may not comply under new rules.</p>	<p>The City's preference is to move forward with the existing framework. We are open to suggested tweaks to the performance standards but otherwise the legal non-compliance and legal non-conformity provisions of the by-law would apply to existing such uses.</p>
				<p>Proposed EV and bicycle parking requirements lack justification and may be excessive.</p>	<p>The EV parking standards have been removed from the final draft zoning by-law. Additionally, the bicycle parking requirements have been reduced and updated in the final draft zoning by-law.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <small>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</small>	Response (as of January 2026)
				Increased landscaping and build-to-zone requirements could conflict with current site layouts.	Noted.
				Sites proposed for the Prestige Employment Zone face potential non-compliance with new landscaping and parking layout standards.	Noted.
184	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. On behalf of Loblaws Companies Limited ("Loblaws")	70 Clementine Drive 35 Worthington Avenue 60 Quarrt Edge Drive 345 Main Street North 8990 Chinguacousy Road 9920 Airport Road 700 Balmoral Drive 295 Queen Street East	30-05-2025	Loblaw expresses concern that the Draft Zoning By-law introduces updated standards that would render several of their existing developments legally non-conforming. They recommend a "vacuum clause" for existing uses and to allow for additions or alterations without triggering non-compliance. Specific concerns include new regulations for seasonal garden centres, increased landscape requirements, restrictive parking and bicycle provisions, and inflexible front yard setbacks and height minimums, especially in General Commercial and Mixed-Use High Rise zones. They request clarification and transitional provisions to protect existing sites and allow for reasonable infill or expansion.	As noted the City does not support the proposed clause which would permanently legalize many conditions that are not in line with the City's new standards. As above it was not clear whether the commenter has reviewed the exception tracking, as the comment letter suggests the new zoning does not include the exceptions. It appears most if not all the exceptions referenced in the letter were retained per the tracking sheet and the transition provisions of the By-law have been updated as well in the Final Draft version.
185		Unassigned (right beside 168 Church Street)	05-05-2025	This parcel should be zoned MHO, not MH, as it has a specific requirement for office GFA. (Did not contact CZBL team)	The address appears to be incorrect so we have not taken any action. The commentor did not leave contact information.
186		4320 Queen Street East	05-05-2025	This site should be zoned MH, as all the existing permitted uses are captured under the parent zone (Did not contact CZBL team)	It appears this is zoned MH unless there's an error in the address. The commentor did not leave contact information so no further action will be taken unless follow up is provided.
187		168 Church Street	26-05-2025	MTSA Team - 172 Church Street East - Delete R3M and keep existing site-specific zoning. ZBA (By-law 116-2022) was passed by Brampton City Council on May 18, 2022, and became final and binding on June 23, 2022. (Contacted CZBL team)	We agree with leaving the site-specific zoning and have completed this in the final zoning by-law.
188			12-05-2025	Address the potential breach of Charter 2(a) regarding houses of worship. 8000sm of minimum lot area for a place of worship is too large, smaller community residential lots can accommodate places of worship.	The minimum lot area was reduced in the final draft zoning by-law to align it more with the maximum floor area on places of worship.
189				Areas with reduced parking rates do not appear to be in keeping with the existing transit service.	The parking rates are in part driven by the Province (no minimum parking is permitted to be regulated in Major Transit Station Areas). The parking rates are also informed by the policies of the Official Plan as well as transit availability.
190			12-05-2025	No minimum parking proposed along Queen Street and west of Highway 10. Will residents in these areas be informed of these new parking guidelines and have an opportunity to provide feedback?	The lack of minimum parking requirements is directed by the Province. All "Major Transit Station Areas" which encompass lands near higher transit stations, are not allowed to be subject to min parking in the future and it would be driven by the market and developers. This approach has been presented through the ZBL previously, including the 1st and 2nd draft documents and the 3rd draft carried that forward.
191			12-05-2025	Will there be front lawns and boulevards with landscaping in front of homes? New developments are providing primarily concrete and parking in the front of dwellings which causes safety concerns.	The new zoning by-law includes new minimum front yard landscaped requirements in all residential zones which will contribute to greening (See section 5.1.E of the new zoning by-law). However, there also is pressure to reduce setbacks and create more housing and building opportunity, so a balance must be struck. These min landscaping standards are not included in the current zoning by-law, however, there are other requirements that applied previously such as limitations on driveways which also continue to apply in the new zoning by-law. The public boulevard is another opportunity to add greenery but this is not regulated by the zoning by-law and subject to other City standards.
192	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.) on behalf of Branthaven Creditview Inc	8940 Creditview Road	27-06-2025	The lapse of Transitional Provisions may alter the approvals that have taken years to obtain and adversely affect housing delivery, forcing developers to seek new approvals later. More broadly, the adverse impact expected to be caused by the transitional provisions are counterproductive to the Province's goal of accelerating housing construction. Furthermore, given the ongoing housing supply challenges in the Greater Toronto Area, a significant number of lots remain unsold. Due to prevailing market uncertainties, it is likely that some of these lots will not be sold or developed prior to the expiry of the transitional period. This undermines the intent of the Transitional Provisions, as their benefits may not be realized for projects that are still in the early stages of market absorption	We have included the recently passed exceptions in the final by-law; they were likely missing in the April tracking sheet as they were recently approved and the data may have been outdated. The transition provisions have been expanded in the final draft zoning by-law.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
193	Circuitview Inc.			<p>We request that the City amends the above Transitional Provisions to recognize the current parent zones and general provisions which applied when the site-specific Zoning By-law was approved. We request that the Brampton Zoning By-law 270-2004 continues to stay in-force for properties with site-specific zoning and preclude these properties from new zoning standards under the updated Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>The transition provisions have been updated in the Final Zoning By-law.</p>
194	MHBC Planning on behalf of Morguard Corporation	410 @ Steeles Business and Retail Centre (bound by Kennedy Road, Steeles Avenue East, and Rutherford Road South)	17-06-2025	<p>We appreciate the clarification in the third draft of the by-law which indicates that the requirement is for the provision of energized outlets. However, EV parking requirements remain a concern as this still has the potential to impact the electrical supply requirements for the shopping centre and the design of the existing and future parking areas.</p>	<p>The EV parking requirements have been removed from the Final Zoning By-law.</p>
195				<p>410 @ Steeles is a master planned shopping and business centre which has almost been completely built out except for two pad sites. The centre was planned without original consideration for EV parking given that EV technology was not in use at the time. Although Morguard does not oppose the introduction of EV parking and regularly considers it for properties that it develops and manages, this provision should not be applied on an ad-hoc basis on partially built-out, master-planned sites. Given that there is potential to affect the transformer sizing and the overall electrical supply needs of the entire shopping centre, implementation of EV requirements in existing master planned sites should be done comprehensively by the owner when the needs of existing businesses warrant as opposed to being triggered by the construction of a single building on one of the few remaining sites within the shopping centre.</p> <p>Therefore, we request that all three site-specific zoning provisions related to 410 @ Steeles include a clause that exempts the Subject Lands from EV parking requirements.</p>	<p>We also note that the transition provisions have been expanded in the final draft zoning by-law.</p>
196				<p>The Subject Lands are currently subject to a number of site-specific zoning provisions. Several permitted uses were removed from the proposed GE-3158 Zone, specifically the furniture and appliance store permission. The Subject Lands have been developed in accordance with these provisions as there is an existing home improvement store (Rona+) on the site. The removal of this permitted use could complicate future development or alteration of this site including hindering minor variance applications or resulting in an unnecessary Zoning By-law Amendment. It is imperative that the permitted uses in the in-effect by-law be carried forward into the new by-law (with appropriate modifications, to be consistent with the new by-law) and to ensure that, at a minimum, all existing uses continue to be permitted. We request the "Building Supply Depot" use and "Retail" use be added as permitted uses to accurately reflect the current use of this site.</p>	<p>As noted in the letter, the exception zones have been retained. Exception 3158 has been maintained as-is which has a few specifically permitted uses, namely motor vehicle manufacturing. The exception was renumbered to 1618. Additionally the uses in PE are permitted. We note that previously the M1 zone allowed furniture and appliances stores. However, M1 was converted into the PE zone which needs to be treated as an employment zone. City staff may undertake further zoning/policy updates in conjunction with the implementation of the recently updated Provincial employment areas policies. At this time, the PE zone is intended as an employment zone. In response to the concerns, the team has added "legally existing uses" as permitted uses into exception 3158 (now 1618). At this time we do not recommend to add "building supply depot" or "retail" as these were not explicitly permitted by the M1 zone or exception 3158 previously.</p>
197				<p>We understand that the approach toward parking standards for shopping centres has changed. Whereas the in-effect by-law has a definition for 'shopping centre' with an associated parking rate, the proposed draft by-law removes this definition and instead simply creates a parking rate for '5 or more commercial uses on the same lot'. It is not uncommon for shopping centres to be developed and managed comprehensively while spread across multiple lots and, in some cases (particularly for larger nation-wide retailers), be owned by multiple owners. To recognize such arrangements, request that the text of the parking rate be modified to read as follows: Development consisting of 5 or more commercial or industrial units on the same lot or on multiple lots but operated / managed as a single development.</p>	<p>The City would still need a legal means of ensuring the parking spaces are retained across multiple properties. As such it is preferable to achieve parking on each site. The provisions enabling off-site parking were removed from draft 3 and would require a zoning by-law amendment or site-specific provisions.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
198	MHBC Planning on behalf of Patel Land and Developments Limited	8383 Mississauga Road	09-06-2025	<p>As stated in our previous correspondence, the Subject Lands are currently subject to an active development application for Zoning By-law Amendment (the “Application”) (City File: OZS-2023-0007), which was deemed complete on April 20, 2023. The City’s proposed Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law (Third Draft) proposes to change the zoning of the Subject Lands from an Agricultural (A) zone to a Future Development (FD) zone. We note that the City and WSP provided a response to our previous submission, and are supportive of the changes made regarding the parkade ventilations within a required yard and the minimum landscape and open space requirements in a Prestige Employment designation. Notwithstanding, we have concerns regarding the “scope of the new ZBL” as the City OP provides direction on the scope of the implementing Zoning By-law. It is within the scope of the Zoning By-law Review to establish a zoning regime that implements the land uses permitted within the City OP. With respect to the Subject Lands this means the Zoning By-law should implement a zoning regime which implements the permitted land uses under the Mixed-Use Employment designation. We formally request that the Subject Lands be considered to be zoned as an Office Commercial zone, to implement the Mixed-Use Employment uses of the City OP.</p>	<p>The Scope of the ZBLR is to conform to and implement the Official Plan and this includes a range of appropriate options. The City is not required to prezone all lands to implement the OP proactively, particularly when some of the Secondary Plans still apply per the OP and some of them require review. The City has not done any prezoning in this process outside of the MTSAs. The FD zone conforms to the OP because it requires a ZBLA that will ensure the policy requirements are met through an application. The City may also require studies in support of the application to establish site-specific zoning requirements and this is not in the City’s scope and should be accomplished by the applicant if required.</p>
205	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) & GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.) on behalf of NWBLG (Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc) & HHLOG (Heritage Heights Landowners Group)	Heritage Heights	24-06-2025	<p>On behalf of the HHLOG, we have reviewed the City of Brampton Third Draft in connection with the CZBL Review. In this regard, attached to this letter is a comment matrix with regard to the Residential Zone provisions, and other general provisions of the new CZBL. The requested revisions as outlined in the attached matrix, represent the minimum provisions/standards being requested. Toward the end, the Heritage Heights Landowners respectfully request that a Workshop be arranged with the Heritage Heights Landowners Group to discuss the comments in greater detail.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Please see attached matrix using the hyperlink</a></u></p>	<p>Various modifications have been made to the greenfield zone, R2G, in consideration of comments. As noted a ZBLA will be required to permit development in Heritage Heights in accordance with the Secondary Plan and alternative standards may be sought. Various meetings with this group have also taken place to discuss comments in more detail and further text updates made in conjunction with the Final Zoning By-law (e.g., standards for dual-frontage townhouses).</p>
206	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of 2846989 Ontario Incorporated	9610 McLaughlin Road North	28-07-2025	<p>CZBL proposes to zone subject site '<a href="#">Local Commercial (LC)</a> and <a href="#">Special Section 2254</a> and '<a href="#">Natural System</a>'</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The proposed LC-2254 and Natural System zoning should recognize the Notice of Decision from the Committee of Adjustment dated November 14, 2023 (City File A-2023-0217) which permitted the use of the subject site for a Residential Care Home and Medical Office</p>	<p>We are supportive of modifying the exception to add the uses as the variance was supported by staff in 2023. This was completed as part of finalizing the zoning by-law prior to Council adoption.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <small>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</small>	Response (as of January 2026)
207	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Brampton Block Plan 40-5 Landowners Group. In collaboration with GSAI (Glen Schnarr and Associates Inc.) & the landowners they represent in purusing Precinct Plan for Block 40-5 Area	Block 40-5	25-07-2025	<p>CZBL proposes to zone the subject site as follows:  <u>"Agriculture (A)"</u>,  <u>"Future Development (FD)"</u>,  <u>"Natural System (NS)"</u>, and  <u>"Local Commercial (LC)"</u>.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We request that the proposed CZBL "Agriculture (A)", "Future Development (FD)", "Natural System (NS)", and "Local Commercial (LC)" designations and provisions for the subject site be revised to identify this area for Mixed-Use residential, commercial and retail uses consistent with the proposed Tertiary Plan and the Bram West Secondary Plan Review Process.</p>	Bram West is subject to an ongoing Secondary Plan review and updating the zoning would be premature at this time. Updating the zoning for this area would occur through a future amendment.
208	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Claireville Holdings Limited	0 Steeles Avenue East	28-07-2025	<p>CZBL proposes to zone the subject site as <u>"Agriculture (A)"</u>.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We request that the proposed CZBL designation and provisions for the subject site be revised to identify this area for 'Industrial/office/commercial uses, consistent with the intended vision for the area, and the Official Plan designations.</p>	This request should be submitted as a ZBLA to the City to ensure that all the policy requirements are addressed. This is outside the scope of this review process.
209	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) & Delta Urban (Delta Urban Inc.) on behalf of Ebrahim Investments Inc., Lark Investments Inc., EP 24 Bramalea Inc., & EP 383 Orenda Inc.	10 & 26 Victoria Crescent 376,379,383,387,390 & 391 Orenda Road 24 Bramalea Road	28-07-2025	<p>CZBL proposes to zone the subject site as follows:  10 Victoria Crescent: <u>"Prestige Employment (PE)"</u>.  26 Victoria Crescent: <u>"Prestige Employment (PE)"</u>.  390 &amp; 391 Orenda Road: <u>"Prestige Employment (PE)"</u>.  376 &amp; 387 Orenda Road: <u>"General Employment (GE)"</u>.  24 Bramalea Road: <u>"General Employment (GE)"</u>.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> On behalf of Lark, GWD requests that the proposed CZBL Prestige Employment and General Employment designations and provisions be revised to identify this area for "Mixed-Use" purposes which feature both mid-rise and high-rise development, consistent with Lark's vision to transform the subject site from existing low-order industrial uses towards a dynamic mixed use complete community.</p>	These lands are in Bramalea and were not prezoned per direction from the MTS study. The owner may submit an application or the City will undertake prezunging in the future. We note that the lands are going to be excluded from the new Zoning By-law and for by-law 270-2004 to be retained to address completion of policy updates prior to prezunging.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <small>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</small>	Response (as of January 2026)
210	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Joginder Dhanoa, Iqwinder Gill, Surjit Dhanoa, & Jagdeep Dhanoa	8180, 8168, 8158 & 8086 Gorewood Drive	28-07-2025	<p>CZBL proposes to zone subject site '<i>Residential Estate (RE)</i>'.</p> <p>The subject site is surrounded by Industrial Uses such as IN N OUT Freight INC., Brar Group Inc. Yard, Nucor Rebar Fabrication, and Hardwoods - Toronto, among others.</p> <p>The Intermodal Drive Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and proposed extension and realignment of Intermodal Drive are being undertaken by the City of Brampton to support industrial uses and the use of Intermodal Drive through to Gorewood Drive as a trucking route.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> With the number of industrial uses and associated Transportation Trucks in the immediate area of the subject site, we recommend that the subject site be zoned General Employment (GE).</p>	<p>The zoning was based on the existing residential zoning. We suggest that further study/work is required to update the zoning in this general area and this was out of scope of the CZBLR.</p>
211	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Manga (Queen) Inc.	249 Queen Street East	28-07-2025	<p>CZBL proposes to zone subject site '<i>Mixed Use High Rise (MH)</i>'.</p> <p>The CZBL directs that the maximum height of building, where its frontage is on a Primary Urban Boulevard, as shown on Schedule K (max. m., max. storeys) is to be 91.5m or 30 storeys.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Given that the subject site is located within the QUE-3 MTSA and is near lands which are planned for building heights greater than 30 storeys, we respectfully request that the maximum height for the subject site be 40 storeys in the new CZBL.</p>	<p>The City is not supportive of changing the height to 40 storeys and continues to support 30 storeys. An application may be sought for additional height.</p>
				<p>The CZBL directs that the Rear Lot Line and Interior Side Lot Line Setback of the 5th to 12th storeys in other cases (min. m.) is to be 10.0 m</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We recommend that the zoning designation for 249 Queen Street East be amended to provide for a minimum Rear Lot Line and Interior Side Lot Line of 9.0m, consistent with the Amendment Application filed with the City.</p>	<p>The proposed setback is consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines and is intended to ensure compatibility with adjacent buildings. Any approved site-specific standards in an exception zone would apply. The ongoing amendment process is the opportunity to request your proposed changes.</p>
				<p>Provision 5.2.G.2 of the CZBL directs that the minimum common amenity area requirement shall be 5.0 m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling unit.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We recommend that the zoning designation for the subject site be amended to provide for a minimum common amenity area requirement of 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling unit, consistent with the Amendment Application filed with the City.</p>	<p>The Amendment process is an appropriate opportunity to seek an alternate standard for evaluation.</p>
				<p>Provision 7.2.C.1 of the CZBL states that the Minimum common amenity areas shall be required for dwelling units in any Mixed-Use Zone in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.2.G.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We recommend that the zoning designation for the subject site be amended to provide for a minimum common amenity area requirement of 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling unit, consistent with the Amendment Application filed with the City.</p>	<p>The Amendment process is an appropriate opportunity to seek an alternate standard for evaluation.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
				<p>Table 7.1.5 of the CZBL Mixed-Use Zone Site and Landscaping indicates that the Minimum Landscaped Open Space (%) is to be 10%.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We recommend that the zoning designation for the subject site be amended to provide for a Minimum Landscaped Open Space of 9.0%, consistent with the Amendment Application filed with the City.</p>	<p>The proposed standard is consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines. Any site-specific standards in an approved exception zone would apply.</p>
				<p>Provision 7.2.I.3 of the CZBL directs that a maximum floor plate requirement of 800 m<sup>2</sup> shall apply to any portion of a building that is above the 12th storey.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Given the location of the subject site within the QUE-3 MTSA and being in proximity to lands which are planned for building heights greater than 30 storeys, we recommend that the CZBL permit Floor Plates of 850 m<sup>2</sup> or greater.</p>	<p>The proposed standard is consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines. Through your amendment process, an alternate standard may be sought but the team prefers to retain the floor plate as shown in the by-law to implement the Urban Design Guidelines.</p>
				<p>According to Schedule C - Floor Space Index Requirements of the CZBL, the subject site is to have a maximum F.S.I of 6.0.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We recommend that the zoning designation for 249 Queen Street East be amended to permit a maximum F.S.I of 9.0, consistent with the Amendment Application filed with the City.</p>	<p>The City is not supportive of the requested change and prefers to retain an FSI of 6.0. An alternate standard could be proposed through the amendment process.</p>
212	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Mr. Surinder Malhi & Charanjit Dhaliwal	3407 Countryside Drive	28-07-2025	<p>CZBL proposes to zone subject site '<i>Residential Estate (RE)</i>'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The proposed Residential Estate (RE) should be amended and redesignated to Residential Apartment A - Special Section (R4A-XXXX) to reflect Application OZS-2024-0062 and the planning process which has already taken place and is still ongoing.</p>	<p>The proposed zoning is carried over from existing zoning. The ongoing application process would be implemented through a future amendment to the new zoning by-law if approved.</p>
213	GWD (Gagnon Walker Domes Ltd.) on behalf of Starbank Developments 285 Corp.	285 & 295 Queen Street East	28-07-2025	<p>The CZBL proposes to zone the subject site as "<i>Mixed Use High Rise (MH)</i>".</p> <p>According to Schedule B - Height Requirements of the CZBL, the subject site is to have a maximum building height of 50 storeys .</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> On behalf of our Client, GWD requests that the proposed CZBL be revised to permit a maximum Building Height of 68 storeys consistent with the Amendment Application filed with the City.</p>	<p>The City is not supportive of the requested change and prefers to retain the height of 50 storeys.</p>
				<p>According to Schedule C - Floor Space Index Requirements of the CZBL, the subject site is to have a maximum F.S.I of 8.0.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> We request that the proposed CZBL be revised to permit a maximum Floor Space Index of 9.0 on the subject site, consistent with the Amendment Application filed with the City of Brampton and reflective of its location within the QUE-3 Rutherford MTSA.</p>	<p>The City is not supportive of the requested change and prefers to retain the FSI of 8.0.</p>

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	Comment or Summary of Comment <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
214	NAV Canada		Dec 12 2025	NAV Canada notes concerns with proposed heights in the various MTAs, indicating an applicable maximum height related to Pearson Airport operations.	This is noted. The Zoning By-law makes a clear notation that other legislation may apply and the zoning by-law does not override other applicable law. No change is recommended.
215	Peel Region		Thursday, December 4, 2025	Peel Region has requested the by-law be updated to include a definition and permitted zones for transitional housing.	No change was made and this may be considered further in the future.
216	Weston	195 Walker, 1615 Clark	Dec 3 2025, Oct 3 2025	The letter requests that some of the uses in the employment zones should be removed to be consistent with the PPS.	WSP agrees that commercial school should be removed as it was not previously permitted in the employment zones and may conflict with the permitted uses allowed by the PPS and Planning Act. This change has been completed in the final zoning by-law. Otherwise the uses appear to meet the intent of the PPS. Note that further refinements may be made as an outcome of the City's policy review to implement the Province's updated employment area policies.
217	SGL Planning	0 Queen, 55 and 75 Auction Lane.	Thursday, November 27, 2025	The letter proposes some base zone changes to align the zoning with the Secondary Plan. Currently all lands are subject to various exception zones which the applicant supports retaining.	We can appreciate the zone categories do not line up with the uses or the policies. The zone categories are a translation of the existing zone categories. At this stage of the project we felt a zone change was premature particularly since the City will be reviewing employment area policies, in light of recent changes to the PPS and Planning Act. At this time no change was made and the City may review further in the future in conjunction with updated employment area policies and zoning. As noted the exception zones continue to apply.
218	Weston	172 Church	Friday, October 3, 2025	The letter notes that there appears to be an error with the exception mapping. Their lands are to be subject to bylaw 116-2022.	This is noted. The lands are now subject to exception # 2821, which replaces old exception 3626.
219	BLG	261 an 263 Queen	Friday, November 28, 2025	Commentor notes that approval of the by-law is premature due to the appeal status of Brampton Plan. The letter requests various other changes to the zoning.	We note that the Zoning By-law will only come into effect when OLT approves Brampton Plan.
220	Mattamy	General	Monday, December 1, 2025	The letter requests a meeting to discuss previously submitted comments.	City staff continue to have dialogue with the HHLOG on an ongoing basis and other revisions have been implemented into the final zoning by-law in response to comments (e.g., Standards for dual frontage townhouses).
221	DMHH	Heritage Heights	Friday, November 28, 2025	The letter requests a meeting to discuss previously submitted comments.	City staff continue to have dialogue with the HHLOG on an ongoing basis and other revisions have been implemented into the final zoning by-law in response to comments (e.g., Standards for dual frontage townhouses).
222	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.)	69 Bramalea	Thursday, November 27, 2025	Comment requests that bylaw 85-2025 is integrated and transitioned.	We note that we have assigned this exception the new number 189, however, the subject lands were excluded from the new zoning by-law per City direction as they are located in the Bramalea GO area. As such the exception will not be included in the zoning by-law.
223	Aird Berlis - Hillside TO	0 Steeles Ave W	Nov 30 2025, Oct 6, 2026	The subject lands are located in an MSA and the letter notes numerous concerns with heights, densities, provisions, holding requirements, etc.	WSP has implemented the City's direction on the MTAs. We note the holding provisions under 1.9 were removed. An application may be sought for further changes to the proposed zoning. The letter notes a lack of clarity on the FSI but these values are precisely noted in the GIS, and the legend has been updated/corrected in the City's interactive map.
224	GWD	0 and 8265 Churchville Rd	Friday, November 28, 2025	Ensure site specific is carried forward. OLT ZBL 3-2024. Exception 3814.	WSP has reformatted this by-law and working to retain this amendment prior to Council adoption.
225	GWD	0 Father Tobin, 10819 and 10833 Bramalea	Sunday, November 30, 2025	Change the base zone to correspond to exception. Carry over exception. Bylaw 94-2025, exception 2761.	This is completed and the base zone was updated (exception 2761 replaces 3834).

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
226	GWD	11860 Bramalea and 0	Sunday, November 30, 2025	Site specific to be passed in Dec 2025, exception 3859.	As this exception was only approved this past week upon completion of the final zoning by-law and is under an appeal period, the exception will be integrated through the OLT process or housekeeping amendment in the future.
227	GWD	1286, 1298, 1300 and 1306 Queen W	Friday, November 28, 2025	Ensure site specific is carried forward. Consider base zone to R3M. Bylaws 16-2025, 17-2025.	WSP has ensured By-laws 16-2025 and 17-2025 are integrated (exception 2764). The base zone was updated to R3M.
228	GWD	9610 McLaughlin Road North	Friday, November 28, 2025	The letter is a request to modify the exception zone to retain the minor variance.	WSP supports the change as previously noted and the exception was updated to refer to the variance and conditions of approval. We note we are unable to modify the extent of zones/exception through this process so the added permission would only be applicable to the lands subject to LC-2254.
229	GWD	1206 Steeles Avenue West	Novmeber 28, 2025	Subject lands are currently zoned exception 3798-3799 but 3799 was not reassigned in the new by-law. Carry over exception 3799 per bylaw 178-2024.	Exception 3798 was reassigned as 94 and 3799 is reassigned as 623 in the final Zoning By-law.
230	GWD	507 Balmoral	Sunday, November 30, 2025	Carry over exception 3861, if it is approved. It was to go to Council in December. They requested base zone of R3H.	WSP supports retaining the exception since it was approved (pending number 3861). The new exception number is 2778 and updated R3H base zone was applied.
231	GWD - Block 40-5 Landowners	Block Plan 40-5 Area of Bram West	November 30 2025	They are suggesting that Bram West be prezoned but it is too late in this process and not recommended.	WSP does not support prezoning Bram West as there is a Secondary Planning process underway.
232	GWD	227 Vodden	November 30 2025	The subject lands are a mall and subject to a recent OPA as well as zoning amendment. The applicant is requesting additional permission for residential across the lands whereas the draft by-law proposes to retain the zoning including the recent exception 3728 which applies to a portion of the site. The balance of the site is subject to exception 3065 which the letter opposes.	WSP consulted with staff and no changes are proposed in response to the comments. An amendment would need to be sought for site specific changes.
233	GWD	0 Steels Ave East (Claireville)	Friday, November 28, 2025	The letter requests changing the zoning from A to a PE zone to facilitate development. Lands on the south side of 407 and a Parkway Belt West amendment is currently under review.	The proposed zone change should proceed through a ZBLA as we have not proactively prezoned lands outside the MTSAs in this process and various requirements have to be satisfied such as the Parkway Belt West amendment.
234	GWD	7614, 7624, 7650, 7662 Creditview Road	Friday, November 28, 2025	The letter requests that exceptions 3694 and 3695 be carried forward.	These exceptions were missing at the time of completing the fourth draft. WSP has since reformatted and carried forward. Exception 3694 is now 2807 and 3695 is now 2806.
235	GWD	Various Victoria, Orenda Rd, 24 Bramalea	Friday, November 28, 2025	The letter requests prezoning on subject lands located in the Bramalea GO PMTSA.	Bramalea GO PMTSA was not prezoned in this project.
236	GWD	3407 Countryside Drive	Friday, November 28, 2025	It appears there's an application in process for the lands and the want to be prezoned along with various amendments to the site specific zoning.	WSP generally has not been prezoning outside the MTSAs, and do not recommend further changes. Suggest the ongoing application proceed to a conclusion. WSP could change the lands to an FD zone but that would have limited benefit. No change has been made.
237	GWD	253 Queen St E	Friday, November 28, 2025	Ensure exception 2780 is carried over (based on existing 3726). They want MH zoning. They also request 3 m2 for private amenity. They also request additional height.	New Exception 2780 (based on Special Section 2780) was integrated into the final bylaw. We agree with changing the base zone to MH to correspond to the exception and this was completed. Other requests would need to be considered through a ZBLA.
238	GWD	249 Queen St E	Friday, November 28, 2025	ZBLA is in process. Applicant requests site specific standards incorporated.	WSP recommends the ZBLA application in process proceed to a conclusion to assess the requested changes to the zoning on a site specific basis.
239	GWD	Rotary Club	Friday, November 28, 2025	They request an update to base zones and to carry over exceptions 3641 and 3642. Should be split zoned R3M and OS and NS. Zoning was approved by OLT in Feb 2025.	WSP supports retaining the recently approved exceptions. They were not included in the database at the time the fourth draft was completed so were missed but are included for adoption.
240	GWD	285 and 295 Queen St E	Friday, November 28, 2025	They request to remove holding and various other tweaks and changes to provisions. The lands are in an MSA. They have a ZBLA in process with the SPM being held in September this year.	WSP does not recommend changes from our end at this time. We would suggest the ongoing application proceed to a conclusion.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
241	GWD	SmartCentres	Friday, November 28, 2025	They have concerns around some of the new landscaping and other applicable standards. They request 5085 Mayfield be zoned GC.	WSP does not support prezoning the site as GC and recommend a ZBLA. With regard to updated standards, the City needs to update its standards to reflect Brampton Plan and the new Urban Design Guidelines. The By-law contains various accommodations for applications in process (transition) and legal non-compliance and non-conformity.
242	DJK Planning	7570 Kennedy Rd S	Monday, September 29, 2025	Commentor wishes to apply I1 zoning, place of worship, at 7570 Kennedy as they expand their facility located at 7580 Kennedy.	We have updated exception 2643 to allow uses accessory to a place of worship, in line with minor variance A18-076. The zone change to I1 was considered out of scope of the CZBLR.
243	DJK Planning	305 and 315 Royal West D	Monday, September 29, 2025	Commentor would like to revert the subject site to OS zoning, from NS, to allow for a daycare.	The site was changed to an OS zone, as requested.
244	DJK Planning	83 Wilson, 14-16 Centre	Thursday, October 2, 2025	They have proposed increased height and an MH zone. Lands are in an MTSAs. Existing exception 3551 applies (new number 3351B).	This exception has been carried forward as requested by the MTSAs team (the new exception number is #325). We have applied the MM base zone.
245	GSAI (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.)	443, 445, 447 Centre Street N	Friday, December 12, 2025	Applicant is requesting a zone that will permit semis such as R1A. The site is subject to exception 153 which has a special road setback.	This comment was resolved through separate correspondence between the City and the commenting party.
246	MHBC	1626, 1646, 1654 Queen St w	Wednesday, December 10, 2025	Applicant has noted corrections to the applicable exception text, #304. WSP to correct.	The exception #304 has been updated as noted.
247	MHBC	1626, 1646, 1654 Queen St w	October, 2025	Wants to ensure holding removed and to carry over exceptions.	Recently removed holding symbols have been removed prior to Council adoption, in line with the City's records.
248	MHBC	5203 Old Castlemore Road	Monday, October 6, 2025	Applicant wants to ensure site specific provisions are carried over, namely exception 3558. Bylaw number is 96-2025.	Exception 3558 (now 684) is carried over and the base zones are now correctly applied. Applicant notes that NS zoning was rezoned by Bylaw 96-2025 which is reflected in the final version. We updated the text for the exception to consolidate the text updates from bylaw 96-2025.
249	MGP	NE corner of The Gore and Queen St E		Lands are zoned MHO and subject to 2793 (an MZO). They request their ZBLA application transitioned. They have active applications.	We note that the schedules should be available in the interactive map under the "Other" tab in the layers selection. The MZO applies as Exception 2793 and assume all other provisions of the bylaw would apply where there is no conflict with the exception zone. ZBLAs are not transitioned as the intent is for ZBLAs to be updated so that they will be an amendment to the current and new by-law.

# City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

## Response to Comments on Final Zoning By-law (January 2026)

ID#	Group/ Organization	Property Address	Date	<b>Comment or Summary of Comment</b> <b>(Note: this summary may omit details of the submission for summary purposes and the original submission should be referred to)</b>	Response (as of January 2026)
250	Weston	SE Corner of Mayfield/Airport Rd	Friday, October 3, 2025	Would like to integrate bylaw 153-2025. Update the exception to add a commercial school as previously noted. Includes mapping updates. They would like confirmation when complete.	The mapping has been updated to reflect the recent by-law. The exception (500) has been revised to add a commercial school as a permitted use.
251	Weston	172 Church St E	Friday, October 3, 2025	Requests carrying forward existing special section 3626.	The exception is carried forward as new #2821, replacing prior exception #3626.
252	Weston	99 Hereford St	Monday, October 6, 2025	Supports carrying forward their exception now numbered 2623, based on existing exception 2803.	Noted
253	Weston	Various employment sites	Monday, October 6, 2025	Supports the approach to the properties.	Noted
254	Arcadis	First Gulf sites	Friday, July 25, 2025	They would like to tweak exceptions and consider use permissions in LC zone. Noting a correction to exception 2836. Feels a use was removed from 59 First Gulf Ave. A meeting was held to discuss the comments.	A meeting was held in late December. WSP has reviewed exception 2562 (replaces 2836) and we find the text accurately translates the previous section reference to exception number 2700. We updated the text to incorporate a subsequent bylaw in 2023 which amended the text. We have modified exception 1975 as requested to incorporate a definition of Pharmacy which we brought forward from the previously referenced exception. We have also added Commercial Service and Repair as a permitted use in the C1 zone as it is similar to other uses in the zone. Last we modified exception 2678 to add the drive test centre as a permitted use on any lot where the use existed (since the exception applies to multiple lots).
255	CN	None	October, 2025	CN continues to request prohibitions on sensitive uses near rail yards as well as other text changes.	No further changes were made in response to the comments. The zoning for these areas is largely carried forward from the existing permissions. The City will be undertaking a further review of policies and permitted uses in employment areas and the comment will be forwarded to staff at that time.
256	GWD-GSAI	Heritage Heights	Monday, October 6, 2025	No specific comments are noted.	Noted
257	GWD	261 an 263 Queen	Monday, October 6, 2025	They feel the zoning is premature and have various concerns and requests regarding the proposed zoning for their lands, which are located in an MTSAs.	With regard to the comment about premature approval, the Zoning By-law will only come into effect when OLT approves Brampton Plan. A site specific amendment could be sought for all the proposed changes. The GFA definition is appropriate for how the term is applied in the by-law and no changes are recommended by WSP/City staff.
258	GWD	8671 Heritage Road	Monday, October 6, 2025	There is a ZBLA in process for the lands and the applicant is requesting a mid rise mixed use or residential exception.	We have not prezoned lands outside the PMTSAs and suggest the application should continue to proceed if the zoning needs to be updated.