

---

DATE: March 12, 2010

REPORT TITLE: **PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

FROM: Norma Trim, Chief Financial Officer and Commissioner of Corporate Services

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**That Regional Official Plan Amendment Number 24 – Places to Prosper: Growth Management, Employment Areas and Greenbelt Conformity, attached as Appendix I to the report of the Chief Financial Officer and Commissioner of Corporate Services dated March 12, 2010, and titled “Peel Region Official Plan Review – Adoption of Regional Official Plan Amendment Number 24 – Places to Prosper: Growth Management, Employment Areas and Greenbelt Conformity”, be approved;**

**And further, that Regional Council deems that no further public meetings related to Regional Official Plan Amendment Number 24 are required as per the provisions of Section 17 of the *Planning Act*;**

**And further, that the necessary by-laws be presented to Council for enactment;**

**And further, that the subject report be forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga, the Town of Caledon, municipalities adjacent to the Region of Peel, and those parties requesting notification;**

**And further, that notice of decision of Council’s adoption of Amendment Number 24 be given in accordance with the *Planning Act*;**

**And further, that the input received from consultation on the Peel Region Official Plan Review be used to inform and guide the development of the Region of Peel’s Strategic Plan.**

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

**REPORT HIGHLIGHTS**

- Staff recommends that Regional Official Plan Amendment Number 24 be adopted.
- Planning staff has consulted extensively including significant collaboration with area municipal staff.
- A public meeting, required under the *Planning Act*, was held on October 8, 2009. Statutory public open houses were held prior to the public meeting on September 8, 9 and 10, 2009.
- All comments received have been thoroughly considered in partnership with the area municipalities and as a result changes have been made to draft ROPA 24, as detailed in this report.
- The input received from consultation on the Peel Region Official Plan Review will be used to inform and guide the development of the Region of Peel's Strategic Plan.

**DISCUSSION**

**1. Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation to Council to approve draft Regional Official Plan Amendment Number 24 (ROPA 24) to add and revise policies related to growth management, employment areas, and greenbelt conformity. ROPA 24 addresses conformity of the Regional Official Plan with the Province's Places to Grow Growth Plan (Growth Plan) as well as the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the Greenbelt Plan specifically providing population and employment numbers for the Region of Peel to 2031, intensification targets, policies regarding density and generally policies pertaining to the planning of complete communities and greenbelt conformity.

Regional staff is recommending adoption of ROPA 24 as it will:

- ensure the Regional Official Plan (ROP) is consistent with provincial policy;
- address policy gaps in the ROP related to growth management, employment areas and greenbelt conformity; and
- provide strategic policy direction that is coordinated with area municipal policy and that is focused on the Regional mandate.

**2. Background**

The Province of Ontario released the Growth Plan on June 16, 2006. All municipal official plans must conform to specific policies in the Growth Plan. The Growth Plan contains key policies allocating population and employment numbers to all Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) upper and single-tier municipalities as well as establishing a 40 per cent minimum intensification requirement by 2015 and density requirements (urban growth centres at 200 and greenfields at 50 people and jobs per hectare). In addition to the Growth Plan requirements, the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) contains growth management policies which official plans must conform to as part of this review. Furthermore, the Greenbelt Plan requires conformity as part of this official plan review.

The Region of Peel, in consultation with area municipal staff, has released several background and discussion papers on the topics pertaining to ROPA 24. In June, 2008 a Growth Management in Peel Background Paper was released to set the context of growth issues in Peel Region. Subsequently, in September, 2009 Places to Prosper - Managing Growth in Peel Region Discussion Paper was released advising of growth options and conformity issues. In addition, the following two papers were published: Greenbelt Plan

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

Policy Review Background Paper in November 2008, and Employment and Employment Lands Discussion Paper in August 2009. All materials were posted on the Region's website for comments. In accordance with the *Planning Act*, Regional staff held public open houses and also a public meeting.

Section 4 of this report describes key issues identified by the Province, area municipalities, stakeholders and aboriginal groups. Section 5 provides a high level summary of Regional staff responses to comments received.

Appendices attached to the report provide supporting documentation for the amendment. Appendix I is the recommended amendment for adoption. Appendix II consists of all comments received along with Regional staff responses. Appendix III contains minutes of the public meeting. Appendix IV provides information outlining all consultation activities held to-date during the Peel Regional Official Plan Review (PROPR) process.

### **3. Communication, Consultation and Engagement**

#### **a) Peel Regional Official Plan Review (PROPR)**

The Communication, Consultation and Engagement Strategy (CCES) has played a significant role in the success of the overall PROPR process and specifically ROPA 24. Regional staff consulted with agencies, stakeholders and the general public through a website, newsletters, stakeholder consultations, open houses and public meetings.

Provincial staff advised that aboriginal groups must be consulted throughout the PROPR process. Regional staff worked in collaboration with area municipal staff to engage aboriginal groups accordingly.

Regional staff has also had regular communication and consultations with Provincial staff through regular Peel Planning and Provincial Liaison meetings. Further, Regional staff has been meeting with area municipal staff through staff working groups and through the Planning Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). A key achievement has been the role of TAC, which has overseen PROPR policy development. This has contributed to the ongoing collaborative relationship between Regional and area municipal staff.

Valuable and insightful stakeholder and public input has been received during the PROPR process. It is recommended that Regional staff use this information in the development of the next strategic plan.

A full communication, consultation and engagement report is provided in Appendix V of this report.

#### **b) ROPA 24**

All studies and reports undertaken by Regional staff relating to ROPA 24 were circulated to a broad list of stakeholders and public. Regional staff further notified stakeholders by e-mail as information on draft ROPA 24 was updated on the Region's website.

In total, four major stakeholder workshops were held related to ROPA 24. Provincial and area municipal staff, Regional and Area Municipal Councillors, as well as stakeholders participated in these workshops.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

Prior to the public meeting, Regional staff held three statutory open houses. The open houses were held on September 8, 2009 at City of Mississauga, September 9, 2009 at City of Brampton, and September 10, 2009 at the Town of Caledon. Regional staff distributed copies of the draft amendment, answered questions and obtained input.

Regional Council also hosted a statutory public meeting on October 8, 2009 to receive oral and written submissions on draft ROPA 24. Six delegations and thirty one written submissions were received on ROPA 24 by October 8, 2009. Following October 8, 2009, additional written submissions were received.

A formal notice of the public meeting was published in the following newspapers having general circulation in the Region of Peel. Notice requirements were given pursuant to Sections 3(15), 5 and 6 of Ontario Regulation 543/06; Sections 26(3), 17(15) and 17(16) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13, as amended in accordance with section 17, subsections (15) and (17) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13 as amended.

- Brampton Guardian – August 26, 2009
- Mississauga News – August 26, 2009
- Caledon Enterprise – August 26, 2009
- Caledon Citizen – August 28, 2009

#### **4. Draft ROPA 24 – Comments**

Attached as Appendix II to this report is a table summarizing all comments received and the Regional responses to these comments. Presented below is a summary of key comments.

##### **Province of Ontario Comments**

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) comments on draft ROPA 24 address conformity to key provincial policies such as the Growth Plan, the Greenbelt Plan and the PPS. MMAH also submitted summary tables outlining specific technical comments. Regional staff met with MMAH staff on a regular basis to discuss revisions and to clarify issues. Highlights of MMAH's comments are as follows:

##### **a) Approach to Growth Forecasts and Municipal Comprehensive Review**

MMAH expressed that the Regional allocation of the growth forecasts contained in Places to Grow should ensure that intensification and designated greenfield densities are met on a Region-wide basis. MMAH suggested that the Region provide clearer policy direction in those areas where it has been assigned responsibility by the PPS and Growth Plan. MMAH also advised that the municipal comprehensive review needs to occur at the Regional level.

##### **b) Greenfield Density Targets**

MMAH recommended that ROPA 24 include specific greenfield density targets for each area municipality and to ensure that achieving a minimum greenfield density of 50 residents and jobs per hectare is achieved across the Region.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

**c) Settlement Study Areas and Boundary Expansions**

In order to accommodate the 2031 population and employment forecasts, MMAH advised that the identification of settlement study areas is not supported and that settlement boundary expansions, if required and justified, may be permitted to take place as part of the ROPA 24 exercise or could occur through subsequent ROPAs. MMAH also indicated that settlement boundary expansion can only occur on the basis of the Regional comprehensive review.

**d) Intensification Targets**

MMAH commented that the Region should include specific intensification targets for each area municipality in the Regional Official Plan to convey how the Growth Plan's intensification target will be distributed across the Region as a whole while providing specific direction to area municipalities. MMAH also suggested that the Region provide information on density targets for all intensification areas, including major transit station areas and intensification corridors.

**e) Employment Areas**

MMAH noted that ROPA 24 essentially defers to the local municipalities the responsibility of identifying employment areas; employment uses and allowing for employment conversions to take place after a municipal comprehensive review has been completed. The Ministry advised that this framework does not conform to the Growth Plan as it is the Region's responsibility to allocate population and employment forecasts. MMAH recommended, therefore, that ROPA 24 detail where employment areas will be located, what employment uses are being permitted in these areas, and, not take into account conversions that stem from outside of a municipal comprehensive review.

In addition, MMAH disagreed with the methodology that was used to determine employment land needs. It was suggested that the Region used assumptions that underestimate the existing employment land supply and overestimate the need for additional employment lands.

**f) Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (SISA)**

MMAH commented that the identification of transportation corridors in the Growth Plan is conceptual in nature. The Growth Plan and the GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment (at its current stage) do not provide the basis for the specific location of the SISA. MMAH also noted that ROPA 24 should reflect the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) requirement; that prior to the submission of any future official plan amendments/secondary plans, studies be undertaken and, in permit control areas, a MTO review, approval and permit are required.

**g) Greenbelt Plan Conformity**

MMAH has asked the Region to provide greater policy direction to area municipalities with respect to the delineation of prime agricultural areas, rural areas, and the detailed boundaries of settlement areas within the Greenbelt. It was also requested that the ROP include more detailed policy direction to the area municipalities related to natural heritage and hydrologic features and lot creation. MMAH also requested that the Region include

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN  
AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT,  
EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

detailed mapping of key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features. Additional technical comments were provided such as whether the Region wanted to include policy for natural features that overlap into areas that are outside of the Greenbelt Plan Area.

**Area Municipal Comments**

Consultation with the area municipalities has occurred throughout all stages of policy development for ROPA 24. Discussions have been beneficial and have provided policy clarification to ensure that ROPA 24 focuses on Regional mandates in accordance with the Five Principles of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) and the Matrix of Planning Responsibilities. The following briefly outlines major ROPA 24 issues for each area municipality. For detailed comments, please refer to Appendix III of the report.

**i) City of Mississauga**

Although generally supportive of ROPA 24, the City of Mississauga had comments relating to the following issues:

**Population and Employment Forecasts**

- Regional forecasts do not correspond to Mississauga Council's adopted growth forecasts.
- It was concluded that adjustments to municipal forecasts are reasonable if based on the principle of proportional reduction given the Region's obligation to conform to the Provincial Growth Plan.

**Growth Management**

- The City questions if the proposed density targets for lands around transit station areas are appropriate in reflecting the diversity of contexts in the Region.
- Policies related to preserving and protecting employment lands adjacent to highways, rail corridors, rail yards and major truck terminals should be modified to allow for flexibility across the different land use contexts across the Region.
- Policies regarding urban growth centres, complete communities, and scale of development extend into local planning responsibilities.

**Employment Areas**

- The City questions the appropriateness of the density target given current employment densities and suggests this policy may lead to inappropriate uses in order to achieve the density and compromise the ability to direct growth to nodes. Further this is not required by the Growth Plan.

**Public Health Assessment Tool**

- Work on this is ongoing and so including implementation policies related to public health impacts are premature.

**Ninth Line Lands**

- The Ninth Line lands, which have recently become a part of Peel Region from the Region of Halton, needs to be addressed. City staff requests that the Ninth Line lands be specifically addressed through ROPA 24.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN  
AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT,  
EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

**ii) City of Brampton**

Although generally satisfied with ROPA 24 policies, City of Brampton had comments relating to the following issues:

**Population and Employment Forecasts**

- As a result of the population and employment forecast study completed by Hemson Consulting in 2009, Brampton Council has requested the Region (as per report dated February 11, 2010) to revise the 2021 and 2031 population forecasts for Brampton, noting specifically that the forecasts are lower than those in the current Official Plan. The report further noted that the ROPA 24 2031 population forecast for Brampton should, at the very least, meet or exceed the approved Brampton Official Plan 2031 Population forecast of 725,000.

**Greenfield Density Target**

- Concern that Brampton will be expected to plan for higher densities to compensate for Caledon's lower densities. ROPA 24 should stress that each area municipality needs to plan to achieve a Greenfield density target of a minimum of 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare.

**Settlement Study Areas**

- Stronger language needs to be used to ensure that the Tullamore study area or any future expansion to settlement area boundaries do not preclude the outcome of the GTA West Corridor EA. The identification of the study areas such as Tullamore, raises the potential to constrain the Environmental Assessment (EA) process that will determine if there is a need and justification for a GTA West Corridor.

**Settlement Boundary Expansion**

- Concerns regarding expansions to the Caledon Rural Settlement Areas (hamlets and villages), potentially without the necessity for a Regional Official Plan Amendment.
- It has been noted that although these expansions are expected to have a minor impact, there would be limited opportunity for Brampton or Mississauga to weigh in on the potential impacts of such expansions without a Regional Official Plan Amendment requirement.
- It has also been stated that these rural expansions can impact Peel's ability to achieve a greenfield density target of 50 residents and jobs per hectare. Brampton staff continues to monitor these proposed policies to ensure there are not adverse implications for Brampton, such as requirements to compensate for lower densities elsewhere in the Region.

**Employment Land Budget**

- To recognize the uncertainty in the global and local economy which may impact future employment densities and land needs, Brampton requests the Region to amend the policy on the regional land budget and Figure 15 to provide flexibility in the land required to accommodate job growth.

**Greenbelt Conformity**

- The policies and mapping should provide greater detail on the Greenbelt Plan municipal conformity exercise including additional references to the City of Brampton throughout the amendment where appropriate.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

- Policies related to infrastructure, natural resources (mineral aggregate) and existing uses should place greater emphasis on applicability in the City of Brampton and the policies should provide direction for external River Valley Connections that extend from the Greenbelt to Lake Ontario.

**iii) Town of Caledon**

The Town of Caledon is generally supportive of ROPA 24, particularly the proposed population and employment forecasts and policies related to the Settlement Study Areas and SISA. Town staff commented on the following areas:

**Greenfield Density Target**

- The Town expressed concern that Caledon would not be able to meet the density target of 50 residents and jobs per hectare on its own as it is not possible to compensate for the existing designated greenfield areas given its population allocation. Caledon was concerned that a number of its critical planning objectives would be at risk if Caledon's future settlement expansions can not proceed based on the requirement to contribute to the achievement of the greenfield density target.
- ROPA 24 should be amended to exclude the Palgrave Estate Residential Community (PERC) from the calculations of the greenfield density target; that employment lands and expansions in the Greenbelt be excluded from the calculation of greenfield density; and, that the Town not have to compensate for its low density employment and residential lands within the existing Designated Greenfield Area.

**Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (SISA)**

- The North-South Corridor should be shown as part of the SISA.

**Municipal Comprehensive Review**

- The Town sought clarification regarding the scope of the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review that is required for a settlement boundary expansion, specifically confirmation that the Regional review will not involve a re-examination of population and employment forecasts already undertaken as part of the PROPR process at a Regional level.

**Greenbelt Conformity**

- ROPA 24 Greenbelt Plan conformity is consistent with the Five Principles of the ROP.
- Town staff has requested that policy direction to the area municipalities for existing uses, expansions to existing agricultural buildings, and new accessory agricultural buildings and structures be coordinated with the policy direction for the Region's Greenlands System outside the Greenbelt to enable a consistent approach and avoid policy conflicts during implementation.

**Ontario Power Authority and Bell Canada**

Ontario Power Authority (OPA) and Bell Canada provided comments in support of policies related to the SISA. Both agreed that proposed SISA policies in draft ROPA 24 provides the required framework for the protection and further study of the infrastructure corridors in Peel Region. Specifically, OPA noted that draft SISA policies are consistent with the OPA planning policies and that their studies have identified a need for a hydro

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

electricity transmission corridor in North Brampton/ South Caledon. Bell Canada also added that Regional staff should consider modifications to proposed policies to ensure greater clarity with respect to the Region's objectives related to utility and telecommunications infrastructure.

**Development Industry**

Several members of the development industry provided comments on draft ROPA 24. The following key issues were raised:

- The identification of a link between Highway 410 and SISA.
- Townsend and Associates, on behalf of Solmar Developments Corporation, stated that they provided alternative growth options for the Region and Town of Caledon but these were not considered as they were considered premature at this stage. They also questioned the process involved in determining Tullamore as a Settlement Study Area.
- Several members of the development industry also commented on the proposed SISA policies. Pound and Stewart Associates, on behalf of Orlando Corporation, noted that where hydro corridors will be assessed for transportation right-of-ways, they should be assessed for parking for various modes of transport and storage opportunities, which would assist in manufacturing, warehousing and distribution businesses. They suggested that this should be included as part of employment study areas. Moscorp Developments noted that SISA policies were of little value in achieving its stated purpose of protecting the corridor. Moscorp Developments further added that proposed SISA designation was both premature and misleading, and should therefore be deleted from Schedule D. Proposed SISA policies should be modified to reference the Environmental Assessment Study being undertaken by MTO.

**Businesses and Landowners' Associations**

Representatives from various businesses and landowners' associations provided comments on draft ROPA 24 policies. The following key issues were raised:

- The Altoa Landowners Association requested that the lands bordered by Chinguacousy Road on the east, Mississauga Road on the west, Mayfield Road on the south and Old School Road on the north be included, with all of the lands in the Town of Caledon outside the Greenbelt Plan Area in the Settlement Study Area as indicated in Schedule D.
- A landowner, Mr. Adriano Conti, indicated that the greenfield density target as set out by the Province was unrealistic and unachievable. He also added that the current supply of designated employment lands is significantly less than what it should be.
- The Caledon Chamber of Commerce noted that Bolton has not been allocated a reliable and sustainable amount of designated growth. The Chamber is requesting the Region to strongly consider designation of land, through the ROP, to accommodate the proposed growth allocations to the Town of Caledon.
- The Coalition of Concerned Residents and Businesses of Bolton (CCRBB) and Valleywood Residents Association do not support the draft policies in ROPA 24 as it does not properly address the urgent need for designated growth to support Bolton. Both groups requested the Region to allocate a proper amount of growth to the Bolton community.
- North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc. (NWBLG) was concerned about specific policies as they relate to natural heritage systems (NHS). They indicated that

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

such policies in draft ROPA 24 should speak to the importance of the Greenbelt Plan preservation and the relationship with lands intended for urban development, which are needed to accommodate growth in the City of Brampton. The Group also noted that proposed Table 3 was premature, and that the greenfield density target of 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare lacks sufficient detail to be supported. The group also noted that SISA policies may unfairly prejudice the outcome of planning decisions on lands in close proximity to the area as identified on Schedule D.

- Landowners in Tullamore were pleased to see that lands in Tullamore were proposed to be identified as a Settlement Study Area in Schedule D. The group further added that the Secondary Plan, as prepared by the Town of Caledon, will be the second step to completing the Municipal Comprehensive Review.
- The Mayfield West Landowner Group noted that a secondary plan study is currently ongoing in the Town of Caledon and policy 5.4.3.2.9 directs growth to lands in the Settlement Study Area west of Highway 10, therefore, a municipal comprehensive review is not necessary.

**Conservation Authorities and Niagara Escarpment Commission**

Conservation Authorities and the Niagara Escarpment Commission submitted comments on draft ROPA 24, specifically pertaining to policies relating to Greenbelt conformity.

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) proposed Greenbelt conformity policy wording which provides greater clarity to prevent ambiguity of interpretation. TRCA suggested that the Region refine the Natural Heritage System (NHS) by expanding the boundary to include key natural heritage features that overlap the NHS boundary.

The Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) has no objection to draft ROPA 24 and noted areas where proposed policies should appropriately reference the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP).

**Other Comments**

Regional staff also received comments from Smart Commute Mississauga, the Region of Peel's Health Services and the Malton Neighbourhood Services who were all in support of draft ROPA 24, specifically in the promotion of healthier land use development patterns through proposed policies in section 7.9.2 of the amendment.

During the course of the ROPA 24 planning process, several comments and emails were received from members of the public expressing support for ROPA 24 and specifically policies pertaining to the growth management approach developed by the Town of Caledon.

Regional staff also received comments from the Peel District School Board (PDSB) and the Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board (DPCDSB). PDSB stressed the need for the timely delivery of publicly funded school sites while DPCDSB, although not objecting to ROPA 24, cautioned that anticipated density increases will lead to the need for capital improvements to existing school facilities. DPCDSB also asked Regional staff to address in the ROP the impact of intensification on existing infrastructure and services, particularly related to schools.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

**Comments from Aboriginal Group**

Regional staff received one comment from the Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians. The written response indicated that First Nations specifically impacted should be directly involved in the process in order to be able to address some of the rights that belong to their population. The Association proposed no specific changes relating to draft ROPA 24.

**5. Regional Response to ROPA 24 Comments**

The PROPR process has been a collaborative approach that is consistent with the Five Guiding Principles of section 1.3.2 of the ROP and the Matrix of Planning Responsibilities. This amendment has been developed using direct input from the area municipalities throughout the planning process. Each area municipality provided their official comments endorsed by their respective Councils on the draft amendment. The responses to all the comments received were thoroughly analysed in consultation with area municipal staff.

**Regional Forecasts**

The population and employment numbers contained in Table 3 have been developed in close coordination and consultation with area municipal staff. The numbers were derived using area municipal input as a starting point and then adjusted, through consultation, to meet the requirements of the Growth Plan. This adjustment has resulted in the reduction of area municipal numbers based on a proportional basis keeping in mind the need to meet the Growth Plan's growth and intensification requirements. The adjustment methodology is described in the Places to Prosper – Managing Growth in Peel Region discussion paper. The principles of this methodology were: sustainability, focus on intensification, fairness, optimization of existing infrastructure and protection of natural heritage. These principles were established using input from two Managing Growth Stakeholder Workshops held in October 2008 and April 2009. The results of this adjustment were presented at the second workshop and received stakeholders support. Regional staff also presented the adjusted forecasts to the IMPSC on May 14, 2009.

The numbers contained in draft ROPA 24 provide for population and employment for the planning periods 2011, 2021 and 2031. The 2011 numbers are slightly higher than the Growth Plan numbers in order to realistically represent current growth rates. However, it is essential to incorporate all three planning periods within the Regional Official Plan in order to monitor our growth against established targets, provide for planning of regional infrastructure and to meet the requirements of the Growth Plan and area municipal planning requirements.

The area municipalities in general supported the proposed Regional forecasts mainly for achieving conformity with the Growth Plan. However, City of Brampton staff is requesting that their population targets for the 2021 and 2031 planning horizons be consistent with the original figures endorsed by Brampton Council that are respectively 646,000 and 738,000 residents or, at the very least, their official plan numbers which are 652,000 and 725,000. Accommodating Brampton's request would result in exceeding the Growth Plan targets for the Region as well as decreasing the Regional intensification targets. This would also not be consistent with the methodology used to proportionally adjust the forecasts of all three area municipalities. Tables A and B of this report show detailed comparison of ROPA 24 and the area municipal forecasts.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

Municipality	Population			Employment		
	ROPA 24	Municipal	Difference	ROPA 24	Municipal	Difference
Brampton	635,000	646,000	-11,000	280,000	274,000	6,000
Caledon	87,000	88,000	-1,000	40,000	38,000	2,000
Mississauga	768,000	775,000	-7,000	500,000	500,000	0
Total Peel	1,490,000	1,509,000	-19,000	820,000	812,000	8,000
Peel (P2G)	1,490,000	1,490,000		820,000	820,000	
Difference	0	19,000		0	-8,000	

Municipality	Population			Employment		
	ROPA 24	Municipal	Difference	ROPA 24	Municipal	Difference
Brampton	725,000	738,000	-13,000	312,000	319,000	-7,000
Caledon	111,000	113,000	-2,000	48,000	49,000	-1,000
Mississauga	805,000	812,000	-7,000	510,000	519,000	-9,000
Total Peel	1,641,000	1,663,000	-22,000	870,000	887,000	-17,000
Peel (P2G)	1,640,000	1,640,000		870,000	870,000	
Difference	1,000	23,000		0	17,000	

The ROPA 24 forecasts for the 2011 planning horizon are consistent with the area municipal forecasts.

Regional staff note that the Regional forecasts proposed for adoption were established based on the process endorsed by Regional Council. Regional Council's position was reflected in report titled "Peel Region Official Plan Review - Results of Managing Growth Stakeholder Workshop" dated October 20, 2008 which states that:

"Regional staff and TAC use the Provincial Growth Plan targets and the themes of environment, infrastructure, finance, transportation, agriculture, employment and housing to evaluate and determine a preferred population and employment growth scenario to guide Peel's growth to 2031."

Regional staff is aware of the fact that the proposed population numbers allocated to Brampton (724,000) are lower than the numbers contained in the Brampton Official Plan (725,000). The population target for the 2031 horizon is lower by 1,000 people. Regional staff considers this as a "minor rounding out" in the context of the 2031 planning horizon contained within the Regional Official Plan. As a result, Regional staff will support an increase of Brampton's population by 1,000 people to 725,000 by 2031 as shown on Table 3.

It is important to note that the proposed forecasts do not reflect the ultimate growth capacities (extending beyond the 2031 planning horizon) of the Region or each area municipality. Policy 2.2.1.2 of the Growth Plan states that the Minister of Energy and Infrastructure will review the forecasts at least every five years in consultation with municipalities and may revise the forecasts. The Minister of Energy and Infrastructure has initiated the review of the Growth Plan forecasts but the current Growth Plan forecasts must

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

still be used for the conformity work. If the Growth Plan forecasts are amended, the Regional forecast will also be required to be updated. Any future review of the regional forecasts will be undertaken jointly with the area municipalities in accordance with policy 4.2.2.6 of the ROP.

In preparing the Regional forecasts for the purposes of conformity to Places to Grow, Regional staff considered fiscal issues on a broad regional basis. Without the geographic distribution of population and employment to 2031 being finalized, it is impossible to complete servicing studies to fully define future costs. However, the preliminary studies of the water and wastewater infrastructure and Regional human services were undertaken. The studies were based on the unadjusted municipal growth forecasts.

The existing water and wastewater servicing strategies support the Growth Plan targets of 1,640,000 residents and 870,000 jobs for 2031. Currently approved Development Charges - related programs reflect this scale of growth. In addition, a preliminary water and wastewater analysis was conducted in spring of 2009 using the area municipal forecasts available at that time. These forecasts added up to a total of 1,683,000 residents and 887,000 jobs and were treated as a worst case scenario. The 2009 area municipal distribution of population and employment forecasts indicate that there has been some localized shifting of growth compared to the approved servicing strategy. However, this shifting does not significantly affect the current Development Charges Programs related to water and wastewater infrastructure. Further, more detailed analysis will be required to assess specific settlement expansions. This analysis is one of the requirements of municipal comprehensive review and should be based on the approved Regional forecasts.

In an analysis of the Region's community infrastructure, human services and health services cost trends, it was determined that the source of budgetary demands has stemmed more from demographic factors than from density or form of development. The analysis found that higher densities do not necessarily generate increased community infrastructure costs in the Region, and rather that socio-demographic, economic and cultural factors are stronger predictors of community infrastructure spending. It was concluded that the differences and similarities in demand for different human services observed across a variety of different urban forms are driven primarily by income, especially among seniors and single mothers. The most cost-effective way for the Region to plan for growth is to capitalize on existing community infrastructure in established communities and continue to be responsive to demographic and socio-economic trends.

### **Growth Management**

In terms of growth management issues, Regional staff in implementing the Growth Plan gave priority to intensification issues as opposed to density measures with the view that achieving intensification represents good planning and allows for the development of complete communities. This view was verified through various consultations including a growth management workshop. This approach allows the Region to support area municipal planning objectives. Intensification in Peel Region will be at 40 per cent ultimately reaching 50 per cent by 2026. While the Province would like to see greater intensification in Peel Region, Regional staff believes that this rate provides a good balance between intensification and greenfield development while maintaining the intent and spirit of the Growth Plan. The Region will not be able to meet the specific objective of greenfield density at 50 people and jobs per hectare established in the Growth Plan. The greenfield density will vary slightly based on current and future development plans, and planning assumptions,

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN  
AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT,  
EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

but it is anticipated to be in the range of 46 residents and jobs per hectare in 2031, which is a slight shortfall from the Growth Plan requirement. However, a policy is being introduced in ROPA 24 which requires further study of how to achieve greenfield density at 50 people and jobs per hectare. That study is to be completed within 6 - 12 months from adoption of this amendment.

Regional staff has introduced proposed settlement study areas as important elements of growth management in Peel to ensure a phased and logical approach to accommodating new growth. The three study areas will be considered when accommodating the targets allocated to Caledon as these targets will require additional lands to be designated for development. This position is supported by Regional and area municipal staff. The three study areas do not represent the designation of land. Further studies will be required to determine the location and amount of lands that will be designated as part of the municipal comprehensive review. The identification of settlement expansions and designation of land will be based on municipal comprehensive reviews undertaken by the Town of Caledon in accordance with the requirements of the Regional Official Plan. One of the major factors that has to be taken into account when considering any land designation within the three study areas is the outcome of the Environmental Assessment for the future GTA West corridor currently being undertaken by the Ministry of Transportation. Future expansions will also need to be consistent with the SISA section of ROPA 24.

In comparison with the draft version of ROPA 24, there are a few changes that need to be highlighted. It has been proposed to identify the Palgrave Estate Residential Community on Figure 16 the same as the rural settlements with an "undelineated" built-up area. This will allow the exclusion of the remaining undeveloped lands within this area from the calculations of regional and municipal greenfield density targets. This is consistent with the Region's and the Town of Caledon's position that the Palgrave Estate Residential Community does not meet the Provincial criteria for the delineation of a built boundary. On January 24, 2008, Regional Council passed resolution 2008-40 in support of the exclusion of Palgrave Estate Residential Community. This change will increase the Regional greenfield density target to approximately 46 residents and jobs per hectre as previously noted.

### **Employment Areas**

MMAH staff expressed concerns about the Region's role in employment area designations and employment area conversions. Regional staff has not taken on the role of designating employment land within the area municipalities or determining the uses permitted. However, the policy regarding employment land conversions has been revised to provide the Region with a stronger role by requiring the Region's approval of area municipal official plan amendments to convert employment uses to non-employment uses. MMAH provided several comments on the methodology of the employment land budget, specifically the use of a vacancy rate to account for lands which are not developed or existing buildings being vacant within employment areas. Regional staff notes that we are confident that the methodologies used are accurate assumptions of employment land need. The methodologies and assumptions are consistent with approaches used by other Regions in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

To address some area municipal concerns, Figure 15 and the related employment area policies have been amended to note that the employment land need numbers are subject to more detailed area municipal studies to determine the type and density of employment.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

**Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (SISA)**

Several comments were received on the SISA, primarily in relation to the general nature and purpose of the SISA. The SISA identified on Schedule D is a conceptual area to be studied based on future transportation, electricity transmission and employment land needs and does not purport to designate lands for the purposes of development. While the SISA is identified in Schedule D, that identification is intended to be conceptual in nature illustrating the general area that will be studied. This study will examine the potential of these lands to contribute to planning objectives of the Region and the area municipalities and provide recommendations for the protection and planning of this area. As previously noted, these lands are within the Preliminary Study Area identified for the Ministry of Transportation's (MTO) ongoing GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment Study (EA). In addition to the MTO's EA, the Region has received a letter and report from the Ontario Power Authority that identify a need for hydro transmission lines in North Brampton/South Caledon. Additionally, the PPS and Growth Plan direct that planning authorities shall plan for and protect corridors and rights-of-way for transportation, transit and infrastructure facilities to meet current and projected needs. SISA policies have been revised to comply with the MMAH and MTO requirement to be notified of applications within their permit control areas to assist the Province with its objectives of planning and protecting for a future transportation corridor through the GTA West Corridor preliminary study area. Identification of the SISA and the development of related policies is a proactive and consistent approach to planning for long term needs.

**Municipal Comprehensive Review**

A number of comments were received requesting clarification on policies relating to municipal comprehensive reviews. Specifically, explanation was requested on the Region's role and how the requirements are to be met.

The municipal comprehensive review requirements will be demonstrated by the area municipality and submitted to the Region for approval as part of the ROPA or area municipal official plan amendment for Regional approval. Some of the components of the review may be completed, and determined jointly, by the area municipality and the Region.

The policy has been revised to clarify that full review of the ROP and re-examination of the population and employment forecasts at a Regional level is not necessary for a municipal comprehensive review because the forecasts have been developed through a municipal comprehensive review, which is PROPR. However, it must be demonstrated how the proposal fits within the forecasts in Table 3 of the ROP.

The policies have been revised to specify that the requirements of a municipal comprehensive review must be satisfied for any settlement expansion, including rural settlements, or designation of an Urban Growth Centre or Regional Intensification Corridor.

**Greenbelt Conformity**

Some of the comments received on the Greenbelt Conformity portion of ROPA 24 were issues that are being addressed in other components of PROPR. Some of the remaining issues were either unnecessary, duplicative, or not in keeping with the ROP. These comments/suggestions were not incorporated into ROPA 24.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

In addition, MMAH recommendations to include detailed policy direction to the area municipalities have not been incorporated into ROPA 24 as this would not be consistent with the Region's approach to Greenbelt Plan conformity. The Region's approach for Greenbelt Plan conformity follows the same format that was developed and approved for the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. For example, the MMAH recommendations to include minor rounding out of hamlets, provide rural area designations and to include detailed land use policies that are more appropriately provided in the area municipal official plans were not included in the amendment.

Section 2.2.10.5.22 was also revised to clarify exemptions for "existing uses" in keeping with policy direction in the Greenbelt Plan and the intent of ROPA 21B, which is yet to be approved. These revised policies clarify that expansions to existing buildings and structures and construction of new accessory agricultural buildings and structures to an existing agricultural use is permitted within key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features when there are no reasonable locations outside of features. Implementation of the policies will ensure impacts to features are minimized.

There were also comments from the City of Brampton, TRCA and the general public that the Natural Heritage System (NHS) boundary be refined through the Region's conformity exercise. Some comments by the general public indicated that the NHS boundary identified by the Province was based on provincial natural features mapping that was not accurate. Regional staff compared provincial natural heritage features mapping data used by the Province to delineate the NHS boundary with Regional and local mapping information. The analysis identified only very minor discrepancies between the datasets and provided no basis that the NHS boundary should be refined. Based on that analysis, Regional staff has not identified a need to refine the NHS boundary as part of the Regional conformity exercise. The policy direction in ROPA 24 is to identify the NHS as defined and mapped in the Greenbelt Plan.

In the past, Regional staff has requested the Province to provide detailed information on the provincial methodology used to establish the NHS. As part of the 2015 Review of the Greenbelt Plan, Regional staff will request that the Province review and verify the criteria and methodology used to establish the NHS in consultation with municipalities, agencies and landowners.

### **Ninth Line Lands**

The policies of the Region of Peel Official Plan do not apply to the lands between Ninth Line and Highway 407 (the Ninth Line Lands) that became part of the City of Mississauga and the Region of Peel on January 1, 2010. These lands are identified in the Region of Halton Official Plan as the Ninth Line Corridor Policy Area. Currently, the policies of the Region of Halton and the Town of Milton Official Plans apply to these lands. A future amendment will bring these lands into conformity with the Region of Peel Official Plan. The Ninth Line Lands are shown on Schedule D, Schedule D3 and Figure 3 for reference purposes.

## **6. The Amendment**

The final recommended amendment attached as Appendix I has been prepared by Regional staff, with significant contributions from area municipal staff, addressing the comments received.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

Changes from the draft amendment to the final recommended amendment were made as outlined in Appendix II. In general, the changes do not affect the structure, approach and intent of the proposed policies. Therefore, no further public meeting is required. However, Regional staff would like to highlight the following key changes to Council:

- The Regional population and employment forecasts have been fully aligned with the Growth Plan forecasts;
- For the purposes of calculating greenfield density, the Palgrave Estate Residential Community has been identified as "Estate Community with Undelineated Built Boundary" resulting in a net regional greenfield density of approximately 46 residents and jobs per hectare;
- Introducing a requirement for the completion of a study analyzing Regional density issues to achieve the minimum Provincial requirements;
- Revisions to Employment Land Budget in relation to the Employment Land Need tables and related Employment Area policy;
- Greenbelt policies to recognize existing agricultural uses, allow expansions to existing agricultural buildings and structures and new accessory agricultural buildings and structures to an existing agricultural use;
- Revision of municipal comprehensive review policies to ensure a more consistent and efficient process.

Other minor changes of an editorial nature, not listed in Appendix II, were also made by Regional staff. In addition Appendix IV includes a list of all submissions related to this amendment. Copies of all written submissions received on ROPA 24 are available in the Clerk's office.

The proposed ROPA 24, as amended and attached as Appendix I to this report, represents good planning for the Region of Peel and appropriately implements Provincial policy with respect to Growth Management, Employment Areas and Greenbelt Conformity as established by the *Planning Act*, Provincial Places to Grow Growth Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement.

## **7. Next Steps**

Upon adoption of the amendment by Regional Council, notice of adoption of the amendment will be sent to all those requesting such notice as per the *Planning Act*.

The amendment will be submitted for Provincial approval to MMAH, under section 26(6) of the *Planning Act*. If there are no appeals, the amendment will come into effect and will be incorporated into the Region of Peel Official Plan. A new consolidation of the ROP will be prepared following completion of the PROPR process, however copies of the amendment will not be made available until such time as a new consolidated ROP is prepared.

Regional staff will be moving forward to begin development of the Region of Peel Strategic Plan. The valuable input received during the PROPR process from public and stakeholders will be utilized in the development of the next strategic plan. Regional staff will continue keeping Council apprised of activities related to the PROPR process and the next strategic plan.

March 12, 2010

**PEEL REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW - ADOPTION OF REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 24 - PLACES TO PROSPER: GROWTH MANAGEMENT, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND GREENBELT CONFORMITY**

**CONCLUSION**

The Region of Peel must bring the ROP into conformity with Provincial policies, plans and legislation. The adoption of the attached amendment fulfills the statutory requirement with respect to the ROP's Growth Management, Employment Areas and Greenbelt Conformity policies.

Regional staff has completed background research and policy development for ROPA 24 through four major stakeholder workshops, three open houses and a public meeting. The amendment has incorporated a figure, a schedule and policy revisions, as appropriate, based on comments received. Given the above, staff recommends that Regional Official Plan Amendment Number 24 be adopted by Regional Council, and that ROPA 24 policies be used to inform and guide future policy development including Peel's Strategic Plan.



Norma Trim  
Chief Financial Officer  
and Commissioner of Corporate Services

**Approved for Submission:**



---

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

*For further information regarding this report, please contact Arvin Prasad, Director of Planning Policy and Research at extension 4251 or via email at [arvin.prasad@peelregion.ca](mailto:arvin.prasad@peelregion.ca)*

*Authored By: Kathryn Dewar, Mark Head and Roman Kuczynski*

c. Legislative Services

