

City of Brampton Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review

Comments to First Public Draft Zoning By-law (Released November 2023)



Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
N/A	CVC	2024-03-06	Email	Natural Environment	Clearer definition of the "green" zones that recognize the sensitivity in use and restrictions	Addressed in Draft 2.
N/A	CVC	2024-03-06	Email	Natural Environment	Emphasis on safeguarding against future development pressures.	Noted.
N/A	CVC	2024-03-06	Email	Natural Environment	Floodplain Overlay should expand from covering downtown to other floodplains and other related natural hazard areas.	To be discussed with Draft 3. The Downtown Floodplain area is a Special Policy Area and differs from other areas. WSP is required to retain these provisions as they were previously approved by the Province. WSP requested floodplain data and is awaiting information from the City to assess the impact of this. Generally floodplains should be zoned in the NS zone.
Norm Lingard	Bell	2024-03-18	Email	N/A	While we do not have any specific comments or concerns pertaining to this initiative at this time, we would ask that Bell continue to be circulated on any future materials and/or decisions related to this matter.	Noted. Bell to be circulated on any future materials.
Katarzyna Siiwa	Dentons (on behalf of Canadian National Railway Company)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	General provision to prohibit the following sensitive land uses within 300 m of a freight rail yard	<p>A general provision should be added to Section 2.4 to prohibit the following sensitive land uses within 300 m of a freight rail yard (based on the definition proposed in Recommendation 4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residential uses; • Sensitive commercial uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Commercial School; o Funeral Homes; o Hotel; o Museum or Gallery; o Medical Office or Clinic; o Pet Day Care; o Place of Worship; o Restaurant Patio; and, o Veterinary Clinic. • Sensitive institutional uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o College or University; o Community Use; o Community Centre; o Day Care Centre; o Elementary or Secondary School; o Hospital; o Library; o Long Term Care Facility; o Medical Office or Clinic; o Outdoor Market; o Place of Worship; and, o Public Park <p>These uses are considered sensitive land uses, as defined by the PPS and D-6 Guidelines. The schedule additions in Recommendation 3 support the implementation of this provision.</p>	WSP would like to discuss CN's comments. A freight rail yard should likely be shown on the schedules or defined very clearly so that the impact of this provision is well understood. The 300 m prohibition of sensitive uses will affect just a small amount of existing residential uses in the vicinity of Bovaird/Humberwest Pkwy. However, it would greatly impact existing hotels and some commercial uses. A fulsome assessment of the impacts is out of scope and may be best considered in any Secondary Plan updates.
Katarzyna Siiwa	Dentons (on behalf of Canadian National Railway Company)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Revise the setbacks identified in general provision 2.4.H.2, to require a 15.0 m setback from a spur rail line for all sensitive land uses	<p>General provision 2.4.H.2 in the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law states that the minimum required setback for any building or structure from a lot line abutting any rail spur line shall be 7.5 m. In any Employment zone, this setback shall be 0.0 m.</p> <p>We request that this provision be revised to require a minimum setback of 15.0 m for all sensitive land uses (as identified in Recommendation 1 above), which abut any spur rail line. FCM-RAC recommends a 15.0 m setback for new residential development in proximity to railway operations for spur lines. While the FCM-RAC Guidelines do not specify the requirements for sensitive commercial and institutional uses, CN recommends the same setback requirements from spur rail lines. Requiring a setback from the railway corridor is highly desirable, as it will provide a buffer from railway operations; permits dissipation of rail-oriented emissions, vibrations, and noise; and accommodates a safety barrier.</p> <p>The schedules presented in Recommendation 3 and the definitions presented in Recommendation 4 would support the implementation of this general provision.</p>	WSP supports the setback changes subject to looking at the spatial extent. WSP is not in receipt of spur line information so this would be required to assess this more fulsomely. If spur lines are not shown, the features can be defined and interpreted by staff.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Katarzyna Siiwa	Dentons (on behalf of Canadian National Railway Company)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Add a new schedule depicting location of CN main and spur lines, and location of the freight rail yards with a 300 m Influence Area	<p>Currently, the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law general provision 2.4.H.2 requires a setback from rail corridors for both main rail lines and spur rail lines. However, it does not provide any schedules which depict and differentiate the locations of the main rail lines and spur rail lines. As such, it is not clear how this policy would be applied.</p> <p>We recommend adding a schedule showing the locations of the CN main and spur rail lines, and the location of the freight rail yards with a 300 m Influence Area. Section 1.4 – Schedules should be updated to reflect this added schedule. By showing the location of the main and spur rail lines, it will support the implementation of general provision 2.4.H.2. By showing the freight rail yards and area of influence, this will help support CN's requested new provision outlined in Recommendation 1. The boundaries of the rail lines and freight rail yards are enclosed in this letter ("Attachment 1"). Identifying the boundaries will reduce the uncertainty for planning and developing sensitive land uses in proximity to major facilities, which will help to avoid land use conflicts for those areas.</p> <p>The main freight rail yards utilize segments of the main line for yard operations, including the building of trains for CN's intercontinental operations. As such, no sensitive land uses should be permitted within 300 m of these main line segments.</p>	WSP supports showing the locations of features to help apply the general provisions/setbacks. As above, the setbacks/prohibitions proposed would be very impactful to existing uses so further review is required. WSP requires the data and it was requested from the City.
Katarzyna Siiwa	Dentons (on behalf of Canadian National Railway Company)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Include a definition for Main Rail Line, Spur Rail Line, Freight Rail Yard, and Intermodal Rail Yard	<p>The following definitions should be included in the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law:</p> <p>Rail Line, Main: shall mean a rail line owned and operated by a rail company, as identified on Schedule "X" as a main rail line.</p> <p>Rail Line, Spur: shall mean a rail line owned and operated by a rail company, as identified on Schedule "X" as a spur rail line.</p> <p>Freight Rail Yard: Means premises where operations of a railway take place, which may include switching and sorting of railcars; repair, fueling and maintenance of railway equipment; and an intermodal rail yard.</p> <p>Intermodal Rail Yard: Means premises where intermodal containers are loaded, unloaded, temporarily stored, dispatched or parked, and which may include freight handling facilities related to the trans-shipment of goods, materials, or products as well as the accessory storage and maintenance of transport trucks and rail cars.</p> <p>These definitions will support the implementation of the Recommendations noted above.</p>	These definitions are suitable and would benefit the provisions proposed previously. Is a spur line always solely operated and owned by a rail company - what about private lands? To discuss with Draft 3.
Dorothy Di Berto	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)	2024-02-29	Email, Letter	Open Space and Natural System Zones	<p>Chapter 9 outlines new provisions for Open Space and Natural System Zones however there is no clear distinction between the two zones. It would be ideal to provide an introductory statement as to the intent of the two zones and clarify if there is a difference. Ideally, an Open Space Zone would include parkland and recreational uses whereas a Natural System Zone would include the City's natural heritage system including water resource system and provide restrictions on land use to ensure protection of these natural heritage and hazard features.</p> <p>CVC staff recommend clearly defined zoning for this section recognizing the sensitivity in the use and the importance of maintaining these features on the landscape and to avoid further development pressures and demands that may be conflicting uses.</p>	The intro statement can be included in the ZBL User Guide but should not be stated as operative text in the by-law. It is correct the NS zone is intended to be the strongest protective category, while OS is used more broadly. Some changes to these zones have been made to help clarify the intent of each of the zones including the new Park zone.
Dorothy Di Berto	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)	2024-02-29	Email, Letter	Floodplain Overlay Zones	<p>CVC staff recognize that Chapter 10 is dedicated to the Downtown Floodplain Overlay Zone, however the concern is that this section only speaks to the downtown core and flooding issues within the Toronto Region Conservation Authority's watershed and it does not include flooding issues and floodplain areas throughout the City as a whole. It should be noted that beyond the downtown and within CVC's watershed, there are number of watercourse and valley systems including the Credit River, Huttonville Creek, Levi Creek, Mullet Creek, Fletcher's Creek and various tributaries, that traverse the City and have associated hazards that impact land use and development. The inclusion of a general floodplain overlay will highlight the fact that the lands are hazardous and can prevent inappropriate land use or development from occurring. Further, it will inform the public that there may be site constraints and that additional approvals (i.e. Conservation Authority regulation) may apply.</p> <p>CVC staff recommend that a general floodplain overlay be included in the Comprehensive Zoning By-Law that recognized the various watercourses and valleylands across the City and highlights that these are hazardous lands that require special attention and potential restrictions. This will assist in zoning gaps where other uses are permissive. For example, as noted in our comments below, some sensitive uses such as existing residential zones or institutional zones (primarily schools, daycares and hospitals) are located within hazardous lands (floodplains) yet if the overlay is missing this fact is omitted. This unintentionally gives the impression that if the zoning permits the use then there are no other issues. CVC staff have dealt with various planning applications that have been subject to this circumstance and have noted that when there is inclusion of a floodplain overlay it has proven to be helpful.</p> <p>CVC staff continue to recommend that a city-wide floodplain overlay is maintained in the Zoning By-Law to avoid confusion at the development stage and direct applicants to the Conservation Authority to have further discussion and/or preconsultation for permitting requirements.</p>	The Downtown Floodplain overlay is related to implementation of a special policy area. WSP/City to discuss the desire to have general provisions restricting sensitive uses in hazardous lands. Generally it is the intent of the City to zone lands that are in the floodplain in a protective zone category such as NS. Showing floodplains which can change over time may be challenging in a ZBL. Alternatively there can be general provisions to restrict certain uses in hazardous lands and sites. The hazardous lands or regulated area could be shown as "FY!" in the interactive map, along with text in the user guide. This may be the best route.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Dorothy Di Berto	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)	2024-03-01	Email, Letter	ARUs	2.3.A – Additional Residential Units (ARU), CVC staff support the restriction on ARUs located in the Open Space and Natural System Zone and also recommend that the ARUs are also restricted within a Floodplain Overlay as noted above. There are many residential zones within the City that have an existing F suffix overlay to identify that the lands are flood prone and as such these sites should have limitations in terms of what development can occur including intensification and ARUs.	See above regarding Downtown Floodplain overlay.
Dorothy Di Berto	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)	2024-03-02	Email, Letter	Garden Suites	2.3.F Garden Suites – this section allows for Garden Suites to be located in all zones however does not limit them from hazardous lands (i.e. floodplain), as is done for Additional Residential Units (ARU). Recognizing that some garden suites may be located in a hazardous lands and may be not be granted approval from a Conservation Authority, CVC staff recommend that similar restrictions as listed in ARU zones are included for garden suites.	Note that garden suites are removed from the 2nd Draft Zoning By-law and merged into provisions for ADUs.
Dorothy Di Berto	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)	2024-03-03	Email, Letter	Supportive Housing	2.3.P Supportive Housing – CVC staff recommend that given the additional residential nature of this type of use and the notion of potentially housing vulnerable people, supportive housing units should not be located within hazardous lands including floodplain overlays. Suggest that the City either include a city-wide floodplain overlay to capture these areas, or put an exception on this use if located within hazardous lands.	See above regarding Downtown Floodplain overlay.
Dorothy Di Berto	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)	2024-03-04	Email, Letter	Mixed Use Employment	7.1 – Mixed Uses – CVC staff recognize that daycare uses are permitted within mixed use employment zones and generally staff have no concern with this however there are instances where mixed uses developments are subject to hazards. It is recommended that a restriction be placed on daycare uses and other sensitive institutional uses so that they are not permitted within hazardous lands (or floodplain overlay). Suggest that the City either include a city-wide floodplain overlay to capture these areas, or put an exception on this use if located within hazardous lands.	See above regarding Downtown Floodplain overlay.
Dorothy Di Berto	Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)	2024-03-05	Email, Letter	Institutional	8.1 Institutional At the outset, Institutional zones should be prohibited in all hazardous lands as a general rule. Suggest including this restriction in the zoning, as is shown in the ARU zoning. As noted above, CVC staff recommend the inclusion of a city-wide floodplain overlay which would also capture existing institutional uses located within hazardous lands.	See above regarding Downtown Floodplain overlay.
Krystina Koops	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	Table 3.1.1 Minimum and Maximum Parking Space Requirements	Revise to require 1 (for elementary) or 1.5 spaces (for secondary) per 100 m2 (excluding portables) plus 1 per each portable. This would be consistent with existing zoning requirements. PRA1 Max zone will require a maximum of 1 or 1.5 spaces per 100 m2, however also states additional parking is required for portables. This will need to be revised as each additional portable will require 1 additional parking space ABOVE the maximum. Variances will be required for each portable or we will be required to build 1 parking space per portable. Further discussion/consideration is required as DPCDSB currently has 2 existing schools within PRA1 parking area where portables are in use. This would limit our opportunity to add additional portables to each school.	The requested changes are addressed. We have removed the maximum requirement from being applicable to portables. We have increased the maximum in favour of taking a more flexible approach in this new by-law.
Krystina Koops	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	Table 3.5.1 Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Equipped with Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment	This is an extraordinary cost for school boards where funding is limited to academic purposes. Our current practice is to provide rough ins for future connections as it's currently cost prohibitive to install them. School Boards should be exempt from this requirement.	This is noted and comment is under review
Krystina Koops	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	Table 3.6.1 Minimum Bicycle Parking Requirements	School Boards should be exempt from long-term bicycle parking requirements. Providing bicycle parking within the building, bike locker or shelter, is considered an extraordinary costs for school board. As mentioned above, school boards funding is limited to constructing academic spaces.	This is noted and comment is under review
Krystina Koops	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	Section 3.6D End-of-Trip Facilities for Non-Residential Uses	School Boards should be exempt from long-term bicycle parking requirements since providing end-of-trip facilities at school is inappropriate. It is inappropriate for schools to provide shower units. No students should be showering at school and this is a major safety concern.	This is noted and comment is under review
Luka Medved	Metrolinx	2024-02-09	Email	Development within 300m of rail corridor	Metrolinx notes that any development within 300m of the rail corridor shall have regard for the Metrolinx Adjacent Development Guidelines, in particular those that may be directly adjacent as it pertains to required setbacks and rail mitigation required for the proposed use.	Implementation of Metrolinx guidelines should likely occur through other processes however we will be open to discussing the revised setbacks with Metrolinx.
Nick Gooding	Peel District School Board (PDSB)	2023-03-28	Email, Letter	Table 3.1.1 Minimum and Maximum Parking Space Requirements	#33 and #34: PDSB requests clarification as the "1" in the PRA1 Max column is not realistic. Is this intended to be in the PRA1 Min column instead? Portable parking spaces: The policy requirement for "plus 1 per each portable" is unreasonable as a variance would be required every time a portable is added to a school site. The allocation of portables on school sites is an ongoing and fluid process that is assessed and changes year to year with student accommodation demands. Requiring school boards to build 1 (or any) parking spaces when a portable is added is unreasonable, costly and would limit opportunities for adding portables to schools. Please delete this requirement.	Modifications have been made. We don't agree with the statement about portables and have not made this change. The addition of a portable will be associated with additional parking needs and a minor variance process is appropriate to address parking suitability.
Nick Gooding	Peel District School Board (PDSB)	2023-03-28	Email, Letter	Table 3.5.1 Minimum Number of Parking Spaces Equipped with Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment	Funding is limited to academic purposes. Current practice is to provide rough-ins for future connections as it's currently cost prohibitive to install them. This policy needs to be revised to exempt school boards until funding becomes available. Funding is currently not available for school boards to meet this policy requirement.	Noted.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Nick Gooding	Peel District School Board (PDSB)	2023-03-28	Email, Letter	Table 3.6.1 Minimum Bicycle Parking Requirements	School Boards should be exempt from short and long-term bicycle parking space requirements. Providing bicycle parking spaces is considered an extraordinary cost for school boards. Funding is limited and intended for constructing academic spaces.	We have removed long term bicycle parking from Draft 2 for schools as we are satisfied the short-term spaces would be adequate for the context.
Nick Gooding	Peel District School Board (PDSB)	2023-03-28	Email, Letter	Section 3.6.D End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities for Non-Residential Uses	3.6.D.1: School Boards should be exempt from long-term bicycle parking space requirements. Providing bicycle parking spaces is considered an extraordinary cost for school boards. Funding is limited and intended for constructing academic spaces. 3.6.D.2: This clause needs to exempt schools as this is a safety concern for students.	We have removed long term bicycle parking from Draft 2 for schools as we are satisfied the short-term spaces would be adequate for the context
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Section 3.2. Shared Parking	For further alignment with the Region Healthy Development Framework and in keeping with several provisions of the City's draft by-law, we recommend the following: • Reduced automobile parking ratios for buildings and other facilities within 400m of a higher order transit stops; and apartments/condominiums offering car share parking spaces. • Efficient use of parking promoted by identifying systems for sharing parking spaces by two or more user groups at different times of the day or week (e.g., weekday use by office staff and evening/weekend use by restaurant clientele).	Parking rates have been revised and minimums removed from PRA 1. City to draft a response as the City requested us to remove shared parking. The zoning by-law includes varied rates according to policy context which is driven by transit access (e.g., exemption of parking minimums in the MTSAs).
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Section 3.6.A General Provisions	Consider including a require minimum of bicycle parking for all commercial and light industrial uses. In our Healthy Development Assessment, we recommend that commercial, industrial, and institutional areas within 400m of higher order transit, provide at least 10 additional publicly accessible, short term bicycle parking spaces per building on the project site or within the public boulevard in addition to the bicycle parking required from the local bicycle parking standards.	The bicycle parking requirements have been updated. The intent of the by-law is to relate the requirements to the noted PRAs.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	4.1.E Site & Landscaping	Are the requirements for (respectively) 20%, 15%, and 10% landscaped open space/greenspace adequate for low-, mid- and high-rise buildings adequate? There is a large body of research identifying a positive relationship between greenspace and various measures of health and well-being (including mental health).	These have been updated to require min. 20% for all zones.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	4.2.B Minimum Amenity Area Requirements	"Amenity Area" is defined as "...a common amenity area designed for active or passive recreation for the exclusive use and benefit of the residents/tenants in a residential building or development". Within the listed requirements, or maybe the definition, it might be useful to define more specifically what an amenity area specifically can/should consist of. Additionally, this could be added to the "minimum common outdoor amenity area" requirements based on the number of dwelling units (e.g., for 21-200 units, at least one outdoor exercise/recreational equipment and a shade-covered bench).	Amenity area in zoning does not typically get into specific programming but is more broad, allowing for Guidelines to provide further direction during site plan review. Some refinements have been made including allowing some interior space to be included in amenity area.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Housing Policy	We appreciate seeing that the Zoning By-law already reflects changes to Accessory Residential Units (ARUs). We seek consideration to also include a supportive housing residence as a permitted use within a dwelling that contains an ARU.	In the interest of ensuring that the parking requirements and other standards work well to address the needs of the use and avoid overdevelopment on the site (e.g., excessive parking), it is preferred that an SHR encompass the entirety of the dwelling. This is explicitly required by Brampton Plan.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Housing Policy	Consider exemptions for supportive housing, other non-market housing, affordable housing and innovative housing types (e.g., modular homes) from minimum distance requirements and minimum parking requirements.	We are open to discussing further but the parking requirements in the 2nd Draft are based on mobility context including elimination of minimum parking in the MTSAs where these uses are likely to be concentrated.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Housing Policy	Recommend that the Zoning By-law permit supportive housing and affordable housing as auxiliary uses to a Place of Worship to align with language in the forthcoming Brampton Plan.	We have added permission for one residential unit in conjunction with a place of worship. Further review will be undertaken in Draft 3.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Housing Policy	Recognize in the by-law the importance of requiring spaces for licensed centrebased and home-based child care and early years services (EarlyON), particularly in greenfield areas, urban growth centres, and larger developments.	Some new expanded permissions for day care centers is included in the updated ZBL including home-based daycares as a permitted home occupation.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Housing Development	Commend the inclusion of supportive housing types 1 and 2 in residential zones.	Noted
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Housing Development	Suggest added flexibility within Employment zones for emergency shelter use.	Emergency shelter is a topic to be reviewed further in Draft 3.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Early Years and Child Care Services	<p>Peel Region is provincially designated as a Service Manager for the Early Years and Child Care System (EYCCS) to implement the Canada-Wide Early Learning and Child Care program, providing \$10/day child care for families in Peel by 2026.</p> <p>As part of this mandate, Peel Region is required to deliver 11,980 new licensed child carespaces across Peel by 2026 to increase access for families in need of care.</p> <p>To successfully achieve this significant system expansion, increasing licensed child care spaces requires a shared commitment by Peel Region and our local municipal partners to support the shared families we serve. This includes removing policy and system barriers to expansion and elevating the priority placed on creating access to child care when planning for complete communities.</p> <p>Any current Zoning By-law references to the Day Nurseries Act legislation should be updated to accurately reference the Child Care and Early Years Act, 2014. As well, the existing references to "day care" should be replaced with "licensed child care" or "child care".</p> <p>Licensed Home Child Care is a viable child care option for families regulated by the Ministry of Education. Given the limited capital investment required to grow home child care capacity, it is a sector that can quickly expand to increase access, absorb system pressures and provide choice for families. Zoning By-law restrictions that limit the ability to open and/or operate licensed home child care in a "residential zone" should be revisited to remove barriers to child care expansion.</p> <p>The minor variance process and requirements should be revisited through the lens of facilitating and supporting the expansion of licensed child care. Child care providers in the Region have reported experiencing prolonged minor variance processes for issues such as securing additional parking as required by the Ministry of Education, or transitioning their child care program model from a Montessori school to a full-time child care program.</p>	We have updated the term as requested. However, note that Brampton Plan uses the term daycare. Licensed home day care provisions are updated in conjunction with home occupation.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Snow Storage Locations	<p>It is recommended that the Zoning By-law permit licensed child care and EarlyON spaces as auxiliary uses to a Place of Business.</p> <p>Peel Region initiated an Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design for Snow Storage Sites Assessment (Study for Snow Storage Sites - Region of Peel (peelregion.ca) to evaluate and analyze select existing publicly owned properties in the Region for their potential feasibility to include a snow storage function in the future. The need for snow storage facilities will only increase in the future due to climate change, anticipated growth, and the need to provide safe travel infrastructure for all commuters all year round. As more development occurs, there is also growth of the transportation infrastructure, which needs to be cleared of snow. The traditional practice of dumping the snow on boulevards and roadside ditches will no longer be a viable option given the loss of available space, road safety needs, and negative impacts to the environment. It is therefore noted that more sites will be required to accommodate the snow storage function, and ideally closer to arterial roads for economies of scale and environmental benefits.</p> <p>Through the study cited above, there are two preferred sites being recommended to include a snow storage function alongside other existing and/or future uses. This proposed use takes into consideration a comprehensive data analysis and evaluation criteria based on environmental, social, technical, and financial factors. The study proposes two existing Peel Region owned properties indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway 50 Carpool Lot (southwest corner of highway 50 and Mayfield Road) is a vacant undeveloped parcel. In the new zoning map, this area is shown as 'Corridor Commercial'. • The proposed snow storage facility will include an asphalt melt pad, low impact development (LID) based stormwater management treatment facility, lighting, and gate/barrier to separate the facility. There will be no building on the property. • Our understanding is that the Region is not in contradiction of the City's Zoning requirements and that a building permit is not required for this use. We did not see snow storage use to be accommodated under any new zoning, although this by-law may provide the potential for this permitted use to be included. • West Brampton Reservoir and Pumping Station (northwest of Williams Parkway and Mississauga Road) • This site has an existing water reservoir and pumping station. A future snow storage facility is proposed at this site. 	We would like to discuss as part of completing Draft 3. The use may fall within the allowance for public use permissions but these are subject to further review. Otherwise we do not feel it is appropriate to permit these uses as principal uses in mixed use or commercial zones but further review will be undertaken.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Waste Management	<p>While we recognize that Section 1.7 of the Draft Zoning By-law makes reference to 'Compliance with Other Legislation, Bylaws, and Regulations', we do note that curbside waste collection in residential areas (garbage and recycling carts) is not specifically addressed. There are four residential zones noted below (as streamlined in the current draft) to which individual lot regulations apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential Estate (RE) • Residential Hamlet (RH) • Residential First Density (R1) • Residential Second Density (R2) <p>Should the City choose to include waste management provisions in these residential zones, we offer the following provisions from the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual (WCDSM).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each dwelling unit within a development must have its own identifiable collection point for one (1) large garbage cart or recycling cart (360 litres) and one (1) source separated organics cart (100 litres), overflow waste (i.e., additional bags), yard waste and bulky items located along the curb, adjacent to the driveway, and must be directly accessible to the waste collection vehicle and free of obstructions such as parked cars. • Each dwelling unit's collection point along the curb must be at least 3 m² in order to provide sufficient space for the placement of carts: maximum one (1) large garbage cart or recycling cart (360 litres) and one (1) source separated organics carts (100 litres), overflow waste (i.e., additional bags), yard waste and bulky items. • A minimum of 3.75 m² (2.5 metres by 1.5 metres) must be provided in the garage, backyard, or side yard for storage for one (1) large garbage cart or recycling cart (360 litres) and one (1) source separated organics carts (100 litres), overflow waste (i.e., additional bags), yard waste and bulky items carts, with direct access to the collection point location. 	The updated ZBL includes new garage dimension requirements that help to accommodate waste collection. A new allowance for a garbage enclosure to encroach in the front yard is included for townhouses. Otherwise it is difficult to regulate this in zoning, especially collection location/dimensions and interior space cannot be regulated in zoning.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	4.2.M Attached Private Garage Requirements	A minimum of 3.75 m ² (2.5 metres by 1.5 metres) must be provided in the garage, backyard or side yard for storage of carts, with direct access to the collection point location.	Noted. This is more significant than what was accommodated via discussion around the garage dimensions but this work is now complete.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	4.2.N Waste Storage	Indoor waste storage rooms and outdoor waste storage areas must meet the requirements set out in the current version of the Region of Peel Waste Collection Design Standard Manual.	Noted. At this time the ZBL only allows waste storage to be indoors and the ZBL is unable to provide further regulations on the nature of indoor spaces.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	6.2.C Waste Storage	Indoor waste storage rooms and outdoor waste storage areas must meet the requirements set out in the current version of the Region of Peel Waste Collection Design Standards Manual.	Noted. At this time the ZBL only allows waste storage to be indoors and the ZBL is unable to provide further regulations on the nature of indoor spaces.
Dana Jenkins	Region of Peel	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Landfill Sites	Closed landfill sites are not identified in the Schedules. Should the City choose to include this information in the Schedules to the new Zoning By-law, we are happy to provide this information. The City may also want to consider a statement within the text of the By-law indicating that structures on or next to the former landfill sites should have integrated engineered soil gas migration measures to ensure compliance with best practices to maintain methane concentrations below the stated values in Ontario Regulation 232/98 Landfilling Sites, Section 14. Subsurface Migration of Landfill Gas.	WSP is interested in obtaining this information but the requirement for soil gas migration measures may be beyond the scope of zoning.
Anuradha P	Rogers Communications	2024-02-22	Email, Letter	N/A	We have reviewed the proposed area and do not have any comments or concerns currently.	Noted
Kaitlin Webber	MHBC (on behalf of TransCanada PipeLines)	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	N/A	We request the Zoning By-law schedules show TCPL's pipelines as an overlay, similar to how they depicted in Schedule 2 of the 2023 Brampton Plan.	Noted and we agree since Brampton Plan shows the feature. This would likely be another schedule or an informational overlay.
Kaitlin Webber	MHBC (on behalf of TransCanada PipeLines)	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	N/A	<p>The TCPL provisions included in Section 2.4.I of the draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law do not reflect TCPL's current setback standards. As such, we request that the policies be amended as follows:</p> <p>2.4.I Setbacks from TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TCPL) Right-of-Way:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> .1 The minimum required setback for any principal building or structure from a lot line abutting the TransCanada pipeline corridor to the edge of the TCPL right-of-way shall be 7.0 m. .2 The minimum required setback for any accessory structure or permitted encroachment from a lot line abutting the TransCanada pipeline corridor to the edge of the TCPL right-of-way shall be 3.0 m. .3 The minimum required setback for any parking area or loading area, including any parking spaces, loading spaces, stacking spaces, bicycle parking spaces, and any associated aisle or driveway to the edge of the TCPL right-of-way shall be 7.0 m. 	We are unclear on the rationale for a setback for parking/loading especially for excess parking spaces (e.g., perhaps the constraint only relates to required minimum spaces). The other standards are reflected in the by-law. To review further with Draft 3.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 2.1.A.6.e – Why is a development agreement required for a model home?	This comment is under review.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-02	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 2.4.1 – We request that sills, belts etc. be permitted to encroach by 0.6 metres	We have made this change as it is minor
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-03	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 2.4.J.1 – We request that sight triangles have dimensions of 3.0 x 3.0 metres	This is under review but has been implemented in Draft 2.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-04	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 2.4.J.4 – We request this provision be deleted.	We do not understand the reason for deleting. This seems like a desirable provision, as oftentimes the sight triangle is incorporated into the ROW and thus the requirements are not otherwise needed. Further review will take place with Draft 3 on this request.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	N/A	Table 3.1.1, 5, Podium Townhouse Dwelling, Stacked Townhouse Dwelling, Back-to-Back Townhouse Dwelling, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling – We request that minimum parking spaces be revised to 1.2 per dwelling unit and 0.2 for visitors.	WSP is supportive of the change and it is complete.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-06	Email, Letter	N/A	Table 3.1.1, 6 Live Work Townhouse Dwelling – We request the parking requirement be 1.2 metres in total.	City has expressed challenges with parking associated with these uses so the rate is established in response to that input.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-07	Email, Letter	N/A	Table 3.1.1, 7, Apartments - Parking Area PRA3 – We request this be revised to 0.75 and 0.2 which would be consistent with PRA2.	We are open to the City's input but 1.0 is best practice; PRA3 would pertain to the most auto oriented areas of the City
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-08	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 3.3.6 – Requires 6.0 metres whereas we request this be revised to 4.5 metres.	We have updated as it seems reasonable and aligns with exterior side yard requirements. However further review is being undertaken internally.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-09	Email, Letter	N/A	Table 3.5.1 – This Section should only be applicable for condominium tenure	Agreed except that purpose built rental could manage this. The provisions have been updated.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-10	Email, Letter	N/A	Table 3.6.A.1 – In our opinion the minimum bicycle parking space requirements are excessive. We request this be revised and we would be pleased to provide additional input into this Section.	The bicycle parking requirements have been updated in Draft #2 in consideration of different comments.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-11	Email, Letter	N/A	Table 4.1.2 – 600 square metres minimum lot area is too large for back-to-back townhouse dwellings along with 18 metre minimum lot width. The R3M and R3H are also too large for cluster townhouse dwellings.	Updates have been made to address the typologies more appropriately. R3M and R3H's uses have been revised.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-12	Email, Letter	N/A	Table 4.1.4, Footnote (2) – Why is the angular plane required? We respectfully request this Section be removed.	Angular plane has been removed from the by-law in favour of setbacks to different portions of buildings.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-13	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 4.2.B.5 – Balconies should be included in the amenity area calculation	Balconies are not included as the amenity area requirements are intended to support only common space for recreation, social interaction, etc. However we have also allowed some indoor space to be counted towards the requirement.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-14	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 4.2.B.6 – We respectfully request this Section be removed.	We agree this may be onerous and should be a site plan matter, so we have deleted it.
Tim Schilling	DG Group	2024-04-15	Email, Letter	N/A	Section 4.2.E.3 – We recommend this be revised to 4.5 metres.	We have made this revision as it better aligns with exterior side yard requirements. City to confirm.
David McKay	MHBC (on behalf of Home Depot of Canada Inc.)	2024-03-11	Email, Letter	Site-Specific	<p>On behalf of our client, Home Depot of Canada Inc. (Home Depot), we have reviewed the first draft of the City of Brampton Zoning By-law (hereinafter the "DZBL"), relative to our client's existing sites and store operations located in the City of Brampton, which includes the following sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 49 First Gulf Boulevard (Store #7006) 60 Great Lakes Drive (Store #7110) 9515 Mississauga Road (Store #7301) 9105 Airport Road (Store #7239) <p>Of particular interest, the DZBL removes existing retail warehousing permissions for the Home Depot stores located at 49 First Gulf Boulevard (Store #7006), 60 Great Lakes Drive (Store #7110) and 9515 Mississauga Road (Store #7301). The exclusion of retail permissions is particularly concerning to our client, as this could restrict Home Depot's ability to display merchandise for sale, which would substantively impact and impede Home Depot's current and future operations.</p> <p>In contrast, we note that the Home Depot store located at 9105 Airport Road (Store #7239) is not subject to these restrictive changes and retains its retail permissions under the proposed General Commercial zone. We respectfully request that City staff address these concerns for the Home Depot stores located at 49 First Gulf Boulevard (Store #7006), 60 Great Lakes Drive (Store #7110) and 9515 Mississauga Road (Store #7301) by recognizing the existing uses as "legal conforming" under the new Zoning By-law. Alternatively, we propose that these three locations be zoned to General Commercial, which is consistent with the zoning of the Home Depot store located at 9105 Airport Road.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, and given that the DZBL process is in still its infancy, the high-level and preliminary comments are being provided for the City's review and consideration at this stage in the process and moving forward.</p> <p>On this basis and moving forward, we will ensure to continue to monitor the DZBL policies released as part of the initiative in consideration of Home Depot's sites, and we look forward to working with City staff and</p>	This is noted. All of these sites are subject to exception zones. All of these exceptions will be reviewed in conjunction with Draft 2 (a preliminary screening) and 3. Outside MTSAs, it is the overarching intent to retain existing permissions and only to delete exceptions if they overly constrain permissions, or if there is another specific reason. As part of reviewing exception zones, specific zone categories may be updated to better reflect the intent of the exception.
Gerry Tchisler	MHBC (on behalf of Morguard Corporation)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Electric Vehicle Parking	<p>The draft by-law introduces electric vehicle ("EV") parking provisions, requiring a minimum number of EV parking spaces for new development and for new gross floor area added to existing development. The Subject Lands contain a master-planned shopping centre where EV parking spaces were not initially planned. 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.</p> <p>There should be additional consideration as to how this provision is applied to large, master planned sites with multiple uses, rather than an ad-hoc, building by building approach. The owner of the site will consider the implementation of EV charging stations in the future through a cohesive approach that considers the whole site, rather than on an individual building basis. Doing so will appropriately address the future needs of the overall shopping centre in a holistic and comprehensive manner, consistent with the way in which the original master plan was developed. We request that the Subject Lands be exempt from the provision of EV parking as this will be considered by Morguard on a comprehensive basis.</p>	This is noted. Note the EV parking requirements have been updated. In the context of zoning, there is a limitation on addressing broader master planned sites that will be severed down the road. The ZBL can only effectively require parking per lot. Note that any development that is currently subject to an application will also receive Transition and as such new EV parking will not apply where a development application or approval meets the transition criteria. WSP is open to further discussion to ensure the site is appropriately being considered.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Gerry Tchisler	MHBC (on behalf of Morguard Corporation)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Parking Regulation Areas	Parking requirements in the draft by-law are based on 'regulation areas', which set out different rates for different parts of the City. Schedule B to the by-law, 'Parking Regulations Areas', has not yet been released. It is understood that this schedule is still forthcoming; comments may be provided in the future upon its release.	This is now available.
Gerry Tchisler	MHBC (on behalf of Morguard Corporation)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Restaurants	A new restaurant is being proposed on the Prestige Employment portion of the site and was subject to a pre-consultation review earlier this year. We want to highlight that restaurants are not a permitted use in the PE zone in the draft by-law. However, the current site-specific MBU3456 zone permits dining room restaurants, convenience restaurants, and take-out restaurants. In addition, the proposed restaurant will have an associated drive-through, which are permitted as accessory uses. As such, we request that the existing site-specific provisions be carried forward to protect for the existing and future uses on the site.	Noted. Site-specific exceptions zones will be reviewed as part of Draft 3.
Gerry Tchisler	MHBC (on behalf of Morguard Corporation)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Retail Establishments and Supermarkets	The draft by-law defines supermarkets as "a retail establishment engaged in the business of selling groceries, meat, fruit, vegetables and household items to the general public." The definition indicates that a supermarket would be permitted in any location where a 'retail establishment' is permitted. However, we note that in most zones a supermarket and a retail establishment are listed as separate uses, implying that if only a retail establishment is permitted, a supermarket would not be permitted. Supermarkets that are located within planned large format shopping centres function the same way as other any other retail store in a shopping centre. As such, it is important that supermarkets be permitted in all zones where retail establishments are permitted. This will help ensure appropriate access to food stores throughout the urban area and to avoid the creation of food deserts. The Subject Lands, through the site-specific zoning, permit retail establishments. We request clarification to ensure that supermarkets are permitted in zones where retail establishments are permitted. If they are not, we request that they be permitted in on the Subject Lands within the site-specific zoning. In addition, the City may wish to amend its definition of retail establishment to ensure it specifically references supermarkets.	We agree and have deleted supermarket, in favour of the broader retail definition and permissions. Note that some zone categories have changed between the 1st and 2nd draft which should help address concerns about loss of permissions. As noted exceptions are to be reviewed with the general intent to retain permissions outside the MTSAs.
Gerry Tchisler	MHBC (on behalf of Morguard Corporation)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Land Acquisition	Through the pre-consultation for the proposed restaurant, the Region of Peel commented that a 2.5 metre dedication will be required along Steeles Avenue East and that a 4 metre dedication will be required along Kennedy Road South. These dedications will greatly impact the setbacks of the existing buildings, as well as the proposed restaurant. The draft by-law includes Provision 1.6.C.1 which addresses non-compliance as a result of land acquisition by a public authority. However, this provision is only applicable to existing buildings and thus would not recognize proposed buildings, nor would it be applicable to buildings that are redeveloped in place of existing buildings. Shopping centres of this nature evolve over time to serve the changing needs of the local market and thus require the flexibility to make adjustments to their built form based on those needs. Therefore, new development or redevelopment will have ripple effects on the rest of the shopping centre layout which was created through a master planning site plan process. Recognizing the road widening within the site-specific provision would ensure that the integrity of the master site plan is maintained. Based on a preliminary review, the result of the road dedications will be a minimum setback of 0.6 metres along Kennedy Road South and a minimum setback of 2.0 metres along Steeles Avenue East. We request that zoning modifications be added to the existing site-specific provision on site to ensure that these reduced setbacks are recognized for existing and new buildings. We will provide detailed measurements to the City for inclusion into the upcoming draft of the by-law.	We are open to reviewing this on a site-specific basis and considering site-specific provisions, but would otherwise prefer to retain the proposed setbacks and provisions for non-compliance as a result of expropriation. Draft 3 will contain all site-specific zones. We also note that recently approved or completed applications in process would receive benefits from Transition, provided they meet the transition criteria.
Gerry Tchisler	MHBC (on behalf of Morguard Corporation)	2024-04-01	Email, Letter	Site-Specific	The Subject Lands are currently subject to a number of site-specific zoning provisions. The Subject Lands have been developed in accordance with these provisions and thus it is imperative that they be carried forward into the new by-law with the appropriate modifications, as necessary to be consistent with the new by-law and as outlined above.	Noted. Site-specific exceptions zones will be reviewed as part of Draft 3.
Lino Malito	Orlando Corporation	2024-03-12	Email	Parking Aisles	Section 7.1.5 allows for one parking aisle. Does this mean one aisle with parking on both sides of the aisle. Please see the attached site plan for 50 Edgeware Road in Brampton along with a few google images. Typically, we provide two rows of parking with one drive aisle between the front of the building and the street. Will this still be permitted? If not, then we cannot support this zoning provision. We require two rows of parking at the front of our industrial buildings to support the office function and often to meet the zoning by-law parking requirement. The required parking cannot interfere with the loading operation at the rear of the buildings	Yes this would allow for parking on both sides and this is updated for clarity. Note that a new provision with a maximum distance has been added to support implementing the Urban Design Guidelines. We would further note that an application in process may be eligible for transition and not subject to the new by-laws requirements, which have evolved.
Lino Malito	Orlando Corporation	2024-03-12	Email	N/A	What is the disinction between a Transportation Depot and Distribution Centre; and Warehouse uses. Warehouse uses have a distribution function. Also, where would a logistics operation fit in? You will note that the definitions for Transportation Depot and Warehouse are quite similar. What criteria will Zoning use to determine the difference in uses? Our concern is that a warehouse, distribution, or logistics use may be construed as a Transportation Depot, which is not permitted in PE zones.	These definitions have been updated.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Lauren Capilongo	MGP	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	N/A	Malone Given Parsons Ltd. is the Planning Consultant for TACC Holborn (Block 140) Inc. ("TACC Holborn"), who own the property located on the northeast corner of The Gore Road and Queen Street East in the City of Brampton, legally described as Block 140 on Registered Plan 43M-2092 (the "Subject Lands"). On behalf of TACC Holborn, we have reviewed the First Draft Brampton Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw, dated November 1, 2023 ("Draft CZBL"). We understand that the City's Draft CZBL does not include lands that are part of Major Transit Station Areas ("MTSA"). The Draft CZBL therefore does not currently propose zoning on any lands within MTSA areas, including The Gore MTSA, which Block 140 is designated within. We further understand that once the respective MTSA studies are completed for each area, the lands will then be brought into the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law.	This is correct. The 2nd Draft includes updated zoning for some of the MTSAs.
Lauren Capilongo	MGP	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	Parking Regulation Areas	In reviewing the Draft CZBL, we note that the City has proposed a new approach to parking with centers around a three-tiered system of parking regulation areas. Despite the Draft CZBL not proposing zoning categories for MTSAs, we note that Block 140 and a large portion of The Gore MTSA has been identified within Parking Regulation Area 3 ("PRA3"). In our opinion, Parking Regulation Area 1 ("PRA1") should apply to Block 140. Based on our understanding, Parking Regulation Area 3 generally includes the highest parking requirements. For apartment dwelling uses, PRA3 requires a minimum of 1 space per dwelling unit plus 0.2 for visitors, whereas PRA1 requires a minimum parking rate of 0.15 spaces per dwelling unit to a maximum of 1 space, and Parking Regulation Area 2 ("PRA2") requires a minimum of 0.75 parking space per dwelling unit plus 0.2 for visitors. Within The Gore MTSA, PRA2 is proposed to apply to areas with existing or under construction low-rise residential uses and proposed high-density development lands located away from the direct intersection of Queen Street East and The Gore Road. Whereas PRA3 has been applied to Block 140 located at the major intersection of this MTSA, as well as Block 139 to the northeast, which was approved for high density mixed-use development (City Files OZS-2020-0032 and SPA-2021-0227) and is currently under construction. We further note that the combination of applying PRA2 and PRA3 to The Gore Road MTSA is also out of sync with how other Primary MTSA's along Queen Street East have been identified. Generally, these MTSA's are mainly identified under the PRA1 category, with smaller portions identified as PRA2 or PRA3. Therefore, we are requesting that Block 140 is included within Parking Regulation Area 1 to recognize that the lands are within the direct intersection of The Gore MTSA bus rapid transit station.	Note that the PRAs have been updated in the second draft ZBL, and now any PMTSA lands are included in PRA1.
Lauren Capilongo	MGP	2024-03-28	Email, Letter	MTSA Zoning	Block 139 is also owned by TACC Holborn, under the ownership name of TACC Holborn (Block 139) Inc. These lands are also within The Gore MTSA and zoning has not been proposed as part of the Draft CZBL. As mentioned, the lands have been approved for a high-density mixed-use development, which is currently under construction. We request that the future zoning regulations for Block 139 reflect the site-specific approvals facilitated through Zoning By-law 172-2021, and related minor variance file A-2022-1082.	Noted. Site-specific exceptions zones will be reviewed as part of Draft 3.
Mary-Ann Burns	TRCA	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Non-Conforming Uses	Please include provisions to address the enlargement or intensification of a non conforming use or a non-complying building or structure where they may be located within lands subject to flooding and erosion to prevent an increase in risk to persons and property. In addition, it should be stipulated that some development activities may be regulated by the conservation authority.	To review/discuss further in Draft 3. At a minimum our intent is to include some context on these matters in the User Guide/mapping in Draft 3.
Mary-Ann Burns	TRCA	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Compliance with Other Legislation, By-laws and Regulation	Either here or in a separate provision, conservation authorities' regulated area and permit regulation under the Conservation Authorities Act should be mentioned.	WSP's recommendation is to show the regulated areas as a convenience feature in the City's interactive map and to reference the feature in the User Guide to the ZBL. As the lands are subject to change it is the City's preference not to incorporate the areas into the ZBL itself but further discussion with Draft 3 can be undertaken.
Mary-Ann Burns	TRCA	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Building Permits	Under the Building Code Act, conservation authority permits are applicable law such that a municipality cannot legally issue a building permit until a CA permit or permit clearance has been obtained for development activities within a regulated area. Further, conservation authorities must provide comments on Planning Act applications to ensure that decisions under the Act are consistent with provincial natural hazard policies. Therefore, a direct reference to conservation authorities is recommended for both of these sections.	This is noted. It is not the intent to provide an exhaustive list of applicable law as this can change and can create administrative issues for the City if something is missed. The preference is to identify this in the User Guide but further discussion can be undertaken.
Mary-Ann Burns	TRCA	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	ARUs	While we appreciate that this section prohibits ARUs from locating with Natural System or Open Space zones, there may be hazardous lands or regulated features that extend outside or are outside and separate from the Natural System or Open Space zones. Please provide additional restrictions to prevent an increase in risk associated with ARUs, Garden Suites, or Supportive Housing being located within hazardous lands and within regulated features important for natural hazard management. These restrictions should apply both within the NS and OS zones as well as where regulated features and hazards may extend beyond these zones, as determined by the applicable conservation authority.	Floodplains are intended to be zoned within NS moving forward in which these uses are not permitted. At this time the ZBL's scope has not involved a detailed review of these areas. Further review on the comment will be completed in Draft 3.
Mary-Ann Burns	TRCA	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Accessory Buildings and Structures	There should be a provision to prevent accessory buildings and structures from being located within natural hazards and an indication that the erection of these structures within a regulated area may require a permit from the applicable conservation authority.	See above

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Mary-Ann Burns	TRCA	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Mapping	Given our general comments regarding discrepancies between the proposed zoning maps and TRCA's mapping of regulated features and hazards, we would be glad to provide our most recent regulated area mapping layers for the City's use in the CZBL	WSP is open to reviewing this mapping information with Draft 3.
Mary-Ann Burns	TRCA	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Mapping	In TRCA's recent experience, there has been an increased interest in locating stormwater management (SWM) ponds within the Natural System. Please consider identifying SWM ponds as a prohibited use within zones representing the Natural System.	We have identified SWM facilities as an explicitly permitted use in appropriate zones and they are not permitted in the NS.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	General	The current method of scaling from a Zoning Schedule "A" often fails to accurately determine zone boundaries. This has led to instances where more restrictive zone provisions are mistakenly applied to lots that appear to have split zoning, or where minor variances become necessary. In some cases, it may even result in the contemplated use being deemed impermissible, necessitating a rezoning process. It's crucial to grant some discretion to the zoning examiner for interpreting zone boundaries. This includes considering the intent behind zone delineations in approved plans, as well as other relevant factors such as contours, tree lines, or natural versus manmade physical features that aid in interpretation. Overall, BILD believes that consolidating zone categories in the current Draft Comprehensive Bylaw could address these concerns for subdivision plans.	This is noted and updates are identified in Draft 2.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Transition	Recommendation: 1.8 A - Add the following: Building Permits under Section 1.8.B shall be exempt from Section 1.8.A. 1.8.B - Remove "...deemed complete by the City..." 1.8.C - Remove this provision	We are unclear on the rationale for the requests. The City requires applications to be deemed complete to grant transition. Further review will be undertaken in Draft 3.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Garden Suites	The necessity for the substantial rear and interior side yard setbacks is called into question in light of Section 4.2.D, which permits garages to be set back 6m from the interior and rear lot lines. The current proposal, stipulating a minimum separation distance of 3.0m to the principal dwelling as outlined in Section 2.3.F, effectively renders a typical urban rear yard unsuitable for accommodating a Garden Suite altogether. It is recommended that the standard setbacks outlined for detached garages in Section 4.2.D Subsection 7 be applied correspondingly to Garden Suites.	Detached ARU provisions have been updated in Draft 2
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Garden Suites	Recommendation: The size of 35 sq.m. is not inadequate for a residential unit. We suggest that the City instead propose an increase of 50 sq.m. It is imperative that such numerical specifications receive industry input. Additional Consideration: Please clarify why there a singular area designated for all lot types and sizes within Residential Zones? Furthermore, what criteria were employed in determining setbacks?	Detached ARU provisions have been updated in Draft 2
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Garden Suites	General Comment: It is recommended that this provision be amended to permit two-storey structures, potentially adopting setbacks similar to the sloped and stepped setbacks for the second floor observed in the City of Toronto's regulations.	Detached ARU provisions have been updated in Draft 2
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Permitted Yard Encroachments	General Comment: Does the provision in line 4 regarding a covered entryway for a second unit contradict the stipulation in 2.3.A.9 regarding the width of steps in a side yard?	This is noted and further internal discussion is required with Draft 3 to refine these provisions and the permitted encroachments.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Permitted Yard Encroachments	Recommendation: Balconies should be permitted to extend up to 1.8 meters into the front yard. Rationale: In instances such as back-to-back towns lacking rear yards, or in the case of three-storey towns necessitating egress balconies at the front, this provision becomes essential. Additionally, in designs featuring balconies above porches, this allowance proves beneficial. Recommending the same encroachment allowance as permitted for porches in the designated table	We have retained the 1.5 m allowance for projection which is the minimum depth as provided by the UDGs. We are open to further discussion.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Setbacks from Rail Corridors	Recommendation: The minimum required setback from any building or structure to a lot line adjacent to any rail main line should be 25 meters. Rationale: There are instances where specific rail authorities permit a 25-meter setback from the rail right-of-way limit. The City of Brampton should consider reviewing this matter with transportation consultants specializing in this area and subsequently update this section	CN has requested 30 m so further discussion is required.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Sight Triangles	Recommendation: Decrease the setback requirement to 5 meters, aligning with the City Design Standards for intersections between local roads and collector roads, as observed in other municipalities (some of which adhere to a 4.5-meter setback). Larger daylighting triangles mandated for higher-order roads will constrain driveway locations in conjunction with other provisions in Section 2.4.J.4, which prohibit any part of a driveway from intersecting with the lot line forming part of the sight triangle. Additionally, we suggest modifying the requirement from triangles to roundings in situations involving local and collector roads, as triangular configurations significantly impact the placement of houses on corner lots. Historical acceptance of 5-meter roundings prompts inquiry into the rationale for increasing it to 6 meters and mandating triangles without any apparent provision or mention of daylight roundings in the draft zoning bylaw. Furthermore, we propose the inclusion of a demonstration plan illustrating house sitings on corner lots with both daylight triangles and roundings to elucidate their respective impacts, accompanied by sight line analyses.	This has been updated to 4.5 m in Draft 2 and further review is taking place by City staff.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Parking	Recommendation: The minimum required provision of parking spaces for Stacked Towns should be set at one space per dwelling unit. Rationale: The Stacked Townhouse configuration represents a higher density housing form compared to traditional low-rise town unit types. Given the compact nature of stacked townhouses and to promote efficient site design, allocating one parking space per unit is deemed sufficient.	WSP supports this change given there is also visitor parking
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Parking	Recommendation - Please remove this provision. Reason - The stipulation within the sight triangle section prohibits driveway encroachments within the designated sight triangle or its vicinity. This provision would be at odds with the approval of a sight triangle smaller than 6 x 6 meters during subdivision by transportation authorities. If the exclusion of this provision is not feasible, BILD seeks a meeting with the City to discuss this matter further.	We are open to further discussion and some internal review is taking place with respect to sight triangle provisions.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Parking	Parking aisle width. Recommendation - A reduction to a width of 6 meters is proposed. Reason - The City of Brampton, in collaboration with its transportation department and regional authorities, is urged to investigate the possibility of narrowing the width from 6.6 meters, especially in light of the proposed increase in parking space length from 5.4 meters to 5.7 meters within this zoning by-law. Notably, neighboring municipalities such as Vaughan, Markham, Richmond Hill, and Caledon all adhere to a 6-meter aisle requirement.	We agree and have made this change. We have also reverted the min parking space length to 5.4 m.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Electric Vehicle Parking	Table 3.5.1 seemingly mandates 20% of the total prescribed parking spaces or 1.0 space, whichever is greater, for back-to-back townhouse dwellings. This provision is tailored for back-to-backs within a condominium or rental framework, featuring a communal parking area. However, there is uncertainty as it appears to encompass freehold units as well. Recommendation: It is recommended to amend this requirement to explicitly state its inapplicability to back-to-back or stacked townhouse typologies with individual private garages or situated on individual lots. Additional Remarks: Is the mandated provision of 20% electric vehicle (EV) equipped parking spaces excessive? Further clarification is sought regarding its applicability—whether for visitors or residents. Consider expanding the exclusion in No. 2 to encompass freehold developments. We request the incorporation of this	We agree and have updated so that this will apply to condominium.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Bicycle Parking	General Comment: As this this a new provision, has there been a commensurate reduction in parking requirements for this particular product type to balance the adjustment?	The vehicle and bicycle parking rates have been comprehensively reviewed and many reductions to min vehicle parking were implemented. Minimum vehicle parking is eliminated in PRA 1 for example, supporting the application of bicycle parking in these areas to support the City's mobility objectives.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Residential Zones	Lacks permissions for certain typologies. Recommendation: The R2 Zone necessitates revision to incorporate authorization for back-to-back dwellings within the permitted uses. Additionally, it is proposed that the R1 Zone be updated to encompass permission for rear-lane single-detached and semi-detached dwellings within the permitted uses	WSP agrees and significant updates for R1 and R2 are included in Draft 2.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Lot Requirements	Recommendation: The reference to square meters in the minimum lot width requirement should be revised to meters for clarity and consistency.	Corrected.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Lot Requirements	Clarification Required: It is necessary to seek clarification from the city regarding the definition of "cluster towns." In the event that lots are constructed along a CEC private road with established frontage on said road, it is imperative to ascertain whether such developments would be classified as Cluster Towns or Townhouses, considering the existence of distinct definitions for each. Moreover, in the scenario where the site is developed as a POTL condominium site, clarification is sought regarding whether zoning regulations would apply to each individual unit or to the entire block as a unified entity.	Further discussion may be required with City/BILD to ensure different tenure arrangements are all clear and captured. Draft 2 has incorporated more comprehensive standards for different typologies.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Building Location	Recommendation: Front yard setbacks for all townhouse typologies should be adjusted to 2.5 meters, while exterior side yard setbacks should be set at 2.0 meters across all townhouse typologies. Additionally, the rear yard setback for rear lane towns should be reduced to 0.5 meter	The min of 3 m is in line with the UDGs, which promotes landscaped open space in the front. The rear yard setback would apply to main building but open to discussion about the concern - assume this is intended for attached townhouses. Some further coordination with the UDGs is required in Draft 3.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Building Location	Recommendation: In order to promote the efficient utilization of land and foster compact built forms, we propose adjustments to setbacks. Proposed Changes: The minimum front yard setback should be amended from 4.5 meters to 3.0 meters. The exterior side yard setback should be revised from 3.0 meters to 2.4 meters. Additionally, the maximum building height should be modified to 13.0 meters	The standards are in line with the UDGs. The allowance of 13 m could allow for 4 storeys which would not be in line with Brampton Plan, allowing for max 3 in the neighbourhoods.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Site and Landscaping Requirements	Recommendation: Remove the R1 and R2 zones of this table, as well remove coverage restrictions for R1 and R2.	Is there a specific rationale? The City prefers to implement these standards to have predictable site coverage and provide for greenery. This will be reviewed further. City staff are completing further review of front yard landscaping/driveway requirements which may impact these requirements in Draft 3.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Driveway Requirements	The language employed in this section has previously been identified as contentious in section 3.3.6. Recommendation: The provision pertaining to the minimum distance between any point of a driveway and the point of intersection of projected front and flankage property lines measured at the front lot line shall be set at 6.0 meters. However, no minimum distance requirement shall be imposed if a curved or daylighting angle is incorporated pursuant to a development agreement. Furthermore, as highlighted in section 3.3.6, BILD strongly recommends that a meeting with the City's traffic department is held for further deliberation on this matter	We are open to discussing this and internal review is taking place. There's a conflict with respect to the width of a corner townhouse which could be as little as 6.5 m; as such we'd have to address this by increasing the min width to at least 9.5 m. WSP supports the inclusion of language regarding the development agreement. However, further review is needed from City traffic operations.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Driveway Requirements	General Comment: The stipulations regarding landscaped open space requirements, specifically the specifications of 0.6 meters and 60%, may present potential issues.	Noted; this is under review by City staff.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Driveway Requirements	The current table does not acknowledge rear-lane lot configurations where the driveway width matches the width of the lot. Recommendation: Incorporate a provision to accommodate exceptions for rear-lane dwellings within the table. We also recommend 4.2.E.14 not apply. In addition, remove all references to landscaping. Additional Comments: This provision must align with the Housekeeping ZBLA. Lots equal to or greater than 12.0 meters. Additionally, the definition of garage remains an ongoing issue, requiring clarification across various unit types.	We agree that rear lane garages should not be subject to the table as open space will be provided in the front yard. The various lot frontages in the table have been corrected. We have updated the max driveway to be at least 3.1 m in all cases, to align with the recent ZBLA.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Driveway Requirements	General Comment: There appears to be an error in the frontage column on the last row. Please advise	Corrected.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Driveway Requirements	Please see Attachment 2 for a rendering regarding a partial ground floor plan allowable driveway width in a front yard. BILD would be happy to schedule a call to walk staff through this figure.	We are happy to discuss. Further review on landscaped open space and driveways is taking place with Draft 3.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Fences	Recommendation: Implement a maximum height restriction of 1.2 meters for any portion of the front yard. Rationale: Standard decorative metal fences commonly utilized along street frontages typically measure 4 feet in height, equivalent to 1.2 meters.	We agree and have updated.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Fences	General Comment: The maximum allowable height is set at 2.0 meters. However, should there be a necessity for a 2.2-meter acoustic fence, further clarification is warranted regarding its permissibility within the regulations.	WSP is supportive of this increase; it should be aligned with any requirements in the Fence by-law - City to weigh in
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Garage Requirements	General Comment: It is imperative to provide a clear definition of a carport. Additionally, there is a necessity to ensure that the construction of second-floor space over the driveway, within the house setback, does not categorize the covered area or wall as a carport. Furthermore, the discussion regarding garage width should be incorporated into this consideration.	Revisions have been made to consider the increased dimensions for one-car garages, and a carport definition has been added
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Garage Requirements	Recommendation: The modifications to be ratified by Council should accurately reflect the amendments mutually agreed upon by BILD and the City. These adjustments include specifications for garage sizes as follows: 1-Car Garage - 2.9m/3.1m x 6.1m, 2-Car Garage - 5.6m x 6.1m, and 3-Car Garage - 8.1m x 6.1m. Please refer to Attachment 3 for a rendering. BILD would be happy to schedule a call to walk staff through this figure.	WSP's understanding is that the dimensions approved by Council were just the min. requirements for dwellings =< 6 m (2.9 x 3.1) and dwellings > 6 m (3.1 x 6.1) and there were no specific dimensions for 3 car. Any additional spaces would have to meet the min parking dimensions.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Waste Storage	General Comment: We seek provisions permitting enclosed garbage enclosures within the front yard, with encroachment allowances equivalent to those permitted for front yard porches on townhouses lacking garages, particularly on full freehold sites. Refer to Attachment 4 for a rendering to support our comment. BILD would be happy to schedule a call to walk staff through this figure.	WSP has proposed some provisions to allow this.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Mature Neighbourhoods	General Comment: It is uncertain whether the regulations are targeted towards new standalone rebuilds within established neighborhoods or infill development within the same neighborhoods. The latter scenario, particularly pertinent in instances where the efficiency of built form is crucial for economically viable development, warrants differential treatment. This differentiation may be warranted, except in cases where immediate adjacency is established, such as a new build within an infill development adjacent to an existing home with a shared mutual property boundary. In a broader context, it has been observed that increasing setbacks on smaller lots within established neighborhoods, concurrently with increased building height, can create the perception of greater height than would be perceived with lesser sideyard setbacks. Recommendation: We recommend that the City carefully reconsider this rather than applying a blanket approach to all infill projects in mature neighborhoods. Infill development, particularly those encompassed within Plans of Condominium, represent substantial revenue sources for municipalities as they bear no long-term obligations for road and service maintenance. Imposing more restrictive zoning standards on infill development could potentially curtail the long-term financial gains for municipalities	Noted. Brampton Plan maintains the mature neighbourhood overlay as a policy and the 2nd Draft Zoning By-law carries forward the current approach to setbacks and height restrictions in the mature neighbourhoods. In the 2nd draft, this is the R1M zone and the overlay has been removed so its influence is more focused on existing lots and reconstruction of existing dwellings. The R1M restrictions would apply to single detached dwellings. Townhouses and higher density forms are not currently permitted in R1M and would need a rezoning.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	Recommendation: Balcony: Defined as a horizontal platform, with or without a foundation, affixed to and protruding from a primary wall of a structure, accessible solely from within the building. Rationale: Establishing a clear definition ensures clarity and eliminates ambiguity, thereby obviating the need for speculation	We support the proposed definition and have integrated it.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	General Comment: There appears to be a conflict between the definitions of "basement" and "storey." Additionally, clarification is sought regarding the application of the definition of "storey," particularly in relation to Live-Work arrangements. Concern: The definition of "storey" stipulates that any portion exceeding 4.0 meters in height from the floor surface to the ceiling or roof above it is considered an additional storey. Clarity is required regarding its application, especially concerning Live-Work setups.	We have updated the definition of basement to be more in line with the OBC. We agree that referring to a max height in storey could be problematic and the new ZBL applies max height in both storeys and metres which can create confusion. We have removed the max height.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	General Comment: As per the definition outlined in the Ontario Building Code (OBC), live-work arrangements do not encompass commercial uses beyond business personal services.	The By-law takes a more open approach to the types of commercial uses that are allowed at the zoning level. Further discussion with City building staff needed to review.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	Height. Recommendation: It is recommended to provide a definition for "underside of soffit" or "eaves" for clarity and precision within the context of the regulation. Recommendation: It is advisable to exclude mechanical penthouses and stair shafts from the specified regulations for greater clarity and specificity	Section 2.12 identifies how rooftop mechanical equipment fits into determination of height. We incorporated reference to a stairway in the definition of rooftop mechanical equipment. The definition does not reference "underside of soffit" so further discussion is required.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	Landscape Open Space. Recommendation: It is advisable to incorporate landscape retaining walls and stairs within the scope of the regulation, while excluding structural retaining walls for greater precision and applicability	To discuss with City; unclear on how to differentiate structural versus landscape retaining walls in a zoning definition. Should retaining walls just be included generally in LOS for simplicity or is there an issue with that?
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	Lot Area. This provision specifies that the area of a corner lot encompasses the area of the daylighting, but solely if it's a rounding and not a triangle. If deduction of the daylighting triangle area is necessary, a scenario not currently addressed by this definition, then the lot depths derived from the minimum lot areas and frontages discussed earlier may be underestimated. BILD proposes two changes: Firstly, modify the requirement for local to local and local to collector daylighting to apply to roundings instead of triangles, and adjust the dimensions as previously discussed. Secondly, amend the definition to include triangles so that the area of the triangle is not subtracted from the area of corner lots.	We are open to discussing further. The intent of the definition is to simplify the calculation of lot area, where a rounding exists. The intent generally is to include all lands within the lot lines so if the sight triangle is part of the lot it would be included in the lot area calculation.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	Lot Coverage. Recommendation: It is recommended to define measurements to the outside face of columns and walls, while explicitly excluding soffits and overhangs for clarity and specificity within the regulation.	We agree and have implemented the changes.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	Yards. Recommendation: It is advised to incorporate a section defining irregularly shaped lots, encompassing instances where there are three or five lot lines, for comprehensive coverage and clarity within the regulation.	We would prefer to maintain the yard definitions as referring to lot lines and then clarifying the lot lines. Further testing of different scenarios is to be completed in the third draft to support refinements.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	Setback to Daylight. General Comment: Upon review, there is no provision indicating the setback to a daylighting triangle in either Section 2.4.E Reserves or Section 2.4.J Sight Triangles. It is imperative that the setback to a daylight triangle be established as zero, as opposed to the frequently observed setback of 1.0 meter. BILD recommends incorporating a reference to a zero setback to a reserve for buildings and structures in either Section 2.4.E Reserves or Section 2.4.J Sight Triangles, and adjusting other provisions of the bylaw as necessary to ensure consistency throughout.	Further review required. The setbacks pertain to lot lines in the by-law and there are no reserve or sight triangle setbacks which could complicate the by-law.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	General Comment: Defined terms throughout the By-law should be italicized; however, they are not currently formatted as such. It is recommended to italicize defined terms consistently throughout the document for clarity.	Noted.
Victoria Mortelliti	BILD	2024-04-05	Email, Letter	Definitions	General Comment: There is no explicit mention of requiring Rear Yard access on townhouses within the current provisions. This requirement was commonly observed in Brampton; however, it appears to be absent in the current regulations	This provision has been re-integrated.
Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates (on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto)	2024-04-22	Email, Letter	Lot and Setback Standards	I would like to confirm that any existing church building that was legally constructed will be grandfathered and these requirements, if they are not met, would only come into play if the Archdiocese wanted to rebuild or put on an addition. I think the requirements in Table 2.3.2 and related zone provisions are reasonable.	That is correct. The provisions of 1.8B. - non complying structures would apply for legal structures that no longer meet new setbacks; additions could be done without a variance provided the new setbacks are met and the contravention is not worsened. The provisions of 1.8.A would apply if the use is no longer permitted but it was legally established before the by-law came into effect.
Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates (on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto)	2024-04-22	Email, Letter	Definitions	This seems like an appropriate definition [place of worship] as it is quite broad and permits the accessory uses that churches typically have. The definition also permits a rectory as of right. It is important that the use of the premises for community outreach activities is referenced in the definition as the functions of a church have evolved considerably over the last few decades to include many activities not necessarily considered faith-based but rather for social, community and charitable purposes. As such I would read the latter part of the first sentence in the proposed definition as a list of uses or activities that are permitted individually and not modified by the term "faithbased" except for "instruction or teaching". We would appreciate confirmation of this intent.	We have updated the definition in response to the comment as the definition was a bit unclear; agree this is the intent.
Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates (on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto)	2024-04-22	Email, Letter	Height Exception for Spires	This is a common provision and needed.	Noted.
Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates (on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto)	2024-04-22	Email, Letter	Parking	The new parking standard is a very significant reduction. The Archdiocese is not opposed to the reduction.	Noted.
Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates (on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto)	2024-04-22	Email, Letter	Permitted Uses	In the Permitted Use Tables for Employment zones I believe you have switched the site-specific standard applying to places of worship (2.3.M) with one applying to outdoor patios (2.3.N).	Noted; some organizational changes were made
Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates (on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto)	2024-04-22	Email, Letter	Site-Specific	The existing zoning map for St. Eugene de Mazenod Mission (Church, Hall and Our Lady of Ludzmierz House) located at 1252 Steeles Avenue West, Brampton shows two site specific by-laws, SC-1553 and 288-2006. Can the zoning permission for this church be modified to simply be zoned General Institutional?	Noted. Site-specific exceptions zones will be reviewed as part of Draft 3.
Bob Lehman	Lehman & Associates (on behalf of Archdiocese of Toronto)	2024-04-22	Email, Letter	Site-Specific	The proposed zoning for the St. Mary's Parish, Brampton (Church, Hall, Rectory and Seniors Residence) located at 66A Main Street South, shows a symbol DF4. Can you advise what this means?	The DF-4 symbol is associated with the Downtown Floodplain area (a Special Policy Area where the Province has approved limited development, subject to floodproofing). These provisions are required by the Official Plan across these lands. In the next draft, the DF is to be updated to be an overlay rather than a zone suffix. The associated provisions under Section 2 apply where this is shown.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Legal Non-Conforming	Concerned that a number of the new zoning standards will create instances of legal non-compliance. Loblaw understands the need to apply updated performance standards to respond to the City's long-term objectives as it relates to creating complete and healthy communities, including appropriate development standards. However, we are concerned that the Draft Zoning By-law will create instances of legal non compliance that could hinder the long-term operation and viability of these lands, including in the case where Loblaw may elect to explore opportunities for infill and expansion opportunities to existing uses.	We are open to discussing but agree that standards have evolved. In the commercial zones, the minimum setbacks have been reduced. We note there are transition provisions and the provisions for legally non complying structures which will help minimize the need for a minor variance if the building or parking areas are proposed to be altered.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Legal Non-Conforming	In order to avoid rendering existing conforming developments as non conforming under the new By-law, it would be appropriate to add a "Vacuum" clause to the Draft By-law, where notwithstanding any other provisions of the new By-law, any lot and the location thereon of any building or structure, existing on the effective date of the new By-law, would be deemed to comply and would be permitted by the new By-law. In addition, it would be appropriate to provide an allowance for additions and alterations to legally existing buildings without rendering the existing development as non-conforming as a result of the addition or alteration.	We have made some updates to the legal non complying provisions of Section 1.8.B. Over time it would be the City's desire to see buildings and lots evolve to conform to the new zones but the 1.8.B provisions will reduce the need for variances if alterations or expansions are proposed.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	MTSA Zoning / Site Specific Zoning	We understand that the Loblaw lands located at 295 Queen Street E and 85 Steeles Avenue W are not subject to the Draft Zoning By-law as a result of their location within a Major Transit Station Area, and are intended to be rezoned as part of a separate process. We seek clarification that the existing Zoning By-law 270-2004, as amended, will continue to apply to these sites until such time as they are rezoned through a separate process.	Noted.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Drive Throughs	Section 2.3E provides zoning standards for Drive Throughs including provisions for minimum number of stacking spaces and regulating the location of the stacking lane, whereas the current Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not generally regulate these matters. The Loblaw lands at 70 Clementine Drive are developed with uses that include multiple drive-throughs, and we are concerned that the configuration of the existing established site will be rendered legal non-conforming.	It is in the City's interest to regulate this use in the zoning. If the use is legal non conforming an expansion would require a minor variance; if the specific design of the stacking lane does not comply with the provisions, the provisions of legal non complying structures would apply.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Seasonal Garden Centres	Section 2.3.O provides zoning standards for seasonal garden centres, whereas the existing Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not provide similar provisions for this type of use. Several of the Loblaw lands are developed with grocery stores that accommodate a seasonal garden centre for approximately 90 days, annually. We have concerns that the new zoning standards would create non-compliance for the longstanding seasonal garden centre, including by restricting the location of the garden centre, requiring that the garden centre provide parking, and that the garden centre not occupy more than 10% of required parking. We have concern with the introduction of new zoning requirements that will conflict with the current and longstanding operation of these lands.	It is desirable for the City to introduce standards to guide this use. The statement about parking is that the garden centre cannot take up 'required minimum' parking stalls so it can be located on excess spaces without restriction. The 2nd draft does not require additional parking for the seasonal garden centre. If a legal such use exists then it would be subject to the non-compliance provisions of 1.8.B.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Bicycle Parking	Section 3.6 of the Draft ZBL provides bicycle parking requirements for new developments, and includes a transition clause as follows (3.6.A.1): "The minimum bicycle parking and end-of-trip bike facilities requirements of Section 3.6 shall not be applicable to any change of use, or reconstruction or development where there is no increase in the gross floor area or where there is no increase in the number of dwelling units". In our submission, we suggest that the above provision be modified to explicitly state that the new bicycle parking requirement is only applicable to net new gross floor area, similar to what is proposed for the loading requirements in the Draft ZBL, which states: "The provisions of this section shall only be applicable to any new buildings, or the net increase in gross floor area where any part of a building is reconstructed".	Agreed, this change has been made as requested.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Bicycle Parking	The bicycle parking requirements of Section 3.6 include a minimum long-term bicycle parking requirement for retail, personal service shop, or restaurant uses at a rate of 1 per 300 sq.m net floor area, and short-term bicycle parking at a rate of 1 per 500 sq.m of net floor area. We seek clarification as to the need for more long-term bicycle parking for these uses, than short-term, and whether these rates are based on any specific technical background study / analysis, in particular as there is no current minimum requirement in Zoning By-law 270-2004, as amended by by-law 259-2020.	The intent of the long term requirement is to provide some accommodation for employees. The direction for bicycle parking comes from other input studies, in combination with best practice review. Rates have been further refined in the 2nd draft.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities	Section 3.6.D of the Draft ZBL provides provisions for "End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities for Non-Residential Uses", including that Bicycle Facilities would be required for non residential uses that are required to provide more than 5 long-term bicycle parking spaces (which for retail uses is a retail use that is 1,500 sq.m NFA for greater based on the identified rates). The definition of a Bicycle Facility is as follows: "shall mean a dedicated area where showers, clothing lockers and private change rooms are provided for cyclists." We seek clarification as to the appropriateness of a requirement for potentially multiple areas dedicated to providing showers, clothing lockers, and change rooms for retail uses, in particular for existing developed sites.	The intent of the long term requirement is to provide some accommodation for employees. Existing uses would not be required to have bicycle parking. If a use is expanded, bicycle parking would only apply to the Rates have been refined in Draft 2.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Waste Storage	Section 5.2.B.1 provides direction for waste storage enclosures in Commercial Zones, including that waste storage be enclosed and not to be in a front or exterior side yard, and shall be located at least 15m from any lot line abutting a residential, institutional, or open spaces use. Similar provisions do not currently exist in Zoning By-law 270-2004, and we are concerned that existing sites may be rendered legal non-conforming given the existing development pattern. We suggest that Section 5.2.B.1 be modified to be applicable only to new buildings.	The City would like to apply this moving forward. If an addition is constructed it should meet the new requirements. Any existing buildings or units that operate out of compliance with these requirements can continue.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Maximum Building Height	Section 5.1.D proposes a provision to require a max building height of 10m in the CC and GC zones, whereas the existing C2 zone is subject to a maximum building height of 6 storeys, and the C3 zone is not subject to a maximum building height. We suggest that the City consider an alternative and greater maximum height, as we are concerned that the proposed provision has the effect of reducing the scale of development on lands zoned Mixed Use, from current zoning permissions.	We have updated the building heights in the 2nd draft to apply a consistent 3 storey requirement as per Brampton Plan (except the RC zone which has a different intent).
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Minimum Landscaped Open Space	Section 5.1.E proposes a provision to require a minimum Landscape Open Space of 20% in the CC and GC zones, whereas the current C2 and C3 zone applicable to the Loblaw lands requires a minimum landscape open space area of 8%, potentially rendering sites as legal non-conforming. This section further proposes a provision to require Landscape Strips in various locations, and specifies their required width, whereas the current C2 and C3 zones applicable to the Loblaw lands do not regulate landscape strips. We suggest a transition clause be added such that existing developed sites will not be subject to the more than doubled landscaped open space requirement.	The provisions of legal non complying uses under 1.8.D would apply. Moving forward the City would like to implement these updated standards to support more landscaping/greenery in these areas. Note that if there are site-specific standards these will be reviewed separately and would supercede the zone requirements.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (on behalf of Loblaw Companies Limited)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Corridor Commercial Zone	Loblaw has substantial concern that the proposed CC zone is a significant departure from existing zoning and built form, and raises concern that the following uses (among others) are not proposed to be permitted in the CC Zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Commercial recreation o Commercial school o Financial Service o Health or fitness centre o Office o Outdoor Market o Personal service shop o Pet day care o Retail o Shopping Centre o Supermarket o Day Care Centre o Veterinary Clinic o Dry cleaning and laundry distribution station o Laundromat We seek clarification that site specific provisions for the Loblaw lands will be carried through, including use permissions where applicable. We also seek clarity regarding the intended function of the CC zone, and the uses intended to be permitted, which as noted are a substantial departure from existing permissions on certain Loblaw lands. We suggest that staff consider expanding the range of uses that are permitted in the CC zone.	This is noted. The CC zone has been updated to the HC zone in the second draft and permissions have been reviewed and updated to be consistent with existing CC permissions while utilizing the updated definitions.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Legal Non-Conforming	We are concerned that a number of the new zoning standards will create instances of legal non-compliance. Choice understands the need to apply updated performance standards to respond to the City's long-term objectives as it relates to creating complete and healthy communities, including appropriate development standards. However, we are concerned that the Draft Zoning By-law will create instances of legal non compliance that could hinder the long-term operation and viability of these lands, including in the case where Choice may elect to explore opportunities for infill and expansion opportunities to existing uses.	This is noted but the City needs to update its standards to support Brampton Plan and UDGs. The By-law includes provisions to address legal non-compliance as a result of these updated standards.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Legal Non-Conforming	In order to avoid rendering existing conforming developments as non conforming under the new By-law, it would be appropriate to add a "Vacuum" clause to the Draft By-law, where notwithstanding any other provisions of the new By-law, any lot and the location thereon of any building or structure, existing on the effective date of the new By-law, would be deemed to comply and would be permitted by the new By-law. In addition, it would be appropriate to provide an allowance for additions and alterations to legally existing buildings without rendering the existing development as non-conforming as a result of the addition or alteration.	This is noted and further discussion will take place with Draft 3.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Site-Specific	It is our client's expectation that site specific provisions will be maintained in the new Zoning By-law. We will continue to monitor draft releases to ensure site-specific provisions are appropriately implemented by the Draft Zoning By-law.	This is noted. However, modifications to exceptions will be considered in Draft 3. Changes to exceptions are primarily anticipated to be done in the PMTSAs, to bring the zoning into compliance with the PMTSA planning work. Outside PMTSAs, exceptions will be reviewed and largely carried forward unless they are onerous and not necessary given changes to the parent zoning by-law.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Drive Throughs	Section 2.3E provides zoning standards for Drive Throughs and Car Washing Facilities, including provisions for minimum number of stacking spaces and the location of the stacking lane, whereas the current Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not generally regulate these matters. The Choice lands at 55 Mountainash Road are developed with uses that include multiple drive-throughs, and we are concerned that the configuration of the existing established site will be rendered legal non-conforming. We therefore suggest that transitional provisions be included for the existing number of stacking spaces and locations of existing drive-through and stacking spaces where they may be located within a front or exterior side yard.	Noted. These uses would be subject to the legal non compliance provisions.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Seasonal Garden Centres	Section 2.3.O provides zoning standards for seasonal garden centres, whereas the existing Zoning By-law 270-2004 does not provide similar provisions for this type of use. The lands located at 55 Mountainash Road accommodate a seasonal garden centre between April 15 to July 15, annually. The existing garden centre permissions for this site were established by a Minor Variance decision (A-2021-0008), and further permits a parking reduction while the garden centre is in operation. We have concerns that the new zoning standards would create non-compliance for the longstanding seasonal garden centre outside of the parking provisions accounted for by the Minor Variance decision, including the restricting the location of the garden centre, and requiring that the garden centre provide parking. The 55 Mountainash Road garden centre has operated for several years in a similar configuration, without known issue or concern, and therefore we have concern with the introduction of new zoning requirements that will conflict with the current and longstanding operation of these lands. We further seek clarity from Staff as to whether existing Minor Variance decisions will continue to apply following approval of the new Zoning By-law.	The use would likely be granted legal non complying status and subject to those provisions. We are open to discussing site specific issues. Minor variances that are recently approved/submitted, would be subject to the transition provisions. Otherwise, minor variances will be repealed by the new by-law as the old by-law is to be repealed within the defined area.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Parking	Section 3.3 of the Draft ZBL provides requirements for angled parking spaces, including that their dimensions be a minimum of 2.7m x 5.7m, whereas the current zoning by-law 270-2004 requires a minimum angular parking space dimension of 2.7m x 5.4m (Section 6.17.1). We suggest transitional provisions be included for existing parking stall dimensions that do not comply to the expanded requirement.	The dimensions have been reverted.

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Bicycle Parking	Section 3.6 of the Draft ZBL provides bicycle parking requirements for new developments, and includes a transition clause as follows (3.6.A.1): "The minimum bicycle parking and end-of-trip bike facilities requirements of Section 3.6 shall not be applicable to any change of use, or reconstruction or development where there is no increase in the gross floor area or where there is no increase in the number of dwelling units". In our submission, we suggest that the above provision be modified to explicitly state that the new bicycle parking requirement is only applicable to net new gross floor area, similar to what is proposed for the loading requirements in the Draft ZBL, which states: "The provisions of this section shall only be applicable to any new buildings, or the net increase in gross floor area where any part of a building is reconstructed".	We agree and this has been completed
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Bicycle Parking	The bicycle parking requirements of Section 3.6 include a minimum long-term bicycle parking requirement for retail, personal service shop, or restaurant uses at a rate of 1 per 300 sq.m net floor area, and short term bicycle parking at a rate of 1 per 500 sq.m of net floor area. We seek clarification as to the need for more long-term bicycle parking for these uses than short-term, and whether these rates are based on any specific technical background study / analysis, in particular as there is no current minimum requirement in Zoning By-law 270-2004, as amended by By-law 259-2020.	This is noted and the standards have been revised.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities	Section 3.6.D of the Draft ZBL provides provisions for "End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities for Non-Residential Uses", including that Bicycle Facilities would be required for non residential uses that are required to provide more than 5 long-term bicycle parking spaces (which for retail uses is a retail use that is 1,500 sq.m NFA for greater based on the identified rates). The definition of a Bicycle Facility is as follows: "shall mean a dedicated area where showers, clothing lockers and private change rooms are provided for cyclists." We seek clarification as to the appropriateness of a requirement for potentially multiple areas dedicated to providing showers, clothing lockers, and change rooms for retail uses and in particular existing developed sites.	This is noted. The standards have been updated but further discussion can take place.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Corridor Commercial Zone	There are several uses currently permitted on the Choice Lands as part of the C3-747 Zone, which are not identified as permitted uses in the proposed CC zone, which appears to be much more restrictive than the current zoning and would not permit the range of uses that currently occupy this established commercial site. Choice has substantial concern that the proposed CC zone is a significant departure from existing zoning and built form, and raises concern that the following uses (among others) are not proposed to be permitted in the CC Zone: o Commercial recreation o Commercial school o Financial Service o Health or fitness centre o Office o Outdoor market o Personal service shop o Pet day care o Retail o Shopping centre o Supermarket o Day care centre o Veterinary clinic o Dry cleaning and laundry distribution station o Laundromat We seek clarification that the site-specific provision (747) applicable to 55 Mountainash Road will be carried through, including the uses that are identified as permitted uses.	This is noted and the HC zone has been updated to better reflect permissions of the existing CC zone.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Waste Storage	Section 5.2.B.1 provides direction for waste storage enclosures in Commercial Zones, including that waste storage enclosure are not to be in a front or exterior side yard, and shall be located at least 15m from any lot line abutting a residential, institutional, or open spaces use. Similar provisions do not currently exist in Zoning By-law 270-2004, and we are concerned that existing sites, including 55 Mountainash Road may be rendered legal non-conforming given the existing development pattern. We suggest that Section 5.2.B.1 be modified to be applicable only to new buildings.	The City would like to apply this moving forward. If an addition is constructed it should meet the new requirements. Any existing buildings or units that operate out of compliance with these requirements can continue.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Minimum Landscaped Open Space	The CC Zone proposes a provision to require a minimum Landscape Open Space of 20%, whereas the current C3 zone applicable to 55 Mountainash requires a minimum landscape open space area of 8%, potentially rendering the site as legal non-conforming. We suggest a transition clause be added such that existing developed sites will not be subject to the more than doubled landscaped open space requirement.	The provisions of legal non complying uses would apply. Moving forward the City would like to implement these updated standards to support objectives of the new Official Plan and ongoing Urban Design Guidelines. Note that if there are site-specific standards these will be reviewed separately and would supercede the zone requirements.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Lot Coverage (Prestige Employment Zone)	Lands in the PE zone are proposed to be subject to a maximum lot coverage provision of 70%, whereas for all of the Choice sites proposed to be rezoned to PE, there is no current max lot coverage provision, which creates the potential for zoning non-compliance. We suggest that a transition clause be added such that existing buildings are not subject to the maximum lot coverage requirements.	The City would like to apply this moving forward and an existing building that does not comply would be subject to the legal non complying provisions.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Minimum Landscaped Open Space (Prestige Employment Zone)	Lands in the PE zone are proposed to be subject to a minimum Landscape Open Space provision of 20%, whereas for all of the Choice sites proposed to be rezoned to PE, there is no current minimum landscape requirement that is a percentage of lot area, which creates the potential for zoning non-compliance. We suggest that a transition clause be added such that existing developed sites are not subject to the minimum landscaped open space requirements.	The City would like to apply this moving forward and an existing building that does not comply would be subject to the legal non complying provisions

Name	Group/Organization	Date	Reference	Topic	Comment	WSP Response
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Landscape Strips (Prestige Employment Zone)	Various width requirements for landscaped strips are proposed for the PE zone adjacent to all lot lines, whereas the minimum landscaped strip requirements applicable to the Choice Sites, do not specify landscaping at all lot lines, but rather to be provided in specific instances (for example lot lines abutting a street). We suggest that a transition clause be added such that existing developments, as of the effective date of the new Zoning By-law, will not be subject to the minimum landscape strip provisions.	The City would like to apply this moving forward and an existing building that does not comply would be subject to the legal non complying provisions.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Parking (Prestige Employment Zone)	Lands in the PE zone are proposed to be subject to restrictions on the location of parking, including limiting the number of parking rows between a building and public street. In our submission, we suggest that the Draft Zoning By-law be revised to specify that the restriction only applies to new parking / parking areas, to account for existing developed sites that were not previously subject to this requirement.	The City would like to apply this moving forward and an existing building that does not comply would be subject to the non complying provisions.
Rob MacFarlane	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (n behalf of Choice Properties REIT)	2024-05-27	Email, Letter	Permitted Uses (Prestige Employment Zone)	The PE zone proposes to permit a range of uses, including warehousing, but does not propose to permit "Transportation Depot or Distribution Centre", the definition of which includes associated warehousing. We seek clarification as to the distinction between warehousing and Transportation Depot or Distribution Centre, and suggest that it may be appropriate to permit a Transportation Depot or Distribution Centre within the PE zone.	These uses have been updated.
Jennifer Jaruczek	Arcadis Professional Services Inc. (on behalf of FCA Canada Inc.)	2024-06-18	Email, Letter	Site Specific	<p>It is our understanding that in the current Zoning By-law (270-2004), the subject site is zoned as Industrial (M2-305). Based on our review of the proposed draft zoning materials released in November 2023, the majority of the subject site will be rezoned to General Employment, which is in keeping with the intent of the current Industrial zone provisions. However, the north-east corner of the site is proposed to now be rezoned as Utility, as shown in Figure 1. It is our understanding that this rezoning to Utility would not be in keeping with sites Industrial land use designation within the Official Plan (OP) and would be better suited to remain within the same zone as the rest of the site as currently shown in the City's Zoning By-law. The rezoning to Utility would limit the development potential for this portion of the site as the only uses permitted under the Draft Zoning By-law would include Community and Conservation Uses.</p> <p>Based our review of the Draft Zoning By-law, we would like to request that the zoning designation for the subject site be General Employment for the totality of the site, in conformity with the OP designation and would be in keeping with the sites current zoning designation.</p>	We agree and will make this change in the mapping in Draft 2.
	First Gulf (on behalf of various properties)	2024-07-15	Email, Letter	Site Specific	Request to be added on Interested Party List and to retain all permitted uses for identified properties.	Noted. The Interested Party List has been updated.
	MHBC (on behalf of Patel Land and Developments)	2024-08-30	Email, Letter	Site Specific	<p>The Subject Lands are designated Mixed-Use Employment in the City's Official Plan. The Subject Lands are currently developed with an existing rehabilitation centre and are currently zoned Agriculture (A) on the interactive map of the in-effect Zoning By-law 270-2004.</p> <p>Lands adjacent to the Subject Lands to the north and south are also designated Mixed-Use Employment in the City's Official Plan. These adjacent lands are currently split zoned, including: (i) Office Commercial Office Commercial (OC-2029) zone on the portion of the adjacent lands fronting on Mississauga Road and (ii) Residential Townhouse (R3E-6-2026) zone on the portion of the adjacent lands fronting onto Sky Harbour Drive.</p> <p>In summary, maintaining the Agricultural zoning on the Subject Lands in the Draft Brampton Zoning By-law does not align with the planned development context of the surrounding area, and in our opinion presents land use compatibility issues, as the intent is for the surrounding area to provide non-agricultural uses. Furthermore, the proposed Agricultural zone does not achieve the policy objectives of the Mixed-Use Employment designation of the City's Official Plan.</p> <p>We request the following revisions be incorporated into the Draft Brampton Zoning By-law:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the Subject Lands be zoned Prestige Employment; 2. a site specific exception be added to recognize the existing permitted Supportive Housing Type 1 and 2 as a permitted use on the Subject Lands; 3. Section 2.4.D (Permitted Yard Encroachments) and specifically, Section 2.4.D.1 - Table 2.4.1 (Permitted Yard Encroachments in All Zones) be revised to permit "parkade ventilations" within any yard to a maximum encroachment of 0.6 m from any property line 4. Section 7.1.E (Site and Landscaping) – Table 7.1.5 be revised to require a Minimum Landscaped Open Space of 10% in a Prestige Employment Zone. 	This is noted and comment is under review.
	Weston Consulting (on behalf of Atlantic Packaging)	2024-09-06	Email, Letter	Site Specific	Request to be added on Interested Party List.	Noted. The Interested Party List has been updated.