

July 25, 2025

GSAI File: 054-006

In Memoriam, Founding Partner:
Glen Schnarr

(Via Email)

Hon. Robert Flack
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
777 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3

**RE: Mississauga Official Plan 2051
Eight Acres Limited
2434 – 2490 Shepard Avenue, City of Mississauga
ERO No.: ERO #0250465**

Glen Schnarr and Associates Inc. (GSAI) are the planning consultants to Eight Acres Limited (the "Owner") of the lands municipally known as 2434, 2442, 2466, 2472, 2480, 2484, 2486 and 2490 Shepard Avenue,, in the City of Mississauga (collectively, the 'Subject Lands' or 'Site'). On behalf of the Owner, we are pleased to provide this Comment Letter regarding the Council adopted Mississauga Official Plan 2051, currently under review by the Ministry.

As background, GSAI participated in the Mississauga Official Plan Review initiative ('OP Review initiative') as well as various related City initiatives and provided a Comment Letter identifying areas of concern with the Mississauga Official Plan 2051. A copy of this previous Comment Letter, expressing a range of concerns, is provided in Appendix II of this Letter. As further outlined in this previous Comment Letter and expanded upon in the detailed rationale for requested changes presented in Appendix I of this Letter, we believe there are outstanding concerns with the Mississauga Official Plan 2051 and request the Ministry enact a number of modifications. For brevity, we request that the Ministry consider the following revisions:

- Remove Policies 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 which require sustainability performance that exceeds a municipality's authority;
- Remove onerous housing requirements established by Policies 5.2.3 and 5.2.4;
- Remove the onerous built form-based policy framework and instead implement a broader, more flexible policy framework for guiding where and how development should occur;
- Prevent down-designations and loss of development permissions;
- Introduce modified permissible height on lands within delineated Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSAs);
- Ensure that as-of-right development permissions are not adversely impacted; and,
- Modify the current Official Plan organization and streamline the policy framework for ease of understanding and implementation.



Further rationale to the above requests is provided in Appendix I of this Letter. In summary, we remain concerned with the Mississauga Official Plan 2051 and request that the Ministry consider our proposed modifications. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We wish to be informed of any future decision made.

Yours very truly,

GLEN SCHNARR & ASSOCIATES INC.

Stephanie Matveeva, MCIP, RPP
Associate

cc. Jennifer Le, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Owner

Appendix I / Rationale for Requested Modifications

As stated above, we have reviewed the Mississauga Official Plan 2051, as adopted by Mississauga Council in April 2025. Based on this review, we offer the following comments and rationale for the requested modifications identified above.

1. City Structure & Land Use

Chapter 3, Managing Growth presents a refined growth management framework for the City. More specifically, Chapter 3 outlines how growth and development is to be managed across the City up to the year 2051 in accordance with a refined City Structure. The City Structure is comprised of various components, each with its own characteristics. The City Structure is visually demonstrated on Schedule 1 and is then reinforced in policy throughout the Official Plan, but beginning in Chapter 3. More specifically, Chapter 3.3 and Schedule 1 provide further direction and clarity on the City Structure framework which is to guide planning decisions. We highlight that the Subject Lands continue to be identified as being located within the Hospital Growth Centre component of the City Structure. Given this, the Subject Lands are subject to Character Area-specific policy considerations, parent land use designation policy considerations, Major Transit Station Area policy considerations and are subject to a Special Site Policy. While we support the continued use of a policy framework, organized and structured by the City Structure, the inclusion of the Subject Lands within the Hospital Growth Centre component and the other policy considerations that any development must consider, may challenge the delivery of a refined, optimized, redevelopment form in an appropriate location in the future. Given the Site is in a peripheral location, is underutilized, is in proximity to various higher order transit services, we remain of the opinion that greater flexibility is required in terms of maximum permitted heights as further described below to enable contextually appropriate development to be introduced. Furthermore, redevelopment of underutilized sites such as this is a Provincial objective, contained in the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024.

2. Sustainability

Chapter 4, Sustaining the Natural Environment provides the refined policy framework for how lands and resources are to be managed. This includes policies which relate to how development is to respond to a changing climate. Of particular concern are Policy 4.2.2, Policy 4.2.3 and Policy 4.2.4 which state:

‘4.2.2. *Mississauga will support the planning and design of new communities and buildings that aim to achieve near net zero emissions.*’

‘4.2.3. *Mississauga will support efforts to protect against the impacts of the changing climate with adaptation measures that make the city more resilient to climate change impacts including extreme weather events.*’

‘4.2.4. *Mississauga will build communities that are compact, low-carbon, mixed-use and transit-supportive. The City will promote renewable energy, energy conservation and efficient design. These initiatives will reduce greenhouse gases and help the city achieve its emission targets.*’

Collectively, the above-noted policies provide policy strength for sustainability initiatives and measures, such as the recently Council adopted City of Mississauga Green Development Standards. The above policies are unnecessary and in practice, serve to encourage Staff to require onerous sustainability measures that endeavour to require development proponents to implement features and technologies that are well above and beyond what is required by the Ontario Building Code. In practice, these policy objectives may also serve to hinder effective and efficient development as the City's sustainability framework does not apply until a proponent is pursuing Site Plan Approval. Put another way, currently, development proponents may be required to re-consider development treatments and technologies when the approval process is concluding, which leads to ever increasing costs to deliver development where development ought to occur. This practice is contrary to the authority granted municipalities by the Ontario Building Code Act and is contrary to the recent clarification provided by Bill 17 which states that municipalities cannot and could in fact never require proponents to implement technologies and performance standards that go above and beyond what is mandatory under the Ontario Building Code. Given this, we request that the above-noted policies be removed so that the policy requirements are clear and a municipality's authority is not extended beyond what is permissible.

3. Housing

Chapter 5 provides the refined City-wide housing policy framework. We remain concerned with the housing policy framework as adopted. Of particular concern are Policies 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 which state:

- '5.2.3. *To achieve a balanced mix of unit types and sizes, and support the creation of housing suitable for families, development containing more than 50 new residential units is encouraged to include 50 percent of a mix of 2-bedroom units and 3-bedroom units. The City may reduce these percentages where development is providing:*
- a. social housing or other publicly funded housing; or*
 - b. additional needs housing such as residences owned and operated by a post-secondary institution or a health care institution or other entities to house students, patients, employees or people with specific needs.'*
- '5.2.4. *The City will plan for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities that contributes to achieving the following housing targets:*
- 1. 30 percent of all new housing units are affordable housing (rental and ownership), of which 50 percent of all affordable housing units are encouraged to be affordable to low-income households. The majority of units affordable to low-income households are anticipated to be rental and will include units such as subsidized housing, supportive housing, emergency shelter beds, and transitional housing; and*
 - 2. 25 percent of all new housing units are rental tenure. These rental units include private rental market and non-market units.'*

The above-noted policies are concerning and require revision. With regard to Policy 5.2.3, the policy as adopted is overly restrictive. While the word "encouraged" is appreciated in the policy, in practice, the policy has and will continue to be used to demand development proponents include a significant proportion of larger, family-sized units. The desire for 50% of all residential units to include 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom unit configurations will challenge the delivery of much needed housing units in appropriate locations to satisfy Provincial policy objectives and local Housing Pledges, in the midst of a Provincial housing crisis. Furthermore, the policy objective of encouraging 50% of all new units to be

family-sized is contrary to Provincial objectives which do not specify this and is also a significant departure from the objectives of neighbouring jurisdictions such as the City of Toronto, where 25% of units are encouraged to be larger family-sized units through the City of Toronto's Growing Up Urban Design Guidelines. We request that the Ministry remove Policy 5.2.3.

Policy 5.2.4 is also concerning and should be removed. In accordance with in-effect legislation, a municipality cannot require affordable housing units to be provided unless a property is located within an Inclusionary Zoning Area. Policy 5.2.4 requires revision to ensure compliance with legislation and change from a policy requirement that affordable housing units be provided regardless of a Site's location. We also highlight that Peel Region Housing and the non-profit sector will and should continue to play a pivotal role in the delivery of affordable housing. This is reaffirmed in the City of Mississauga's Partners in Homebuilding: Mayor's Housing Task Force Report.

4. Built Form

The Mississauga Official Plan 2051 provides a refined, built form-based policy framework. This framework is first established in Chapter 8, Well Designed Healthy Communities which provides policy direction for matters related to built form, site design, building organization and more. The built form-based policy framework is then referenced and reinforced throughout the remaining land use and Character Area policies of the Official Plan. We remain concerned with the transition to a built-form based policy framework. In particular, we are concerned with the proposed land use designation framework based on built form which can serve to restrict development opportunities rather than fostering them. In particular, the built form-based policy framework is overly prescriptive, results in onerous policy criteria to be satisfied and elevates urban design guidance to policy. For example, the general built form and site development policies contained in Chapter 8 of the Official Plan serve to restrict development opportunities, implement restrictive built form policies such as requiring that a built form relate to the right-of-way onto which it fronts, implements restrictive setback requirements, implements restrictive podium-tower requirements and also implements a restrictive minimum 30 metre tower separation as policy, whereas tower separation was formally outlined in the area-specific Built Form Standards. Given the above, we request that the elevation of urban design guidance to policy and the built-form based policy framework be reconsidered and eliminated to enable flexibility and high-quality built forms that effectively and appropriately respond to local conditions.

Chapter 8.6.1 also contains a policy definition for how low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise buildings are to be interpreted. We oppose this policy definition and request that the definitions and characterizations of built form typologies be removed.

5. Transition

Given that Chapter 8 provides the refined built form and site development policy framework, we remain concerned that specific urban design guidance has been elevated to policy. More specifically, we are concerned with Policies 8.2.9.c) and Policy 8.6.2.5. Policy 8.2.9.c) states that the City's vision will be supported by site development that demonstrates context sensitivity and transition, while Policy 8.6.2.5 which states that transition can be achieved through the use of setbacks, stepping down of buildings, angular plane, separation distances and other means. As stated above, there are a multitude of ways that transition can be provided. There is also ambiguity given transition is not a defined term.

In our opinion, elevating appropriate transition and the ways that transition, including the use of angular plane provisions, can be achieved from urban design guidance to policy is alarming. This concern is furthered by Urban Design Guidelines, which are applied as companion documents to the Official Plan, which suggest that a development application conform to a 45 degree angular plane, without specifying how the angular plane is to be applied. Any policy or guidance requiring that an angular plane be applied as a means to control transition is overly restrictive, misleading and contrary to good practice. In our opinion, any angular plane requirement should be removed from the Official Plan. Angular planes are one of many urban design guidance tools that can and should remain in the area-specific Built Form Standards, if at all. Elevating such urban design guidance to policy will restrict development and efficient, high-quality built forms where development ought to be directed in the midst of a Provincial housing crisis. Furthermore, the inclusion of angular planes and other urban design guidance in policy is contrary to Provincial objectives and contrary to the findings of the City of Mississauga Mayor's Task Force. Finally, the continued inclusion of such policies to require transition be provided in such manners with frustrate expeditious development approvals and will also result in costly, inefficient built forms. As an example, the requirement that built forms respect an angular plane results in substantially reduced gross floor area, a reduced number of dwelling units to be accommodated, and terraced built forms that are costly to construct and significantly less energy efficient than would otherwise be the case. We also highlight that given the above implications, neighbouring jurisdictions such as the City of Toronto have recently updated their Built Form or Urban Design Guidelines to eliminate the practice of angular planes. Based on the above, we request that the built form policies be modified to eliminate the practice and policy requirement that will lead to inefficient and costly built forms to be mandated.

6. Additional PMTSA Height Permissions

Chapter 11 of the Official Plan contains the City's Major Transit Station Area policy framework. Given the Subject Lands are located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area (PMTSA), the Site is understood to have recognized development potential. To be clear, we are supportive of the policy framework that specifies that compact, dense development can and should be directed to PMTSAs. We are however not supportive of the restrictive height permission policies that apply to lands within a delineated PMTSA. As adopted, Schedule 8 of the Official Plan states that lands within a PMTSA are assigned a maximum permissible height. Of relevance to the Subject Lands, Schedule 8 identifies that the maximum permitted height for the Site is 3 – 8 storeys, while surrounding and adjacent lands have maximum height permissions that well exceed this threshold. More specifically, lands immediately west that have frontage along Hurontario Street have height permissions of 3- 25 storeys. In our opinion, this significant difference in permissible building heights is unnecessarily restrictive and requires revision. We request that an even distribution of height be applied to all lands within the Queensway PMTSA, within which the Site is located, be applied. While we appreciate certain development constraints on lands within the Queensway PMTSA, the Subject Lands are not subject to these same environmental-related constraints given the Site is outside of a Natural Hazards policy overlay and is sufficiently separated from the nearby Cooksville Creek by lands on the east side of Shepard Avenue and Shepard Avenue itself. For clarity, we request that the maximum height on the Subject Lands also be increased to 25 storeys, to be in line with permitted heights on adjacent and surrounding lands. We highlight that while there is a policy mechanism to permit additional height on lands within a PMTSA established by Policy 11.3.3.2, the criteria established by this policy is overly restrictive such as the requirement that a proponent demonstrate that full funding is secured for planned higher order transit improvements. The onus for a property owner is demonstrate funding status of Provincial transit improvements is inappropriate. We remain of the opinion that more flexible policy, such as that established by Policy 11.3.3.4 is required for lands within PMTSA lands.

7. Organization

A final overarching concern is the length and organization of the Mississauga Official Plan. As adopted, the Mississauga Official Plan, exclusive of implementing Schedules, is 713 pages in length. This is a significant and overly complicated policy framework meant to guide how growth and development occurs across the City of Mississauga up to the year 2051. We respectfully request the Ministry to require modifications to streamline and simplify the local policy framework so that broader, overall policy objectives are identified. Simplification of the Official Plan would enable the Official Plan to function as intended – as a strategic document which provides policy guidance. Further detail regarding matters such as setbacks, angular planes, etcetera can and should be provided either through companion documents such as Secondary Plans, Urban Design Guidelines or the implementing Zoning By-law. This approach would also ensure consistency with how Official Plans are crafted for neighbouring jurisdictions such as the City of Brampton, Town of Oakville, Town of Milton and the City of Toronto. Furthermore, a streamlined Official Plan would enable a document that is more easily accepted, can be understood by community members and would support the Provincial objective of Bill 17 for a consistent planning framework for lands across the Province of Ontario.

Conclusion

In summary, we remain concerned about the policy directions outlined in the Mississauga Official Plan 2051 and continue to request that modifications be made.



Appendix II / Previous Comment Letters

March 15, 2024

GSAI File: 054-006

(Via Email)

Chairman and Members of the Planning and Development Committee

City of Mississauga

300 City Centre Drive

Mississauga, ON L3B 3C1

**RE: Mississauga Official Plan 2051
Eight Acres Limited
2434 – 2490 Shepard Avenue, City of Mississauga**

Glen Schnarr and Associates Inc (GSAI) are the planning consultants to Eight Acres Limited (the "Owner") of the lands municipally known as 2434, 2442, 2466, 2472, 2480, 2484, 2486, 2490 Shepard Avenue, in the City of Mississauga (the 'Subject Lands' or 'Site'). On behalf of the Owner, and further to the Mississauga Official Plan Review Comment Letters, submitted by GSAI, dated June 23, 2023 and July 31, 2023, we are submitting this Comment Letter in relation to the ongoing Mississauga Official Plan Review initiative.

GSAI has been participating in the Mississauga Official Plan Review initiative ('OP Review initiative') as well as various related City initiatives. We understand that when complete, the City's OP Review initiative will culminate in a new draft Official Plan (the 'Mississauga Official Plan 2051') that will modify the policy framework permissions for lands across the City, including the Subject Lands.

The Subject Lands are located on the west side of Shepard Avenue, north of Paisley Boulevard East. The Site, which is an assembly of parcels, is currently improved with eight (8) detached dwellings and a selection of accessory, detached structures. Forested areas are also present. Based on the in-effect planning policy framework, the Site is located within the Downtown Hospital Character Area, within the Downtown Mississauga Urban Growth Centre, within a Strategic Growth Area (in accordance with Schedule E-2, Strategic Growth Areas, Region of Peel Official Plan), within the Queensway Major Transit Station Area (in accordance with Schedule E-5, Major Transit Station Areas, Region of Peel Official Plan), and is designated 'Residential High Density' (in accordance with Schedule 10, Land Use Designations, Mississauga Official Plan). Based on the above, the Site has recognized development potential.

When considered collectively, the in-effect policy framework identifies the Subject Lands as an appropriate and desirable location for higher density, compact, transit-supportive development to occur. This is strengthened by the Site's locational characteristics of being within 300 metres of the Hazel McCallion Light Rail Transit ('LRT') network and various street-level transit services. Additionally, the Subject Lands are located within walking distance of various services, amenities, facilities, parks and greenspaces to meet the daily needs of residents and support Downtown Hospital as a vibrant, complete, 15-minute community.

We have reviewed the draft Mississauga Official Plan 2051, released on February 12, 2024, and offer the following comments.

The draft policies propose revisions to Chapters 3 (Directing New Development), 5 (Housing Choices), 8 (Well Designed Healthy Communities), 10 (Land Use Designations), 11 (Transit Communities), 12 (Urban Growth Centre), 16 (Special Sites) and select Schedules. We support the move to a modified policy framework to guide how growth is to be managed in accordance with Provincial, Regional and local policy initiatives and the release of a complete, draft Official Plan so that the evolving policy framework can be evaluated in its totality. Based on our review of the Mississauga Official Plan 2051, we have a number of concerns as further outlined below.

Chapter 3: Directing New Development

In accordance with the in-effect Provincial and Regional policy frameworks, the Mississauga Official Plan introduces a new term – Strategic Growth Areas. Section 3.3.1 provides the policy framework for how growth and development is to be managed across Strategic Growth Area lands. We understand that Strategic Growth Areas are those lands located within the Downtown Mississauga Urban Growth Centre, in Major Node Character Areas, in Community Node Character Areas and within Major Transit Station Areas. In accordance with the policy framework and Map 3-1, Strategic Growth Areas, the Subject Lands are located within a Strategic Growth Area. We support the identification and policy directions identified for Strategic Growth Areas, which collectively identify Strategic Growth Area lands as those areas of the City where a mix of land uses, and higher density, transit-supportive development ought to occur to support the achievement of complete communities.

Chapter 5: Housing Choices and Affordable Homes

A new housing-related policy framework is proposed and is presented in Chapter 5, Housing Choices and Affordable Homes. Policies 5.2.2, 5.2.4, 5.2.5 and Table 5.1 as stated below are particularly concerning:

'5.2.2. Phased development will have a range and mix of housing types for each development phase.'

The purpose of this policy is unclear. As written, the policy appears to place an obligation on development proponents to provide a range of housing types, without specifying what is meant by housing type. For example, as written, the policy could be interpreted to require that each development phase is required to provide two or more housing types, such as apartment-style units, ground-oriented units, townhouse-style units, etcetera. The requirement for each development phase to provide a variety of housing types can be problematic and can challenge the ability to deliver high-quality housing options for current and future residents. In our opinion, the policy should be revised to encourage phased developments to provide a range and mixture of housing units, thereby removing reference to housing type.

'5.2.4. To achieve a balanced mix of unit types and sizes, and support the creation of housing suitable for families, development containing more than 50 new residential units is encouraged to include a minimum of 50 percent of a mix of 2-bedroom units and 3-bedroom units. The City may reduce these percentages where development is providing:

- *social housing or other publicly funded housing; or*
- *specialized housing such as residences owned and operated by a post-secondary institution or a health care institution or other entities to house students, patients employees or people with special needs'*

We note that the above-noted policy has been revised since the previous draft policy was presented in the Bundle 3 draft of the Mississauga Official Plan in May of 2023. Specifically, the percentage of larger units has increased from the current drafted 50% target from the previous draft policy which stated 30%, while the language has also changed to include the phrase “encouraged”. The re-phrasing and use of the word “encourage” is supported; however, we remain concerned with the policy as drafted. In our opinion, the above-noted policy should be modified to encourage a reduced percentage (20% or less) of larger, family-sized units (understood as being two-bedroom units or larger) based on market trends. The requirement for half (50%) of units to be of a certain type will challenge Provincial, Regional and local policy objectives of delivering a variety of affordable and attainable housing options for current and future residents. It may also challenge the delivery of housing units in appropriate locations that are in proximity to existing and planned transit networks and support the creation of complete communities, while also being in the midst of a Provincial housing crisis.

'5.2.5. The City will plan for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities by implementing Regional housing unit targets shown in Table 5.1'

Table 5.1 – Peel-Wide New Housing Unit Targets

<i>Target Area</i>	<i>Targets</i>
<i>Affordability</i>	<i>That 30% of all new housing units are affordable housing, of which 50% of all affordable housing units are encouraged to be affordable to low income households</i>
<i>Rental</i>	<i>That 25% of all new housing units are rental tenure</i>
<i>Density</i>	<i>That 50% of all new housing units are in forms other than detached and semi-detached houses. Note: These targets are based on housing need as identified in the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan and Regional Housing Strategy</i>

The above-noted policy and Table 5.1, as written, are concerning. Use of the Region-wide housing targets, as established by Policy 5.2.5 and Table 5.1 are concerning as the housing-related targets have not been adapted nor studied to ensure applicability at the smaller, City-wide scale. Furthermore, the requirement in Table 5.1 that 30% percent of all new housing units are to be affordable housing units and the requirement that 25% of all new housing units be rental in tenure are concerning and will challenge the rapid delivery of housing units, in appropriate locations. Furthermore, the requirement for affordable units, regardless of a property’s location, is contrary to in-effect Provincial and Regional policy objectives, which state that affordable housing units are legislated requirements in Inclusionary

Zoning Areas. The policy requirement that 30% of all new housing units across the City of Mississauga be affordable housing, without identifying how affordable housing units are to be understood, is concerning. We request that Table 5.1 be modified so as to relate to housing targets at the City-wide scale and to reflect that affordable housing units are to be provided through the application of Inclusionary Zoning.

Chapter 8: Well Designed Healthy Communities

A new urban design-related policy framework is proposed and is presented in Chapter 8, Well Designed Healthy Communities. Policies 8.4.1.17, 8.4.5.2 and 8.6.2.5 as stated below are particularly concerning:

'8.4.1.17. Built form will relate to the width of the street right-of-way.'

As written, this policy is concerning and requires modification. In our opinion, the requirement for a built form to have a relationship to the width of the public Right-of-Way ("ROW") on which it fronts is inappropriate. As written, the policy will apply a one-size-fits-all approach to sites across the City, regardless of their location and unique contexts. Furthermore, a limitation of building height to relate to the ROW width will challenge the ability to provide efficient, high-quality, refined, compact, mixed-use, transit supportive development forms in the desired locations. This policy requires revision to eliminate a universal application of building height limits based on a site's location along a street.

'8.4.5.2. Privately owned publicly accessible spaces will be designed in accordance with the city's standards for public open spaces.'

The above-noted policy is concerning and is vague. In our opinion, the above-noted policy requires revision to provide for sufficient flexibility based on a site's locational attributes. The statement that Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces (POPS) be designed in accordance with City Standards is concerning given City Standards for public open spaces do not always reflect the as-built condition of encumbered lands being provided as privately owned, publicly accessible spaces. Furthermore, greater acknowledgement is required that POPS of varying size and locations can be successfully planned, designed and delivered in various ways. Based on the above, we request that the above-noted policy be modified to encourage compliance with City Standards and that conformance with the City's Standard for public open spaces not be required in this instance.

'8.6.2.5. Transitions between buildings with different heights will be achieved by providing a gradual change in height and massing. This will be done through the use of a variety of methods including setbacks, the stepping down of buildings, the general application of a 45 degree angular plane, separation distances and other means in accordance with Council-approved plans and design guidelines.'

The above-noted policy is concerning. In our opinion, the above-noted policy requires revision to exclude the requirement that any development be required to conform to a 45 degree angular plane. As the policy suggests, there are various ways of ensuring appropriate transition can be provided. In our opinion, a policy requirement that a development application conform to a 45 degree angular plane, without specifying how the angular plane is to be applied, is overly restrictive and unnecessary. In our opinion, the angular plane requirement should be removed from the above-noted policy.

Chapter 10: Land Use Designations

The draft MOP proposes refinements to the land use policy framework and an evolution towards a built form-based policy framework. This evolution and associated policy refinements are concerning. In accordance with the draft Schedule 7, Land Use Designations, a number of properties across the City, including the Subject Lands, have been re-designated. In our opinion, there are instances where this is akin to down designations and if adopted, would result in the loss of development permissions in comparison to existing permissions.

In the case of the Subject Lands, the proposed re-designation from 'Residential High Density' to 'Residential Low Rise II' is troubling. Furthermore, the proposed 'Residential Low Rise II' designation identified on Schedule 7 is inconsistent and conflicts with the 'Residential High Density' designation identified for the Site on Schedule 8l. Given that the Site is located within a Strategic Growth Area, is within the Urban Growth Centre, and is within a Protected Major Transit Station Area, the Site's designation requires re-evaluation. In our opinion, the 'Residential High Density' designation is the most appropriate and should be recognized. This designation would also further implement the City's evolving built form-based height permissions.

Chapter 11: Transit Communities

The draft Official Plan proposes to provide a policy framework for lands within Major Transit Station Areas ('MTSAs'). The delineation and land use designations assigned to Protected MTSA (PMTSA) lands are presented in Schedules 8a through 8r. We highlight that the land use designations identified on these Schedules do not align with the land use designations and policy framework presented in Chapter 10. This discrepancy is concerning and requires modification.

Furthermore, Chapter 11 provides for a policy framework that appears to be informed by the City's previous Official Plan Amendments 143 and 144. We highlight that OPA 143 and 144 are not in full force and effect, given they remain before the Region of Peel for approval. Therefore, the inclusion of Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) policies in this draft and presented in this manner is concerning.

In accordance with Schedule 8l, the Subject Lands are identified as being located within the Queensway Protected Major Transit Station Area (PMTSA), as being designated 'Residential High Density' and as having a maximum building height permission of 3 to 8 storeys. We support the inclusion of the Subject Lands within the Queensway PMTSA given the Site's locational attributes. However, we request that additional policy direction be provided to determine how development applications which seek building heights above and beyond those established by the MTSA Schedule are to be evaluated. In the case of the Subject Lands, while the height permissions are appreciated, they are also unnecessarily restrictive particularly given lands immediately west have much greater height permissions. The current height permissions will challenge the ability of the Site to accommodate the provision of a high-quality, refined, efficient, compact, mixed-use development that supports the Provincial and Regional objectives for MTSA lands.

Chapter 12: Urban Growth Centre:

Revisions are contemplated in Chapter 12 for lands formerly located within the Downtown component of the City Structure. We highlight that the term Downtown has been replaced with the term Urban Growth Centre throughout the policies. In accordance with Chapter 12 as drafted, the Subject Lands are located within the Urban Growth Centre and the Hospital Character Area of the Urban Growth Centre.

Section 12.1.2 provides a series of urban design policies that are to apply across all lands in the Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Urban Growth Centre Character Areas. Of concern is Map 12-1.2 which identifies a series of future pedestrian connection and public park locations across this area of the City. While we support the desire for appropriately placed parks or publicly accessible open spaces, as well as mid-block pedestrian connections, our concern is there is implementing policy to award flexibility in the final location of the parks, open spaces or pedestrian connections. Furthermore and in the case of the Subject Lands, a pedestrian connection is desired in two locations, along the northern and southern property lines. Should these connections be required, which are identified as to be unencumbered, 20 metre pathway cross-sections in the Council adopted Downtown Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Built Form Standards, this would bisect the Site and adversely impact the development potential of the lands. We request that clarity, in the form of new implementation policy, be provided that the location and mechanism to secure these desired pedestrian connections be determined on a site-by-site basis and through the technical evaluation of a development application.

Sections 12.3 and 12.6 present a refined policy framework for lands within the Hospital Urban Growth Centre Character Area. We are concerned with the refined policy framework and in particular, Policies 12.3.2.1 and 12.5.4.2.

- '12.3.2.1. New buildings will achieve a high quality urban design and built form, and will be designed and located to:*
- a. create a transition in height generally consistent with a 45 degree angular plane that is measured from the property line adjacent to Residential Low Rise I and II land use designations;*
 - b. generally maintain a minimum separation distance of 30 metres between portions of buildings that are greater than six storeys;*
 - c. add visual interest by varying the massing of buildings; and*
 - d. promote visibility and interest from the street through the use of high quality materials and architectural detailing in the design of podium.'*

The above-noted policy has incorporated urban design-related objectives into policy. In particular, the requirement that a 45 degree angular plane be respected when lands are adjacent to designated Residential Low Density I and II lands as well as the policy requirement that a 30 metre tower separation distance be provided. The inclusion of these urban design objectives into policy is concerning. In our opinion, the above-noted policy requires modification to include more flexibility and to recognize that appropriate transitions can be provided in a number of ways. The above-noted policy is unnecessarily restrictive and will serve to hinder the ability for lands to redevelop in support of the development vision for the Hospital Urban Growth Centre Character Area.

Similarly, we are concerned with the revised Hospital Urban Growth Centre Character Area policy framework as presented in Section 12.6. Our concerns with these policies, which appear to be a repetition of the policies enacted by City Council following the 2022 Downtown Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Policy Review, have been previously noted in our earlier comment letters. We remain concerned with the evolving policy framework for lands within the Hospital Urban Growth Centre area of the City. Of particular concern is Policy 12.6.3 which states:

- '12.6.3.2. On lands designated Residential High-Rise and Mixed Use, the maximum permitted building height as shown on Schedule 8: Protected Major Transit Station Area (Schedule 8I) may be exceeded by up to three storeys without an amendment to this Plan, subject to meeting the*

building transition policies of this Plan, where a development provided additional non-residential uses, including community infrastructure. One additional storey in building height may be permitted for every 900 square metres of non-residential gross floor area (GFA) provided above the first storey. This does not include amenity space, above grade parking or ground floor non-residential uses, where required by the policies of this Plan.'

As stated above, we are concerned with the identified maximum building height permission contemplated. While we appreciate the above-noted policy enables additional permitted height without requiring an Amendment, we are concerned with the assertion that additional height can be provided in exchange for a specified amount of additional non-residential areas, above the ground floor. In our opinion, the policy as drafted does not adequately accommodate the evolving context of the community nor changing market trends. The requirement to provide additional non-residential uses and area above the ground level does not adequately accommodate a developer's ability to right-size the non-residential areas to be provided and facilitate an optimal site design. We continue to request that the policy be modified to enable additional height to be permitted, subject to differing evaluation criteria.

Chapter 16: Special Sites

Revisions are contemplated to the Special Site policy framework. Specifically, a new Chapter 16 is contemplated which presents all Special Site policies, presented in sequential order, rather than as components of the parent Character Area policies. Of relevance to the Subject Lands, the Site is identified as being located within and subject to Special Site 117 (Downtown Hospital – UGC) and policies 16.117.1 and 16.117.2. Policy 16.117.2 continues to require that prior a development application proceeding, additional study is required to clarify a two-zone floodplain management concept. We support the continuation of this policy given the site-specific characteristics of the Subject Lands.

In summary, we are concerned about the proposed policy directions outlined in the draft Mississauga Official Plan 2051 and request that modifications be made. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Our Client wishes to be included in the engagement for the Mississauga Official Plan Review initiative and wishes to be informed of updates, future meetings and the ability to review and provide comments on the final Official Plan prior to adoption.

We look forward to being involved. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if there are any questions.

Yours very truly,

GLEN SCHNARR & ASSOCIATES INC.



Glen Broll, MCIP, RPP
Managing Partner



Stephanie Matveeva, MCIP, RPP
Associate

cc. Owner
Councillor Damerla
Ben Philips, Project Manager, Official Plan Review