

ISSUE DATE:

**April 10, 2012**



PL101408

Ontario Municipal Board

Commission des affaires municipales de l'Ontario

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: City of Mississauga  
Appellant: Region of Peel  
Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Failure of the Minister of the Municipal Affairs and Housing to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 24

Municipality: Upper Tier of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL101408

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 20  
Municipality: Regional Municipality of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL091170

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 22  
Municipality: Regional Municipality of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL101063

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Gemini Urban Design (Cliff) Corp.  
Appellant: Orlando Corporation  
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No 95  
Municipality: City of Mississauga  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL100111

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Failure of The Regional Municipality of Peel to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 226

Municipality: Town of Caledon  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL110195

**APPEARANCES:**

**Parties**

**Counsel\*/Agent**

Regional Municipality of Peel

S. R. Garrod\*

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

C. Young\*  
B. Boxma\*

Town of Caledon

L. Bissett\*  
C. Barnett\* (in absentia)

City of Mississauga

M. Joblin\*  
Q. M. Annibale\* (in absentia)

City of Brampton

B. Kussner\*

Solmar Development Corporation

J. W. Harbell\*  
J. Meader\*  
L. Townsend\* (in absentia)

Gemini Urban Design (Cliff) Corp.

M. R. Flowers\*

Orlando Corporation

L. F. Longo\*

Mayfield West Developers Groups Inc.

M. R. Flowers\*

Osmington Inc.; Heathwood Homes (Brampton) Ltd.

K. Sliwa\*

Mayfield Station Developments Inc.;

S. A. Zakem\*

Mayfield McLaughlin Developments Inc.;  
Caledon Development LP; Ben-Ted  
Construction Ltd.; Caledon 410  
Development Limited; A-Major Homes  
(Ontario) Inc.; Lormel Joint Venture Inc.;  
(collectively, the Mayfield West Phase 2  
Landowners Group)

Northwest Brampton Landowners Group  
Ltd.

S. Snider\*

James Dick Construction Ltd.

J. Buhlman\*

**MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION DELIVERED BY JAMES R.  
McKENZIE ON MARCH 7, 2012 AND ORDER OF THE BOARD**

---

This proceeding was a sixth pre-hearing conference convened for the purpose of reporting on the status of discussions regarding the matters before the Board and the subject of a hearing scheduled to commence on June 25, 2012.

Mr. Garrod reported that, pending the outcome of the above-noted discussions, the scheduled duration of five weeks will most likely be insufficient to complete the hearing.

On consent, a telephone conference call (TCC) is scheduled for **Tuesday, April 17, 2012, commencing at 9 a.m.** to address the matter of scheduled hearing time. The particulars for that TCC are: **Dial-in Number: 416-212-8012 / Toll Free 866-633-0848; Conference ID: 4779874#.**

Mr. Garrod also reported that a settlement has been achieved with respect to the appeals filed by Orlando Corporation and 1096288 Ontario Limited.

Finally, appended to this decision as "Attachment 1" is the Procedural Order for the Phase I hearing to commence on June 25, 2012, which the Board approves.

This is the Order of the Board.

“James R. McKenzie”

JAMES R. McKENZIE  
VICE-CHAIR

**ATTACHMENT 1**

PL101408

**Ontario Municipal Board  
Commission des affaires municipales de l'Ontario**

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(40) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: City of Mississauga  
Appellant: Region of Peel  
Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Failure of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 24  
Municipality: Regional Municipality of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL101408

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Official Plan Amendment No. 20  
Municipality: Regional Municipality of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL091170

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Official Plan Amendment No. 22  
Municipality: Regional Municipality of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL101063

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Azuria Group  
Appellant: Gemini Urban Design (Cliff) Corp.  
Appellant: Orlando Corporation  
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. # 95  
Municipality: City of Mississauga  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL100111

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(40) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Failure of The Regional Municipality of Peel to announce a decision  
respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. OPA #226  
Municipality: Town of Caledon  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL110195

### **PROCEDURAL ORDER**

1. The Board may vary or add to these rules at any time, either on request or as it sees fit. It may alter this Order by an oral ruling, or by another written Order. The terms used in this Order shall have the meanings as set out in Attachment 1.

#### **Organization of the Hearing**

2. This hearing will be conducted in phases. Phase 1 will consist of all matters in OMB Case No. PL101408, being the appeals relating to Amendments Nos. 20, 22 and 24 of the Official Plan of the Regional Municipality of Peel. Whether the other matters identified in the above Style of Cause will be heard in subsequent phases of this proceeding or in other separate proceedings has not yet been determined. The Phase 1 hearing will begin on Monday, June 25, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in the Municipal Hearing Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Mississauga Civic Centre, 300 City Centre Drive, in the City of Mississauga.

3. The length of Phase 1 of the hearing will be about 20 days. The Board has set aside dates from June 25, 2012 to July 27, 2012 to complete Phase 1. The hearing panel will determine whether or not the hearing will sit on Fridays. The hearing will not sit on Monday, July 2, 2012 (Canada Day).

4. The parties and participants (and their contact information) are as listed in Attachment 2 to this Order.

5. The Region of Peel, the Province and the three Area Municipalities have reached an agreement (the "government settlement") regarding proposed modifications to ROPA 24. The government settlement has been subsequently revised by Minor Modifications dated March 6, 2012 and by Minutes of Settlement dated March 7, 2012 (to resolve issues raised by Orlando Corporation and 1096288 Ontario Limited). The Parties who take issue with the government settlement on ROPA 24 or have issues with the portions of ROPAs 20 and 22 which remain under appeal, have filed Issues Lists which are attached as Attachment 3. The relevance of any party's issues in the Phase 1 hearing is not being determined by the filing of these lists or by the issuance of this Procedural Order. Except for any further settlements, there will be no changes to these Issues Lists, unless the Board permits, and a party who asks for changes may have costs awarded against it.

6. The order of evidence for Phase 1 of the hearing shall be:

- i. Regional Municipality of Peel;
- ii. Province of Ontario;
- iii. City of Mississauga;
- iv. City of Brampton;
- v. Town of Caledon;
- vi. Other Parties generally in support of Peel's position;
- vii. Solmar Development Corporation;
- viii. Other Parties generally opposed to Peel's position;
- ix. Reply Evidence by Regional Municipality of Peel.

**Requirements Before the Hearing**

7. A party who intends to call witnesses, whether by summons or not, shall provide to the Board and the other parties a list of the witnesses, their area of expertise and the order in which they are intended to be called. Witnesses may be called in panels if they are addressing the same subject matter. This list must be delivered on or before **Monday, April 16, 2012**.

8. A party who intends to call an expert witness shall ensure that the witness prepares an expert witness statement and a summary of their expertise and qualifications. The expert witness statement shall list any reports prepared by the expert, or any other reports or documents to be relied on at the hearing. Copies of the witness statement must be provided as in section 12. Instead of a witness statement, the expert may file his or her entire report if it contains the required information. If this is not done, the Board may refuse to hear the expert's testimony.

9. A party who intends to call any other witness, who is not an expert, shall ensure that the witness prepares a witness statement, which shall summarize the evidence that the witness will give. Copies of the witness statement must be provided as in section 12. If this is not done, the Board may refuse to hear the witness's testimony.

10. Any participant who wishes to give oral or written evidence at the hearing must provide a participant statement outlining the participant's evidence to the Board and to the parties on or before **Monday, April 30, 2012**. If this is not done, the Board may refuse to hear or receive the participant's evidence.

11. Expert witnesses who are under summons but not paid to produce a report do not have to file an expert witness statement; but the party calling them must file a brief outline of the expert's evidence, as in section 12. If this is not done, the Board may refuse to hear the expert's testimony.

12. On or before **Monday, April 30, 2012**, the parties shall provide copies of their witness and expert witness statements to the other parties.

13. Parties may provide to all other parties a written response to any written evidence on or before **Monday, May 28, 2012**.

14. On or before **Monday, June 11, 2012**, the parties shall provide copies of their visual evidence to all of the other parties. If a model will be used, all parties must have a reasonable opportunity to view it at least 14 days before the hearing commences.

15. A person wishing to change written evidence, including witness statements, must make a written motion to the Board.  
*(see Rules 34 to 38, inclusive, of the Board's Rules, which require that the moving party provide copies of the motion to all other parties 10 days before the Board hears the motion.)*

16. Documents may be delivered by email, personal delivery, facsimile or registered or certified mail, or otherwise as the Board may direct. The delivery of documents by fax shall be governed by the Board's Rules [26 – 31] on this subject. Material delivered by mail shall be deemed to have been received five business days after the date of registration or certification.

17. No adjournments or delays will be granted before or during the hearing except for serious hardship or illness. The Board's Rules 61 to 65 apply to such requests.

**This Member is [not] seized.**

**So orders the Board.**

---



## ATTACHMENT 1 TO PROCEDURAL ORDER

### Meaning of terms used in the Procedural Order:

**Party** is an individual or corporation permitted by the Board to participate fully in the hearing by receiving copies of written evidence, presenting witnesses, cross-examining the witnesses of the other parties, and making submissions on all of the evidence. If an **unincorporated group** wishes to become a party, it must appoint one person to speak for it, and that person must accept the other responsibilities of a party as set out in the Order. Parties do not have to be represented by a lawyer, and may have an agent speak for them. The agent must have written authorisation from the party.

**NOTE** that a person who wishes to become a party before or at the hearing, and who did not request this at the prehearing conference, must ask the Board to permit this.

**Participant** is an individual, group or corporation, whether represented by a lawyer or not, who may attend only part of the proceeding but who makes a statement to the Board on all or some of the issues in the hearing. Such persons may also be identified at the start of the hearing. The Board will set the time for hearing this statements. **NOTE** that such persons will likely not receive notice of a mediation or conference calls on procedural issues. They also cannot ask for costs, or review of a decision as parties can. If a participant does not attend the hearing and only files a written statement, the Board will not give it the same attention or weight as submissions made orally. The reason is that parties cannot ask further questions of a person if they merely file material and do not attend.

**Written and Visual Evidence:** **Written evidence** includes all written material, reports, studies, documents, letters and witness statements which a party or participant intends to present as evidence at the hearing. These must have pages numbered consecutively throughout the entire document, even if there are tabs or dividers in the material. **Visual evidence** includes photographs, maps, videos, models, and overlays which a party or participant intends to present as evidence at the hearing.

**Witness Statements:** A **witness statement** is a short written outline of the person's background, experience and interest in the matter; a list of the issues which he or she will discuss and the witness' opinions on those issues; and a list of reports that the witness will rely on at the hearing. An **expert witness statement** should include his or her (1) name and address, (2) qualifications, (3) a list of the issues he or she will address, (4) the witness' opinions on those issues and the complete reasons for the opinions and (5) a list of reports that the witness will rely on at the hearing. A **participant statement** is a short written outline of the person's or group's background, experience and interest in the matter; a list of the issues which the participant will address and a short outline of the evidence on those issues; and a list of reports, if any, which the participant will refer to at the hearing.

### Additional Information

**Summons:** A party must ask a Board Member or the senior staff of the Board to issue a summons. This request must be made before the time that the list of witnesses is provided to the Board and the parties. (See Rules 45 and 46 on the summons procedure.) If the Board requests it, an affidavit must be provided indicating how the witness' evidence is relevant to the hearing. If the Board is not satisfied from the affidavit, it will require that a motion be heard to decide whether the witness should be summoned.

**The order of examination of witnesses:** is usually direct examination, cross-examination and re-examination in the following way:

*direct examination by the party presenting the witness;*  
*direct examination by any party of similar interest, in the manner determined by the Board;*  
*cross-examination by parties of opposite interest;*  
*re-examination by the party presenting the witness; or*  
*another order of examination mutually agreed among the parties or directed by the Board.*

**ATTACHMENT 2 TO PROCEDURAL ORDER**

**LIST OF PARTIES and PARTICIPANTS**

Revised March 9, 2012

<b>Party</b>	<b>Counsel or Agent</b>
Region of Peel	Stephen Garrod Garrod Pickfield LLP 9 Norwich Street West Guelph, Ontario N1H 2G8 Tel: (519) 341-4370 Fax: (519) 763-2204 garrod@garrodpickfield.ca
Ministry of Attorney General	Bob Boxma & Claire Young Ministry of the Attorney General Legal Services Branch Municipal Affairs & Housing 777 Bay Street, 16 <sup>th</sup> Floor Toronto, Ontario M5G 2E5 Tel: (416) 585-6553 Fax: (416) 585-4003 bob.boxma@ontario.ca claire.young@ontario.ca
City of Mississauga	Quinto Annibale and Mark Joblin Loopstra Nixon LLP Barristers & Solicitors Woodbine Place 135 Queen's Plate Drive, Suite 600 Toronto, Ontario M9W 6V7 Tel: (416) 748-4757 (Annibale) Tel: (416) 748-4756 (Joblin) Fax: (416) 746-8319 QAnnibale@loonix.com MJoblin@loonix.com  Marcia Taggart Legal Counsel, City of Mississauga 300 City Centre Drive, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor Mississauga, Ontario, L5B 3C1 Tel: 905-615-3200, ext. 3743 Fax: 905-896-5106 marcia.taggart@mississauga.ca

City of Brampton	<p>Barnet Kussner WeirFoulds LLP The Exchange Tower, 1600 - 130 King Street West, PO Box 480, Toronto, ON M5X 1J5 Tel: 416-947-5079 Fax: 416-365-1876 bkussner@weirfoulds.com</p> <p>Matthew Rea City of Brampton Legal Department 2 Wellington Street West, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Brampton, Ontario L6Y 4R2 Tel: (905) 874-2626 Fax: (905) 874-2699 matthew.rea@brampton.ca</p>
Town of Caledon	<p>Chris Barnett &amp; Laura Bisset Davis LLP 1 First Canadian Place, Suite 6000 P.O. Box 367, 100 King Street West Toronto, ON, Canada M5X 1E2 Tel: (416) 365-3502 (Barnett); (416) 941-5400 (Bisset) Fax: (416) 365-7886 cbarnett@davis.ca lbisset@davis.ca</p>
Solmar Development Corp.	<p>Jim Harbell &amp; Patrick G. Duffy Stikeman Elliott LLP 199 Bay Street, Suite 5300 Toronto, Ontario M5L 1B9 Tel: (416) 869-5500 Fax: (416) 947-0866 jharbell@stikeman.com pduffy@stikeman.com</p> <p>Lyn Townsend &amp; Jennifer Meader Townsend and Associates 1525 Cornwall Road, Suite 10 Oakville, Ontario L6J 0B2 Tel: (905) 829-8600 Fax: (905) 829-2035 lyn.townsend@ltownsend.ca jennifer.meader@ltownsend.ca</p>

<p>Mayfield Station Developments Inc.; Mayfield McLaughlin Development Inc.; Caledon Development LP.; Ben-Ted Construction Ltd.; Caledon 410 Development Limited; A-Major Homes (Ontario) Inc.; and Lormel Joint Venture Inc. (Collectively known as the West Phase 2 Landowners Group)</p>	<p>Steven Zakem Aird &amp; Berlis LLP Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street Suite 1800, Box 754 Toronto, ON M5J 2T9 Tel: (416) 863-1500 Fax: (416) 863-1515 szakem@airdberlis.com</p>
<p>Orlando Corporation</p>	<p>Leo F. Longo Aird &amp; Berlis LLP Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street Suite 1800, Box 754 Toronto, ON M5J 2T9 Tel: (416) 865-7778 Fax: (416) 863-1515 llongo@airdberlis.com</p>
<p>Mayfield West Developers Group Inc.</p>	<p>Mark R. Flowers Davies Howe Partners LLP Lawyers 5th Floor, 99 Spadina Avenue Toronto, ON M5V 3P8 Tel: (416) 977-7088 Ext. 246 Fax: (416) 977-8931 markf@davieshowe.com</p>
<p>Osmington Inc.; and Heathwood Homes (Brampton) Ltd.</p>	<p>Katarzyna Sliwa Davies Howe Partners LLP Lawyers 5th Floor, 99 Spadina Avenue Toronto, ON M5V 3P8 Tel: (416) 977-7088 Ext. 259 Fax: (416) 977-8931 katarzynas@davieshowe.com</p>
<p>North West Brampton Landowner's Group Ltd. (NWBLG)</p>	<p>Scott A. Snider Turkstra Mazza Associates 15 Bold Street Hamilton, Ontario L8P 1T3 Tel: (905) 529-3476 Fax: (905) 529-3663 ssnider@tmalaw.ca</p>

Hopewell Development (Ontario) Inc.; and M-J-J-J Developments Inc.	Robert D. Howe Goodmans LLP Bay Adelaide Centre 333 Bay Street, Suite 3400 Toronto, Ontario M5H 2S7 Tel: (416) 597-5158 Fax: (416) 979-1234 rhowe@goodmans.ca
James Dick Construction Limited	John M. Buhlman WeirFoulds LLP The Exchange Tower 1600-130 King St W PO Box 480 Toronto Ontario M5X 1J5 Tel: (416) 947-5070 Fax: (416) 365-1876 jbuhlman@weirfoulds.com
1096288 Ontario Limited	Agent: Clare Riepma, P.Eng., RPP Riepma Consultants Inc. 13041 Highway 7 Georgetown, Ontario L7G 4S4 Tel: (905) 877-6751 Fax: (905) 877-6751 riepma@riepma.ca
Lafarge Canada Inc.	Agent: Mal Wensierski, P. Eng. Lafarge Canada Inc. 7880 Keele Street, 3rd Floor Concord, Ontario L4K 4G7 Tel: (905) 738-7070 x 4280 Fax: (905) 738-0224 <a href="mailto:mal.wensierski@lafarge-na.com">mailto:mal.wensierski@lafarge-na.com</a> <a href="mailto:mal.wensierski@lafarge-na.com">mal.wensierski@lafarge-na.com</a>
Brampton Brick Limited	Ronald K. Webb, Q.C. Davis Webb LLP 24 Queen Street East, Suite 800, Brampton, ON L6V 1A3 Tel: 905.451.6714 Fax: 905.454.1876 Ronald.Webb@DavisWebb.com ☐

<b>Participants:</b>	<b>Counsel or Agent:</b>
3 landowners on Albion-Vaughan Road in Caledon: 1. Dominec and Antonetta Scida; 2. POD Lift Equipment Ltd.; and 3. Giuseppe Scenna and Marco Scida.	Chad B. John-Baptiste, Senior Planner MMM Group 100 Commerce Valley Drive West Thornhill, Ontario L3T 0A1 Tel: (905) 882-4211, ex. 6328 Fax: (905) 882-7276 John-BaptisteC@mmm.ca
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)	Quentin Hanchard, RPP 5 Shoreham Drive Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4 Tel: (416) 661-6600, ex. 5324 Fax: (416) 661-6898 qhanchard@trca.on.ca
Caledon Chamber of Commerce	Kelly Darnley, President & CEO 12598 Hwy 50 South Bolton, Ontario L7E 1T6 Tel: (905) 857-7393 Fax: (905) 857-7405 kelly@caledonchamber.com
Labourers' International Union of North America, Local 183	John R. Evans, General Counsel 1263 Wilson Ave., Suite 300 Toronto, Ontario M3M 3G3 Tel: (416) 243-6558 Fax: (416) 241-7607 jevans@local183.ca  Andrew N. Black, Associate Counsel 1263 Wilson Ave., Suite 300 Toronto, Ontario M3M 3G3 Tel: (416) 241-1183, ex. 6611 Fax: (416) 241-7607 ablack@local183.ca

**ATTACHMENT 3 TO PROCEDURAL ORDER**

**ISSUES LISTS**

- 1. Mayfield West Developers Group Inc.**
- 2. North West Brampton Landowner's Group Ltd.; and**
- 3. Solmar Development Corp.**



Date: March 2, 2012

**Issues List for Mayfield West Developers Group Inc.  
Peel ROPA 24**

1. Do the policies in Section 4.2.2 serve to restrict population, household or employment growth to the year 2021 to the 2021 forecasts contained in Table 3? If so, is this appropriate?
2. Should Policy 5.4.3.2.7 be modified to stipulate that additional growth allocated to the Mayfield West study area will be directed west of Highway 10 only if sufficient opportunities to accommodate such growth are not available through intensification and in existing designated greenfield areas within the Mayfield West study area? If so, what are the appropriate modifications?
3. Should Figure 16 form part of the Official Plan as a Schedule, and should the term 'Designated Greenfield Area', as identified on Figure 16, be consistently used throughout the Plan?
4. Should Policy 5.7.2.1 be modified to stipulate that an amendment to the Official Plan would be required to identify the refined location of the *SISA* if it is refined such that the new boundaries extend beyond the limits of the corridor shown on Schedule D? If so, what are the appropriate modifications?
5. Is it appropriate for Policies 5.7.2.2 and 5.7.2.4 to direct area municipalities to restrict land uses and only consider approving development applications within the *SISA* based on the proposed criteria, regardless of existing land use permissions? If not, what are the appropriate modifications?

OMB Case No. PL101408 March 2, 2012

**FINAL ROPA 24 ISSUES LIST: North West Brampton Landowner's Group Ltd.**

**REGIONAL FORECAST (Table 3, Figure 4, and related policies)**

- 1. Has the Region of Peel forecast appropriate population and employment to the City of Brampton to the year 2031?*
- 2. Has the Region of Peel completed all of the necessary and relevant studies required to finalize population and employment forecasts?*
- 3. Are the forecast dwelling units within the Built-Up Area for the period 2015 to 2031 achievable?*
- 4. Are the assumptions and calculation methodologies utilized in preparing the land budget and the forecast for the Built-Up Areas appropriate, comprehensive, practical and reasonable?*
- 5. Should the Regional Official Plan require that existing Settlement Areas within the Urban System be adequately planned to provide reliable population and employment yields before permitting additional urban expansions or allocating population and employment beyond what can be accommodated within the existing Urban System? Is it premature to allocate "unallocated" population to Caledon?*
- 6. Should the Regional Official Plan limit who may initiate changes to the population, household and employment forecasts beyond the limitations in the Planning Act?*
- 7. Should the "Settlement Study Areas" policies ensure that there will be no Settlement Area Expansion until the current Urban System has been adequately planned to provide reliable population and employment yields?*
- 8. Should policies be added to make it clear that Greenfield development that otherwise meets all of the policies of the Plan will be allowed to proceed despite any delay in the development of the built-up areas?*
- 9. What is the basis for the unit allocation in Section 5.5.3.2.5 and is it appropriate?*

**POPULATION and EMPLOYMENT AREAS (Section 5.3, Section 5.5, Sections 5.6)**

- 10. Should the range of Employment Designations in the City of Brampton be expanded to include other designations, such as Institutional, Retail and Service Uses?*
- 11. Is it appropriate to preserve and protect lands in Planning Districts for Employment Uses predicated on major highways, rail yards and trucking terminals when these facilities may not be in place and operational within the 2031 planning horizon?*

**NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM (Section 2.2)**

- 12. Is it appropriate that the Regional Official Plan proposes to establish "associated" vegetation protection zones, which may extend beyond the limits of the Greenbelt?*

March 2, 2012

**UPDATED ISSUES LIST - Solmar Development Corp.  
ROPA 20, 22 AND 24 ISSUES**

1. Does the inclusion of a growth forecast for the interim year of 2021 in the Region Official Plan allow for proper long term planning, does it conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and is it consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement? In the alternative, should additional policies be added to ROPA 24 to clarify the planning intent of a 2021 interim year forecast?
2. Did the Region undertake a proper municipal comprehensive review in updating the Region Official Plan? In the alternative, has the Region provided appropriate direction in ROPA 24 for the approach, criteria and timing to undertake a municipal comprehensive review for settlement boundary expansion.
3. Should the Regional Official Plan be modified to require that any settlement area expansion be designated on the basis of a single municipal comprehensive review for each area municipality which will be undertaken by the Region?
4. Did the Region set in policy 7.9.2.12 appropriate criteria determining an expansion area?
5. Should the Regional Official Plan be modified to direct growth in Caledon to Rural Service Centres and require that each expansion of a Rural Service Centre contain a diverse mix of land uses including residential and employment uses to support vibrant neighbourhoods in balanced and complete communities?
6. Is the study area for Mayfield West established by policy 5.4.3.2.7 and shown on Schedule D inconsistent with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and should it be deleted?
7. Are the policies, schedules, and definition relating to conceptual strategic infrastructure study areas, planned transportation corridors, the GTA West Corridor, and the GTA West transportation corridor appropriate and properly balanced with other policies of the Regional Official Plan?
8. Should the Conceptual Strategic Infrastructure Study Area shown in Schedule D be modified to reflect the Preliminary Route Planning Study Area for the GTA West Corridor?