

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



**ISSUE DATE:** August 26, 2016

**CASE NO(S):** PL080248  
PL101408  
PL141189 PL120151  
PL110195 PL130110

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended

Appellant: Ornstock Developments Ltd  
Appellant: Lorwood Holdings Inc.  
Appellant: Ivy Manor Estates Inc. and others  
Subject: New Official Plan  
Municipality: City of Brampton  
OMB Case No.: PL080248  
OMB File No.: PL080248  
OMB Case Name: Crawford v. Brampton (City)

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. Et All  
Appellant: City of Mississauga  
Appellant: Region of Peel  
Appellant: Solmar Development Corporation  
Subject: Failure of the Regional Municipality of Peel to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. OPA #24  
Municipality: Regional Municipality of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL101408  
OMB File No.: PL101408  
OMB Case Name: AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. v. Peel (Regional Municipality)

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** 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: Upper Tier of Peel  
 OMB Case No.: PL101408  
 OMB File No.: PL091170

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Town of Caledon  
 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

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** 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: Upper Tier of Peel  
 OMB Case No.: PL101408  
 OMB File No.: PL101063

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: 1388688 Ontario Limited  
 Appellant: 805062 Ontario Limited  
 Appellant: 857529 Ontario Inc.  
 Appellant: Brampton Areas 52,53 Landowners Group Inc.; and others  
 Subject: Failure of the Regional Municipality of Peel to announce a decision respecting Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. OPA 2006-043  
 Municipality: City of Brampton  
 OMB Case No.: PL120151  
 OMB File No.: PL120151

OMB Case Name: Brampton 52, 53 Landowners Group Inc. v. Peel  
(Regional Municipality)

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O.  
1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. Et All  
Appellant: Brampton Brick Limited  
Appellant: G.C. Jain Investments Ltd.  
Appellant: Mayfield West Developers Group Inc.; and  
others  
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 26  
Municipality: Regional Municipality of Peel  
OMB Case No.: PL130110  
OMB File No.: PL130110  
OMB Case Name: AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. v. Peel  
(Regional Municipality)

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 17(24) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O.  
1990, c. P.13, as amended

Appellant: Region of Peel  
Appellant: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
Appellant: Caveze Investments Limited  
Appellant: Adriano Lori; and others  
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. OP  
2006-105  
Municipality: City of Brampton  
OMB Case No.: PL141189  
OMB File No.: PL141189  
OMB Case Name: Bottos v. Brampton (City)

**Heard:** June 6, 2016 in Brampton, Ontario

**APPEARANCES:**

**Parties**

**Counsel/Representative\***

The Regional Municipality of Peel

S. Garrod  
R. Maclver (absent)

City of Brampton

B. Kussner  
J. Meader

Town of Caledon

L. Bisset

The Regional Municipality of Halton Hills and the Town of Halton Hills	J. Wilker
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	U. Popadic J. Page
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	A. Miller*
840966 Ontario Ltd. and 860116 Ontario Ltd.	P. Patterson
Cavese Investments Limited	D. Artenosi
Solmar Development Corporation, Osmington Inc., Heathwood Homes (Brampton) Inc., and Mayfield West Developers Group Inc.	A. Platt M. McDermid (absent)
Maria Bottos, Gabriella Buffa, Ermes Buffa, Beppino Ceolin, and Giuliana Ceolin; Dina Sartor, Luisa Anna Pedron, Lorena Maria Pedron, Sando Pedron, Vally Pellarin, Vittorin Ius, Dino Paly, and 2262428 Ontario Inc.; Adriano Iori and Genevieve Iori; and 2167492 Ontario Inc.	P. Bottos
Orlando Corporation	L. Longo
Mayfield West Phase 2 Landowners Group, (incl. Mayfield Station Developments Inc., Mayfield McLaughlin Developments Inc., Caledon Developments LP, Ben-Ted Construction Ltd., A-Major Homes (Ontario) Inc., and Lormel Joint Venture Inc.)	L. Longo for S. Zakem (absent)
Lorwood Holdings Inc., Ivy Manor Estates Inc., and 1212949 Ontario Inc.	J. Park
Brampton Brick Limited	R.K. Webb

Jain Investments Inc.	R.K. Webb
Brampton Areas 52, 53 Landowners Group Inc.; and, AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc., AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc., and AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.	A. Pilkington
Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	A. Toumanians S. Kaufman (absent)
Block 47-1 Landowners Group and Block 47-2 Landowners Group	I. Kagan A. De Gasparis (absent)
Maple Lodge Farms Ltd.	D. Farkas R. Folkes (absent)

**DECISION AND MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION BY JAMES R. McKENZIE ON JUNE 6, 2016 AND ORDER OF THE BOARD**

---

[1] This decision arises from a prehearing conference that dealt with the ongoing case management of the matters set out in the above-listed Title of Proceedings. It addresses three issues: first, the articulation of an earlier order that administratively consolidated the appeals of Transportation and Corridor Protection Policies in respective official plan amendments adopted by the Regional Municipality of Peel (“Region”), the City of Brampton (“City”), and the Town of Caledon (“Town”); second, the scheduling of future proceedings in view of provincial actions to review the Greater Toronto Area (“GTA”) West Corridor Project; and, third, a motion by the City with respect to its Official Plan Amendment No. 105 (“OPA 105”), the Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan.

**CONSOLIDATION OF TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR PROTECTION POLICIES**

[2] To begin, the Board notes the Ministry of Transportation (“Ministry”) decision to suspend the environmental assessment of the GTA West Highway Corridor Project (Exhibit 7 in PL141189), and the related Order-in-Council establishing an Advisory Panel “to assist the Government in conducting a strategic assessment of future

transportation demand and other transportation infrastructure needs for passenger and goods movement in the Greater Toronto Area West Highway Corridor” (Exhibit 8 in PL141189).

[3] In an oral decision given October 16, 2015—the written memorandum of which is dated and was issued January 18, 2016—the Board ordered the administrative consolidation of appealed Transportation Corridor Protection Policies (“TCPP”) in planning instruments adopted by the Region, the City, and the Town that amended their respective official plans. The Board also directed that the consolidated TCPP appeals be catalogued in a schedule to serve as a single-source repository.

[4] In preparing that catalogue, the respective counsel of the Region, Stephen Garrod, the City, Barnet Kussner, and the Town, Laura Bisset, felt it appropriate to articulate specific terms for the ongoing application of the consolidation order and proposed those terms as a cover to the catalogue (“enhanced order”). Referring to the enhanced order as purely procedural, Mr. Kussner submitted that the intent underpinning its proposed language is to make sure that TCPP matters are not prejudiced by an approval of a non-TCPP matter.

[5] The enhanced order consists of six clauses and four attachments. Clauses 1, 2, 3, and 5 are generally acceptable; no objection was advanced in connection with those four or with Attachments 1, 2, and 3. Clauses 4 and 6 and Attachment 4 are at the heart of this dispute.

[6] Clause 4 consolidates certain appeals or portions of OPA 105 with the TCPP appeals, and Attachment 4 articulates those appeals/portions.

[7] Clause 6 also relates to OPA 105 and facilitates an opportunity for non-TCCP appeals to proceed separately from TCPP appeals provided doing so does not prejudice the TCPP matters. Specifically, Clause 6 would allow non-TCPP matters in OPA 105 to be independently administered and determined, “...provided that no order proposed to be made in any other proceedings shall be final or come into effect if it is

determined by the Board that it may prejudice or predetermine the outcome of any matter that is to be determined as part of the TCPP proceedings” [underlining added].

[8] The objection to the words “other” and “may” was led by Paul Bottos on behalf of his many clients, referred to for convenience in this proceeding as the Clarkway-Mayfield Appellants, who have appealed both TCPP and non-TCPP components of OPA 105. He proposed alternative wording for Clause 6, replacing the word “other” with “such,” and the word “may” with “would,” so that the challenged phrasing would read as, “...provided that no order proposed to be made in any such proceedings shall be final or come into effect if it is determined by the Board that it would prejudice or predetermine the outcome of any matter that is to be determined as part of the TCPP proceedings” [underlining also added].

[9] Mr. Bottos focused his submissions exclusively on the inclusion of the word “may” in the enhanced order. (The Board infers that his suggestion to swap the word “other” with the word “such” is meant to avoid confusion in the future by articulating the proceedings to which Clause 6 is directed.) He submitted that the use of the word “may” introduces an additional burden for his clients: that of demonstrating that TCPP matters will not be negatively affected by a decision allowing an appeal of and approving a non-TCPP matter. He maintains that would be unfair, and that the onus of demonstrating prejudice should be explicit and vest with the party alleging prejudice. That is the motivation underpinning his alternate wording.

[10] Mr. Bottos also challenged Clause 4 and Attachment 4 of the enhanced order, alleging that their wording and operation could result in the OPA 105 designation of his clients’ lands being encumbered by the effect of the administrative consolidation.

[11] Mr. Bottos’s submissions were adopted by Ronald Webb on behalf of Jain Investments Inc.

[12] Parenthetically, the Board notes that the enhanced order tabled by Messrs. Garrod and Kussner and Ms. Bisset was not entered as an exhibit at the prehearing

conference, and that Mr. Bottos's revised enhanced order was—as Exhibit 11. To remedy this oversight, the Board will exercise its powers to post-hoc mark the enhanced order as Exhibit 11-A (in PL141189).

[13] The Board has carefully considered the respective submissions of counsel on this issue.

[14] First, the Board finds that the replacement of the word “other” with the word “such” is a helpful revision that will lessen the potential for ambiguity in the future with respect to which proceedings a Board order will relate to. That revision will be ordered.

[15] Second, the Board finds that the wording and operation of Clause 4 and Attachment 4 of the enhanced order could result in the designation of the Clarkway-Mayfield Appellants' lands being encumbered as a consequence of being conjoined with the TCPPP appeals. It equally finds, given the significance of the GTA West Corridor Project however, that that potential alone is not a compelling reason to change the language of Clause 4 and Attachment 4 of the enhanced order.

[16] Third, the Board is not persuaded that the use of the word “may” introduces a new burden for the Clarkway-Mayfield Appellants. Whether the word “may” or “would” or some other phrasing were deployed, an initial onus vests with whomever initiates an allegation of prejudice, following which onus shifts to whomever elects the dispute the allegation. The alternate word proposed by Mr. Bottos carries the same burden. Where onus initially or subsequently vests is not contingent upon which word is used.

[17] Finally, with respect to the choice between the words “may” and “would” the Board finds itself challenged: the respective submissions supporting each word have merit. It is clear that use of the word “may” establishes the lowest threshold test where a party alleging prejudice need only demonstrate a possibility of prejudice. That could keep the issuance of a non-TCPPP-related order in abeyance for so long a period of time as to make proceeding independently pointless. On the other hand, it is equally clear that the use of the word “would” establishes the highest threshold test where a party



alleging prejudice need demonstrate prejudice as a certainty. In the grey that routinely characterises land use planning, that could introduce a standard impossible to achieve. Either extreme carries a measure of prejudice in the context of proceeding in parallel with the planning process for an undertaking having the magnitude of the GTA West Corridor Project and its concomitant public infrastructure investment.

[18] Unfortunately none on either side of this particular quarrel has, to this point, acknowledged the function of probability. To that end, the Board will hold Clause 6 in abeyance until the next prehearing conference for OPA 105 (PL141189) in order for counsel to confer to explore wording that takes probability into account, the objective being to find wording that moves away from the extremes and opens a tolerable range within which an independent, non-TCPP proceeding in the future could meaningfully attend to corridor protection and allow for an order in the event an appeal was allowed. Counsel, for example, could discuss inserting the word “likely” after either word “may” or “would,” or consider other possibilities to bridge the extremes advanced thus far. To be sure, these are only suggestions meant to encourage problem solving. And, again to be sure, in the event counsel cannot arrive at any consensus, the Board is quite prepared to decide this issue of wording one way or the other, despite the measure of prejudice each attracts.

## **ORDER**

[19] The Board orders that the enhanced order (Exhibit 11-A) is approved subject to the correction of typographical errors, and except for Clause 6—which is held in abeyance until the next prehearing conference for OPA 105, the details of which are set out in the next section. To avoid confusion, it is appended to this decision as Attachment 1. A corrected version will be appended to the decision arising from the next prehearing conference.

[20] In the interim, those counsel engaging this issue are directed to confer as set out above. Other counsel may participate if they wish. Counsel are also directed to attend

the next prehearing conference prepared to address the specific issue of Clause 6 with either consent language or with further submissions on other wording possibilities to achieve a tolerable range, or with augmented submissions on the use of the word “may” or “would.” Finally, the final iteration of Clause 6 (when approved) will replace the word “other” with the word “such” as discussed above.

## **FUTURE SCHEDULING**

[21] The Ministry’s decision to review the GTA West Corridor Project has triggered frustration among parties with respect to the scheduling of future proceedings for TCPP matters now that they have been administratively consolidated. That frustration was expressed by Leo Longo, counsel to Orlando Corporation, who remarked that “dithering [by the Ministry] should not influence the scheduling of appeals” and “continuing to defer scheduling [by the Board] is tantamount to [it] declining its jurisdiction.”

[22] Corridor protection is a fundamental requirement for a provincially significant transportation facility having the magnitude of the GTA West Corridor Project; the full implications of not appropriately recognising that necessity are immeasurable. As Mr. Garrod correctly points out, that’s the harsh reality for Mr. Longo’s client and for others given the location of their lands. For the time being, therefore, the Board finds that public need must succeed private desire with respect to scheduling.

[23] With respect to OPA 105, however, the parties shared a general sense that a further prehearing conference could be scheduled in late October 2016, to update the Board with respect to ongoing efforts related to scoping. The Board will make that accommodation. A prehearing conference is scheduled for OPA 105 (PL141189) **on Wednesday, October 26, 2016 commencing at 10 a.m. at:**

**City of Brampton  
The West Tower  
41 George Street  
Brampton, ON L6Y 2E1**

[24] No further notice is necessary.

## **MOTION**

[25] Finally, the City filed a motion seeking particular relief with respect to the partial withdrawal of various appeals of OPA 105. First, it seeks an order stipulating that as a result of those withdrawals, the Board's Secretary, "...is at liberty to notify the City Clerk that the decision by City Council to adopt [OPA 105]...is final and that OPA 105 has come into effect, save and except those policies and land use schedules which remain under appeal either on a Secondary Plan-wide basis or on a site-specific basis as set out on Exhibit "C" to the Affidavit of David Waters [sworn May 20, 2016]." Second, it seeks an order pursuant to s. 17(50) of the *Planning Act* "...approving sections 10.1.3, 10.5.1, and 10.5.2 of OPA 105 as adopted, save and except to the extent [those three policies] remain under appeal on a site-specific basis in respect of lands delineated on Exhibit "D" to the Affidavit of David Waters and owned by [the Clarkway-Mayfield Appellants] and without prejudice to their appeals on a site-specific basis."

[26] Mr. Bottos confirmed that the motion is not opposed by the Clarkway-Mayfield Appellants.

[27] The Board notes that the Secretary's action articulated in the first 'ask' is codified in sections 17(30) and 17(30.1) of the *Planning Act*. The Board also notes that the approval sought by the second 'ask' manifests as an operation of law pursuant to those same sections of the *Planning Act*. The Board understands the City's desire to have those policies of OPA 105 no longer under appeal recognised as being in force and effect, but it is not persuaded that the relief sought in this motion—which, as noted, is achieved as an operation of law pursuant to sections 17(30) and 17(30.1) of the *Planning Act*—is the appropriate means through which to see those desires fulfilled.

[28] Following a short exchange, it was determined that the operative component of the motion is the matrix of appeals set out Exhibit "C" to Mr. Waters's affidavit and that the motion need not advance if that matrix were recognised in this decision. The Board

is prepared to give that recognition. The Board is also prepared to recognise a consolidated issues list relating to that matrix.

## ORDER

[29] The Board orders that the motion is deemed abandoned. Exhibit “C” to Mr. Waters’s affidavit (Exhibit 10 in PL141189), the matrix, is appended to this decision as Attachment 2 and represents, as of June 6, 2016, the status of appealed policies that remain active and outstanding with respect to OPA 105. The Board also directs attention to the “NOTE” set out at the top of that matrix. The related consolidated issues list is appended as Attachment 3.

[30] Finally, this panel will attend to informing both Mary Ann Hunwicks, the Board’s Secretary, and Nazma Ramjaun, the Board’s case coordinator for PL141189, of the matters arising in connection with the abandoned motion.

[31] Board Rule 107 states:

**107. Effective Date of Board Decision** A Board decision is effective on the date that the decision or order is issued in hard copy, unless it states otherwise.

[32] Pursuant to Board Rule 107, this decision takes effect on the date that it is e-mailed by Board administrative staff to the clerk of the municipality where the property is located.

*fdzsa “James R. McKenzie”*

JAMES R. McKENZIE  
VICE-CHAIR

If there is an attachment referred to in this document,  
please visit [www.elto.gov.on.ca](http://www.elto.gov.on.ca) to view the attachment in PDF format.

### **Ontario Municipal Board**

A constituent tribunal of Environment and Land Tribunals Ontario  
Website: [www.elto.gov.on.ca](http://www.elto.gov.on.ca) Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

## ATTACHMENT 1

Exhibit: 11-A.

File #: PL/41189

### THE BOARD ORDERS that:

1. All outstanding appeals of Region of Peel ROPAs 16, 20, 22, 24 and 26 are consolidated by the Board for administrative purposes. The appellants and the portions of these Peel ROPAs that remain under appeal as of this date are identified in Attachment 1 to this Order. These appeals are herein referred to collectively as the "Peel Transportation and Corridor Protection Policy Appeals" (the "Peel TCPP Appeals").
2. The outstanding appeal of Town of Caledon OPA 226 is consolidated by the Board for administrative purposes with the Peel TCPP Appeals. The appellant and the portions of OPA 226 that remain under appeal as of this date are identified in Attachment 2 to this Order. This appeal is herein referred to as the "Caledon Transportation and Corridor Protection Policy and Deferred Ecosystem Definitions Appeal" (the "Caledon TCPP Appeals").
3. All of the appeals of the various City of Brampton planning instruments that are identified in Attachment 3 to this Order are consolidated for administrative purposes with the Peel TCPP Appeals and the Caledon TCPP Appeal. The appellants of the various Brampton planning instruments and the portions of those instruments that remain under appeal as of this date are identified in this Attachment. These appeals are herein referred to collectively as the "Brampton Transportation and Corridor Protection Policy Appeals" (the "Brampton TCPP Appeals").
4. Certain appeals or portions of appeals of Brampton OPA 2006-105 (Secondary Plan 47), as identified in Attachment 4 to this Order, are also consolidated by the Board for administrative purposes with the Peel TCPP Appeals, the Caledon TCPP Appeals and the Brampton TCPP Appeals. These appeals are herein referred to collectively as the "Secondary Plan 47 Transportation and Corridor Protection Policy Appeals (the "SP47 TCPP Appeals").
5. The OMB proceedings that include the Peel TCPP Appeals, the Caledon TCPP Appeals, the Brampton TCPP Appeals and the SP47 TCPP Appeals are herein referred to collectively as the "TCPP Proceedings".
6. The remaining appeals and/or portions of appeals of Brampton OPA 2006-105 (Secondary Plan 47) that are not included in the SP47 TCPP Appeals as herein identified may be independently administered and determined by the Board, provided that no order proposed to be made within any other proceedings shall be final or come into effect if it is determined by the Board that it may prejudice or predetermine the outcome of any matter that is to be determined as part of the TCPP Proceedings.

11/15/2011  
11/15/2011  
11/15/2011

**Attachment 1**  
**Peel TCPP Appeals**

DRAFT

Outstanding Appeals as of February 22, 2016 (TD)

PEEL REGION ROPA 16 - PL051048			
ORIGINAL POLICY #	CURRENT POLICY # (Oct '14)	POLICY TEXT/DESCRIPTION	APPELLANT
5.6.3.2.3	5.9.3.2.5	Encourage the study and protection of a north-south transportation corridor and related Bram West Parkway facility along the boundary of Brampton and Halton Hills, until such time as the need for and long term role of one or both of these facilities can be evaluated and approved through the completion of one or more Environmental Assessment studies.	840966 Ontario Inc. Maple Lodge Farms Limited and May Family Brampton Brick Limited
Item 120 (Schedule E)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addition of "Conceptual North-South Corridor/Bramwest Parkway Study Area</li> <li>- Deletion of North-South Conceptual Corridor in Western Brampton</li> </ul> <p>Note: Schedule E further was revised through ROPA 26 (2012).</p>	840966 Ontario Inc. Maple Lodge Farms Limited and May Family Brampton Brick Limited
Schedule E		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As it applies to land designated as Conceptual North-South Corridor/Bramwest Parkway Study Area</li> <li>- As it applies to notation stating "North-South Corridor/Bramwest Parkway Study Area - Precise major roads in these areas will be determined through future studies and Official Plan Amendments.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Schedule E further was revised through ROPA 26 (2012).</p>	840966 Ontario Inc. Maple Lodge Farms Limited and May Family Brampton Brick Limited
PEEL REGION ROPA 20 - PL10148			
3.7.2.18		Identify jointly with the area municipalities, the Province and relevant agencies, strategic infrastructure study areas well in advance of development to accommodate load growth resulting from projected growth in the population and the economy.	Solmar Development Corporation
PEEL REGION ROPA 22 - PL10148			

Outstanding Appeals as of February 22, 2016 (TD)

5.9.2.19	5.9.2.19	Work with the area municipalities to ensure that development in planned transportation corridors does not preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified.	Solmar Development Corporation
5.9.3.2.2	5.9.3.2.2	Work with the Province and affected municipalities to take appropriate actions to ensure that planned transportation corridors are not precluded.	Solmar Development Corporation
5.9.3.2.3	5.9.3.2.3	Work cooperatively with the Province and other GTA and Golden Horseshoe municipalities in planning and implementing freeway and higher order transit improvements identified in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.	Solmar Development Corporation
5.9.3.2.4	5.9.3.2.4	Encourage and work with the Province and affected municipalities to identify and plan for the following future multi-modal transportation corridors and take appropriate action to ensure that these corridors are not precluded: a) A transportation corridor linking the GTA West Corridor and the Mid-Peninsula (Niagara to GTA Corridor); and b) The further extension of Highway 427.	Solmar Development Corporation
5.9.3.2.6	5.9.3.2.6	Participate in and support, in consultation with affected municipalities, the Province's Environmental Assessment Study for the GTA West Transportation Corridor and its links to the transportation network, and encourage and work with the affected municipalities to take appropriate action to ensure that the corridor is not precluded.	Solmar Development Corporation
5.9.7.2.4.(f)	5.9.7.2.4 (f)	Define a strategic goods movement network in Peel, in consultation with the Province, the other regions in the GTHA, area municipalities, adjacent municipalities and other public and private stakeholders. In so doing, undertake the following: (f) Participate in and encourage the Province's study of the GTA West Transportation Corridor, in recognition of the potential role of this transportation corridor for the movement of goods.	Solmar Development Corporation
Planned Transportation Corridors (definition)		Corridors identified through provincial plans or preferred alignment(s) determined through the Environmental Assessment Act process which are required to meet projected needs.	Solmar Development Corporation



Outstanding Appeals as of February 22, 2016 (TD)

PEEL REGION ROPA 24 - PL10148		
5.6.2.11	5.6.2.12	<p>Support the study and protection of the Strategic Infrastructure Study Area for potential infrastructure and employment areas needs in consultation with the Province, area municipalities, other applicable regions, municipalities and agencies.</p>
5.7 Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (preamble)	5.7	<p>In order to plan, protect and provide for potential long term strategic infrastructure needs, the Region is establishing policies for a study area that is conceptually shown as the Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (SISA) on Schedule D. The purpose of this conceptual study area is to provide protection for long-term planning and infrastructure studies in advance of future development. Since the uses for the SISA have not been defined, it is possible for this study area to have a planning horizon that extends beyond 2031. The population and employment forecasts in Chapter 4 of this Plan indicate that significant residential and employment growth will occur in Peel Region to 2031. This growth will produce increased demands for travel, electricity utilities and employment land. This growth will also create a demand for urban development that has the potential to encroach on lands that contain the optimal lands for a route that could support transportation facilities, utilities and/or employment land. In conclusion, the population and employment growth forecast for Peel Region to 2031 will generate land development that could begin to limit the availability of options for meeting strategic infrastructure planning needs.</p> <p>The provincial Growth Plan, June 2006, identifies a conceptual Transportation Corridor between the urban areas of the northwest GTA and the western Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has initiated the first phase of an Environmental Assessment study which will more specifically define the need, location and details of the "GTA-West" "Future Transportation Corridor". This "GTA-West" "Future Transportation Corridor" has provided a basis for the SISA section of this Plan and the identification of the conceptual SISA on Schedule D.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that any future infrastructure project approved must consider a range of impacts and studies, including the mitigation of environmental impacts.</p>

Outstanding Appeals as of February 22, 2016 (TD)

5.7.1.1 (objective)	5.7.1.1	To identify and protect areas that require long term comprehensive study and assessment with respect to long term strategic planning and infrastructure needs such as transportation facilities, utilities and electricity transmission infrastructure.	Solmar Development Corporation AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.
5.7.2.1	5.7.2.1	Work in partnership with the Province, area municipalities and adjacent Regions, to further define and refine the location of the conceptual Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (SISA) based on the outcomes of the MTO's GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment and identify and implement tools, policies and other measures to protect lands within the SISA from land uses that would predetermine or preclude the potential outcomes of the MTO's GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment.	Solmar Development Corporation AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.
5.7.2.2	5.7.2.2	Direct the area municipalities to review the <i>area municipal official plans</i> and revise policies as necessary to restrict land uses within the SISA that would predetermine or preclude the potential outcomes of the MTO's GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment and to identify and implement other implementation tools. All land uses currently permitted within the <i>Prime Agricultural Area</i> of the Rural System will continue to be permitted.	Solmar Development Corporation AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.
5.7.2.3	5.7.2.3	Only consider approving ROPAs for development applications within the SISA requiring Regional approval if a satisfactory assessment has been made and has determined that the application will not predetermine or preclude the outcomes of the MTO's GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment.	Solmar Development Corporation AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.
5.7.2.4	5.7.2.4	Direct the area municipalities to only consider approving development applications within the SISA where there has been a satisfactory assessment that has concluded that the proposal would not predetermine or preclude the outcomes of the MTO's GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment.	Solmar Development Corporation AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.
5.7.2.5	5.7.2.5	Acknowledge and comply with the Province's requirement for their review of official plan amendments and secondary plans submitted to the Region within the Province's permit control areas.	Solmar Development Corporation AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.
Schedule D		As it applies to the depiction of the Strategic Infrastructure Study Area (SISA).	Solmar Development Corporation AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.

PEEL REGION ROPA 26 - PL130110

<p>Section 5.9.12. Future GTA West Transportation Corridor (preamble)</p>	<p>5.9.12</p>	<p>In order to plan for and protect a strategic corridor and rights-of-way for transportation and transit facilities, in advance of future development, the Region is establishing policies to protect the corridor shown conceptually as the Conceptual GTA West Corridor on Schedule E.</p> <p>The provincial Growth Plan, June 2006, identifies a conceptual Future Transportation Corridor in Peel between the urban areas of the northwest GTA and the western Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has initiated an Environmental Assessment which will more specifically define the need, location and details of the GTA West Transportation Corridor.</p>	<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc. Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>
<p>5.9.12.1.1 (objective)</p>	<p>5.9.12.1.1</p>	<p>To plan for and protect a Future GTA West Transportation Corridor in Peel.</p>	<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc. Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>

Outstanding Appeals as of February 22, 2016 (TD)

5.9.12.2.1	Plan for and protect the Future GTA West Corridor and rights-of-way for transportation and transit facilities to meet current and projected needs and not permit development in such planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified or actively being planned.	<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc.</p> <p>Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>
5.9.12.2.2	Ensure transportation and land use considerations be integrated and coordinated at all stages of the planning and Environmental Assessment process.	<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc.</p> <p>Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>
5.9.12.2.3	Work with the Province and area municipalities to plan for and protect for the GTA West Corridor and its connections to the existing highway network including Highway 410 in the Mayfield West area (as identified on Schedule E).	<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc.</p> <p>Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>

Outstanding Appeals as of February 22, 2016 (TD)

5.9.12.2.4	Direct the area municipalities, in consultation with and to the satisfaction of the Province, to develop official plan policies that provide corridor protection to ensure that development applications will not predetermine or preclude the planning and/or implementation of the GTA West Transportation Corridor.	<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc.</p> <p>Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>
5.9.12.2.5	Recognize that as the Environmental Assessment Act process progresses, any related Official Plan or Secondary Plan may, in consultation with the proponent, include provisions for the phased release of lands that are appropriate to the environmental assessment process.	<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc.</p> <p>Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>
Schedule E November 2012		<p>Solmar Development Corporation Orlando Corporation Northwest Brampton Landowners Group Inc.</p> <p>Mayfield West Developers Group Inc. G.C. Jain Investments Brampton Brick Limited AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc. AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.</p>

Outstanding Appeals as of February 22, 2016 (TD)

NOTE: The Region of Peel continues to reserve its rights to challenge the validity and/or scope of the Appeals of ROPA 24 and ROPA 26 filed by: AMB Highway BP 1 Canco Inc., AMB Highway BP 2 Canco Inc., and AMB Highway BP 3 Canco Inc.

Attachment 2

Caledon TCPP Appeals

Appellant	Parts of OPA 226 under appeal	Board File No.
Town of Caledon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4.1 - 7<sup>th</sup> bullet</li> <li>• Section 4.1.6 Strategic Infrastructure Study Area</li> <li>• Section 5.5.1 - 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph</li> <li>• Section 5.5.2.5</li> <li>• Section 5.5.3.6</li> <li>• Section 5.9.5.1(d)</li> <li>• Section 5.9.5.2.5</li> <li>• Section 6.7.148 - Definition of Strategic Infrastructure Study Area</li> </ul>	<p>PL101408 PL110195</p>
Town of Caledon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6.7.173 - Definition of Wildlife Habitat (Significant) - last sentence of clause 6.7.173 (c) "The identification of Significant Wildlife Habitat shall consider the criteria in Figure 5 of the Region of Peel Official Plan (attached as Appendix IV to this Plan for information)."</li> <li>• Section 6.7.174 - Definition of Woodland Core Area</li> <li>• Appendix IV - Figure 5 of the Region of Peel Official Plan: Recommended Criteria and Thresholds for the identification of Significant Wildlife Habitat</li> <li>• Appendix V - Table 1 to the Region of Peel Official Plan: Criteria and Thresholds for the Identification of Core, Natural Areas and Corridors (NAC) and Potential Natural Areas and Corridors (PNAC) Woodlands</li> </ul>	<p>PL101408 PL110195 PL120717</p>

Attachment 3  
Brampton TCPP Appeals

DRAFT



TRANSPORTATION & CORRIDOR PROTECTION POLICIES OF BRAMPTON PLANNING INSTRUMENTS

Policy		Appellant	Comments
Section # in OPA 43	Section # in October 2008 OP	Section # in Nov. 2013 office consolidation	OPA 2006-043 (BL120157) & 2006 Official Plan (E1080248)
	4.4.2.1	4.5.2.1	Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. Road Network Policies
	4.4.2.4	4.5.2.4	Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. Road Network Policies
	4.4.2.13	4.5.2.13	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. Road Corridor and Arterial Network Protection Areas
	4.4.2.15	4.5.2.15	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. North South Corridor Protection Area
	4.4.2.16	4.5.2.16	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. North South Corridor Protection Area
	4.4.2.17	4.5.2.17	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. North South Corridor Protection Area
	4.4.2.18	4.5.2.18	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. North South Corridor Protection Area
4.4.2.19		4.5.2.19	MMAH*
4.4.2.21		4.5.2.20	MMAH*
4.4.7.8		4.5.7.8	NWBGL and MMAH*
	4.13.2	4.14.2	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. Tracking and Goods Movement
	4.13.2	4.14.2	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. Corridor Protection Areas (entire section)
	4.13.2.1	4.14.2.1	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. Corridor Protection Area (certain portions of the section)
	4.13.2.2	4.14.2.2	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc., NWBLG Corridor Protection Area - North West Brampton
	4.13.2.2.6	4.14.2.2.6	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. Corridor Protection Area - Bram West Secondary Plan
	4.13.2.2.7	4.14.2.2.7	Maple Lodge Farms, Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc., NWBLG Corridor Protection Area
	4.13.2.3.1	4.14.2.3.1	NWBGL Corridor Protection Area - Highway 427 and Arterial Network
	4.13.2.3.4	4.14.2.3.4	NWBGL Corridor Protection Area - Highway 427 and Arterial Network
4.14.9		4.15.9	MMAH* North South Transportation Corridor
<b>Schedules</b>			
Schedule 1			
Schedule A (General Land Use Designations)			
			Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. All schedules relating to their property
			Maple Lodge Farms All schedules relating to their property
			Maple Lodge Farms As it applies to the "Corridor Protection Area" designation in lots 1, 2 and 3, Con 6 W.H.S.
			Ivy Manor/Destoria, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc. All schedules relating to their property
			Maple Lodge Farms As it applies to the "Corridor Protection Area" designation in lots 1, 2 and 3, Con 6 W.H.S. and to the designation of the north-south Collector road in Lots 1, 2 and 3 Con 5 W.H.S.
			Brampton Area 52, 53 Landowners Group Inc. ("BLG") and Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH)* The depiction of the North South Transportation Corridor (NSTC)/GTA West

Section # in OPA	Amendments to OPA	Policy	Appellant	Comments
			Adding a minor arterial extension to Sandalwood Parkway westerly	North West Brampton Landowners Group (NWBLG)
		Schedule B1 (City Road Right-of-Way Widths)	Ivy Manor/Destonia, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc.	All schedules relating to their property
			Maple Lodge Farms	As it applies to the "Corridor Protection Area" designation in lots 1, 2 and 3, Con 6 W.H.S and to the designation of the north-south road 23-26 metres in width in Lots 1, 2 and 3 Con 5 W.H.S
			BLG and MMAH*	The depiction of the NSTC (GTA West)
			NWBLG	extending a 36 m road westerly along Sandalwood Parkway alignment (west of CNR)
		Schedule C (Transit Network)	Maple Lodge Farms	As it applies to the alignment of the "Secondary Transit Corridor" designation in the vicinity of proposed Financial Drive within Concessions 5 and 6 W.H.S
		Schedule C1 (Major Pathway Network)	Ivy Manor/Destonia, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc.	All schedules relating to their property
			Maple Lodge Farms	As it applies to the "Citywide Pathway Network" designation on the lands within Con 6 W.H.S, south of the Credit River
		Schedule G (Secondary Plan Areas)	Ivy Manor/Destonia, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc.	All schedules relating to their property
		Appendix C	Ivy Manor/Destonia, Lorwood Holdings, 1212949 Ontario Inc.	All schedules relating to their property
		All	<b>Zoning By-law 300-2005 (PL051251)</b> R.W. Crawford and Elaine Crawford, 840966 Ontario Ltd., 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes (2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc., Maple Lodge Farms	Holding By-law
			<b>OPR93-255 (PL051251)</b>	
Section # in OPA	Amendments to OPA			
43	2006-043			
3.1(3)	4.13.5.1		840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Bram West Secondary Plan Corridor Protection Area
3.1(3)	4.13.5.1.1		840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Bram West Secondary Plan Corridor Protection Area
3.1(3)	4.13.5.5		Maple Lodge Farms, 840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Corridor Protection Area; OPR93-251 was amended by OPR93-255 by adding one policy (4.13.5.5)
3.2(3)	4.1.10		840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Corridor Protection Area
3.2(3)	4.1.10.1		840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Corridor Protection Area
3.2(3)	4.1.11		840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Corridor Protection Area
3.2(3)	4.1.11.1		840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Corridor Protection Area
3.3(3)	4.1.8		840966 Ontario Ltd, 1212949 Ontario Inc., Destonia Homes(2003) Inc., Lorwood Holdings Inc., North West Brampton Landowners Group Inc.	Transportation Policies

Attachment 4  
SP47 TCPP Appeals

Appellant	Parts of OPA2006-105 under appeal	Board File No.
Region of Peel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7.2 – Corridor Protection Area, save and except Policy 7.2.2</li> <li>• Schedules B, D, E, and L and Schedule SP47(a) to the geographical extent of the Corridor Protection Area as depicted on the Schedules and to the further extent of the Route Planning Study Area (November, 2014) identified in Stage 2 of the GTA West Corridor EA Study being undertaken by MTO.</li> </ul>	PL141189
MMAH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7.2 – Corridor Protection Area, save and except Policy 7.2.2</li> <li>• Schedules B, D, E, L, and M and Schedule SP47(a) to the geographical extent of the Corridor Protection Area as depicted on the Schedules and to the further extent of the Route Planning Study Area (November, 2014) identified in Stage 2 of the GTA West Corridor EA Study being undertaken by MTO, including the geographical extent of Special Policy Areas 3, 4, and 5.</li> </ul>	PL141189
Sartor, Pedron, Lus et al., 2167942 Ontario Inc., Bottos, Buffa, Cedin, Iori	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7.2 – Corridor Protection Area, save and except policy 7.2.2</li> <li>• Schedules B and L and Schedule SP47(a) to the geographical extent of Special Policy Areas 3, 4, and 5.</li> </ul>	PL141189
Caveze	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedules D, E, L, and M and</li> </ul>	PL141189

	<p>Schedule SP47(a) to the geographical extent of the Corridor Protection Area as depicted on the Schedules and to the further extent of the Route Planning Study Area (November, 2014) identified in Stage 2 of the GTA West Corridor EA Study being undertaken by MTO.</p>	
--	--	--

9273868.1

DRAFT

# ATTACHMENT 2

**NOTE:** The City acknowledges that for policies indicated with an 's' as remaining under appeal on a site-specific or area-specific basis, these Appellants remain at liberty to seek modifications, exceptions, additions or deletions to the text of those policies as they apply to the site or area to which the appeal has been scoped, provided these Appellants shall be bound by the commitments made by them to scope their appeals to a site-specific or area-specific basis. The City will not rely upon the coming into force of a given policy as a basis for opposing an appeal of a policy which has been scoped site-specifically or area-specifically, and its status will be treated the same as a Council-adopted policy for purposes of that appeal. Likewise, the City will not use the 's' as a reason to oppose the changes on jurisdictional or other grounds but is, of course, at liberty to oppose the changes on their planning merits.

Appellant Names are Provided for Convenience and Reference Purpose Only

Appealed Policies	Sartor, Pedron, Pollarin, Lus, et. al. <sup>1</sup>	2167942 Ontario Inc. <sup>1</sup>	Bottos, Buffa, Cedini <sup>1</sup>	Iori <sup>1</sup>	Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing <sup>2</sup>	Region of Peel	Caveze Investments	Orlando (Non-Appellant Party)
1.0							w	
3.0							s	
4.1(xi)							w	
4.2	s	s	s	s				
4.2.2	s	s	s	s				
4.2.3	s	s	s	s				
4.2.14							w	
4.2.17							w	
4.2.19							w	
4.2.28							w	
4.2.32							w	
4.2.32 (iii)	w	w	w	w				
5.1.5	w	w	w	w				
5.1.1.6	w	w	w	w				
5.3.1.2							w	
5.3.9.1							s	
5.3.9.3							s	
5.3.9.6							w	
5.4 (Natural Heritage)	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.1	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.2	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.3	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.4	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.7	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.10	s	s	s	s				
5.4.2	s	s	s	s				
5.4.2.1	s	s	s	s				
5.4.2.2	s	s	s	s				
5.5.2	w	w	w	w				
6.3	s	s	s	s	s			
6.4	s	s	s	s	s			
6.5	s	s	s	s	s			
6.6.1							w	
7.1	w	w	w	w				
7.1.1							w	
7.1.2							w	
7.1.5							w	
7.1.6							w	
7.1.7							w	
7.1.8							w	
7.1.9							w	
7.1.10							w	
7.1.11							w	
7.2	w	w	w	w	s	s		
7.2.1 (iii)								s
7.2.1 (iv)								s
7.2.2							w	
7.3.2							w	
7.3.6							w	
7.3.7							w	
7.4.2							w	
7.4.7							w	
7.4.8							w	
8.1.3							w	
10 (Community Block Plan)	s	s	s	s				
10.1.2							w	
10.1.3	s	s	s	s				
10.5.1	s	s	s	s				
10.5.2	s	s	s	s				
10.6.1							w	
10.10.2							w	
12 (General Provisions)	s	s	s	s				
12.1.2	s	s	s	s			w	
12.1.3	s	s	s	s				
12.1.4							w	
12.3.2							s	
12.4.1							w	
13.1							w	
<b>Appealed Schedules</b>								
Schedule A	s	s	s	s				
Schedule B	s	s	s	s	s	s		
Schedule D					s	s	w	
Schedule E					s	s	w	
Schedule G	s	s	s	s				
Schedule K							w	
Schedule L	s	s	s	s	s	s	w	
Schedule M					s		w	

How to read this chart:

S	Site Specific or Area-Specific Appeal
W	Policy has been appealed as it applies to the whole Secondary Plan Area

Note 1: In respect of sections 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5, the appeal has been scoped to the extent of the corresponding Special Policy Area

Note 2: Area-Specific - GTA West Corridor and certain Special Policy Areas

Exhibit: 10

File #: PL141189

**Consolidated Issues List<sup>1</sup>**

No.	Issue	Parties with an Interest
<b>Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MAH)</b>		
1	Do the policies and schedules under appeal by MAH (MAH-Appealed Policies and Schedules) prematurely grant planning approvals and allow development within the GTA-West Corridor Preliminary Route Planning Study Area (Study Area) in advance of a determination of the GTA-West Corridor Preliminary Route?	Block 47-1 Landowners Group and Block 47-2 Landowners Group (Landowners' Groups)  AMB Highway BP 1 Canco, Inc., AMB Highway BP 2 Canco, Inc., & AMB Highway BP 3 Canco, Inc. (AMB)  Clarkway-Mayfield  Orlando Corporation  Region of Peel
2	Do the MAH-Appealed Policies and Schedules hinder the protection of future transportation corridors and linkages for the Greater Toronto Area?	Landowners' Groups  AMB  Clarkway-Mayfield  Orlando Corporation  Region of Peel
3	Did Council's decision to approve the MAH-Appealed Policies and Schedules have sufficient regard for subsections 2(f), (m), and (p) of the <i>Planning Act</i> ?	Landowners' Groups  AMB  Clarkway-Mayfield

<sup>1</sup> The specific policies and schedules under appeal by each appellant are set out on the attached Matrix of City of Brampton Appeals Against OPA 105 (Highway 427 Industrial Secondary Plan).

		Orlando Corporation Region of Peel Jain Investments
4	Do the MAH-Appealed Policies and Schedules conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, particularly sections 3.2.2.3 and 3.2.4.6?	Landowners' Groups AMB Clarkway-Mayfield Orlando Corporation Region of Peel Jain Investments
5	Are the MAH-Appealed Policies and Schedules consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014, particularly policies 1.1.1 g), 1.6.8.1, and 1.6.8.3?	Landowners' Groups AMB Clarkway-Mayfield Orlando Corporation Region of Peel Jain Investments
<b>Regional Municipality of Peel</b>		
6	Are the policies and schedules under appeal by the Region (Region-Appealed Policies and Schedules) consistent with the intent of the Regional Official Plan?	Landowners' Groups AMB Clarkway-Mayfield Orlando Corporation Jain Investments
7	Do the Region-Appealed Policies and Schedules properly coincide with the Study Area?	Landowners' Groups AMB Clarkway-Mayfield

		Orlando Corporation
<b>Sartor, Pedron, Pellarin, Lus, et. al; 2167942 Ontario Inc.; Bottos, Buffa, Cedin; Iori (Clarkway-Mayfield)</b>		
8	<p>a. Do the policies and schedules under appeal by the Clarkway-Mayfield appellants preclude alterations or adjustments to the limits of the Natural Heritage System, including the Valleylands and Watercourse designation limits, in advance of the completion of the Master Environmental Servicing Plan?</p> <p>b. Are the policies and schedules in respect of the Natural Heritage System, including Valleylands and Watercourse designations appropriate and/or consistent with the City Official Plan and Regional Official Plan?</p> <p>c. Are the limits of the Natural Heritage System, including the Valleylands and Watercourse designation limits, including the 15 metre top of bank buffer limit appropriate and capable of being adjusted during this hearing?</p>	<p>TRCA</p> <p>Landowners' Groups</p> <p>Region of Peel</p>
9	<p>In relation to section 5.1.5, which sets out policies respecting Peel Living, affordable housing, and similar non-profit social housing agencies:</p> <p>a. Do these policies lack appropriate specificity?</p> <p>b. Has the rationale for inclusion of these policies in OPA 105 been specifically outlined and established?</p> <p>c. Should these policies specify how much land, how many sites, and the location of sites required to address the objectives of these policies?</p> <p>d. Are these policies appropriate and consistent with the City Official Plan and/or the Region of Peel Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statements?</p>	<p>Landowners' Groups</p> <p>Region of Peel</p>
10	<p>In relation to section 5.5.2, which indicates that no approval of draft plans, site plans or rezoning shall be permitted until such time as the City of Brampton acquires the Community Park or has entered into an Agreement to ensure the conveyance of the Community Park or has entered into an Agreement to ensure the conveyance of</p>	<p>Landowners' Groups</p> <p>Region of Peel</p>



	<p>the Community Park to the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Are these policies unduly onerous?</li> <li>b. Do these policies result in landowners having no control over the location of Community Parks?</li> <li>c. Are these policies appropriate and/or consistent with the City Official Plan and/or Regional Official Plan?</li> </ul>	
<b>Caveze Investments Limited (Caveze)</b>		
11	<p>Do the policies and schedules under appeal by Caveze ("Caveze-Appealed Policies and Schedules") provide appropriate recognition for properties that are already developed, such as the lands owned by Caveze ("Caveze Lands")?</p>	<p>TRCA Landowners' Groups Region of Peel</p>
12	<p>Do the Caveze-Appealed Policies and Schedules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Inappropriately undermine the ability for the Caveze Lands to facilitate existing uses and the current buildings?</li> <li>b. Inappropriately undermine the ability to expand operations and building areas?</li> <li>c. Impose financial or other obligations on the Caveze Lands that are required for other lands in the area to develop? Are these policies reasonable, fair and equitable?</li> <li>d. Fail to account for the existing and planned function of the Caveze Lands and to constitute good planning?</li> </ul>	<p>TRCA Landowners' Groups Region of Peel</p>
13	<p>Does the introduction of a "new" Collector Road between Coleraine Drive and Regional Road 50, as shown on Schedules D, E and L (SP47(a)), as currently proposed to run through the Caveze Lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Negatively impact on the ability for the existing uses and building areas on the Caveze Lands to operate and expand and undermine Provincial policy?</li> </ul>	<p>Landowners' Groups Orlando Corporation Region of Peel</p>

14	Is the "new" Collector Road between Coleraine Drive and Regional Road 50, as shown on Schedules D, E, and L (SP47(a)), required and/or appropriately sited?	Landowners' Groups Orlando Corporation Region of Peel
15	Are the Active Transportation policies under appeal by Caveze vague and therefore inappropriate? Are the potential road widenings, as contemplated by and described in these policies, appropriate? Do these policies have the effect of giving non-Official Plan policies the force and/or effect of Official Plan policy?	Landowners' Groups Region of Peel

9216337.1

NOTE: The City acknowledges that for policies indicated with an 's' as remaining under appeal on a site-specific or area-specific basis, these Appellants remain at liberty to seek modifications, exceptions, additions or deletions to the text of those policies as they apply to the site or area to which the appeal has been scoped, provided these Appellants shall be bound by the commitments made by them to scope their appeals to a site-specific or area-specific basis. The City will not rely upon the coming into force of a given policy as a basis for opposing an appeal of a policy which has been scoped site-specifically or area-specifically, and its status will be treated the same as a Council-adopted policy for purposes of that appeal. Likewise, the City will not use the 's' as a reason to oppose the changes on jurisdictional or other grounds but is, of course, at liberty to oppose the changes on their planning merits.

Appellant Names are Provided for Convenience and Reference Purpose Only

Appealed Policies	Srator, Pedron, Peljarin, Lus, et. al. <sup>1</sup>	2167942 Ontario Inc. <sup>1</sup>	Bates, Buffa, Cadin <sup>1</sup>	lori <sup>1</sup>	Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing <sup>2</sup>	Region of Peel	Cavezo Investments	Orlando (Non-Appellant Party)
1.0							w	
3.0							s	
4.1(x)							w	
4.2	s	s	s	s				
4.2.2	s	s	s	s				
4.2.3	s	s	s	s				
4.2.14							w	
4.2.17							w	
4.2.19							w	
4.2.28							w	
4.2.32							w	
4.2.32 (iii)	w	w	w	w				
5.1.5	w	w	w	w				
5.1.1.6	w	w	w	w				
5.3.1.2							w	
5.3.9.1							s	
5.3.9.3							s	
5.3.9.6							w	
5.4 (Natural Heritage)	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.1	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.2	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.3	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.4	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.7	s	s	s	s				
5.4.1.10	s	s	s	s				
5.4.2	s	s	s	s				
5.4.2.1	s	s	s	s				
5.4.2.2	s	s	s	s				
5.5.2	w	w	w	w				
6.3	s	s	s	s	s			
6.4	s	s	s	s	s			
6.5	s	s	s	s	s			
6.6.1							w	
7.1	w	w	w	w				
7.1.1							w	
7.1.2							w	
7.1.5							w	
7.1.6							w	
7.1.7							w	
7.1.8							w	
7.1.9							w	
7.1.10							w	
7.1.11							w	
7.2	w	w	w	w	s	s		
7.2.1 (iii)								s
7.2.1 (iv)								s
7.2.2							w	
7.3.2							w	
7.3.6							w	
7.3.7							w	
7.4.2							w	
7.4.7							w	
7.4.8							w	
8.1.3							w	
10 (Community Block Plan)	s	s	s	s				
10.1.2							w	
10.1.3	w	w	w	w				
10.5.1	w	w	w	w				
10.5.2	w	w	w	w				
10.6.1							w	
10.10.2							w	
12 (General Provisions)	s	s	s	s				
12.1.2	s	s	s	s			w	
12.1.3	s	s	s	s				
12.1.4							w	
12.3.2							s	
12.4.1							w	
13.1							w	
Appealed Schedules								
Schedule A	s	s	s	s				
Schedule B	s	s	s	s				
Schedule D					s	s	w	
Schedule E					s	s	w	
Schedule G	s	s	s	s				
Schedule K							w	
Schedule L	s	s	s	s	s	s	w	
Schedule M					s		w	

How to read this chart:

S	Site Specific or Area-Specific Appeal
W	Policy has been appealed as it applies to the whole Secondary Plan Area

Note 1: In respect of sections 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5, the appeal has been scoped to the extent of the corresponding Special Policy Area

Note 2: Area-Specific - GTA West Corridor and certain Special Policy Areas