

July 21, 2025

GSAI File: 1016-010

(Via Email)

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

**RE: Mississauga Official Plan 2051
Morguard MCC Limited
33, 55, 77 and 201 City Centre Drive, City of Mississauga
ERO No.: ERO #0250465**

Glen Schnarr and Associates Inc. (GSAI) are the planning consultants to Morguard MCC Limited (the “Owner”) of the lands municipally known as 33, 55, 77 and 201 City Centre Drive, in the City of Mississauga (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, the Owner and GSAI participated in the Mississauga Official Plan Review initiative (‘OP Review initiative’) as well as various related City initiatives and provided various Comment Letters identifying areas of concern with the Mississauga Official Plan 2051. A copy of these previous Comment Letters, expressing a range of concerns, are provided in Appendix II of this Letter. As further outlined in these previous Comment Letters 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;
- Remove restrictive and onerous office replacement policies; 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.



Jim Levac, MCIP, RPP
Partner



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 and offer the following comments and rationale for the requested modifications identified above.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 the policies suggest, there are various ways and tools available to ensure appropriate transition can be provided. There is also ambiguity given transition is not defined. 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 concerning. This concern is furthered by the above-noted policies 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 requiring that an angular plane be applied as a means to control transition is overly restrictive, misleading and contrary to good practice. If this policy is not met, an Official Plan Amendment would become necessary, notwithstanding that a redevelopment proposal may be appropriate. In our opinion, any angular plane requirement should be removed from the above-noted policies. Angular planes are one of many urban design guidance tools that can and should remain in the area-specific Built Form Standards. 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 the findings of the Mayor's Task Force which highlighted that urban design considerations can be an added hurdle or hindrance to expedited development approvals. This would be the case if urban design guidelines became policy as adopted.

5. Office & Office Replacement

Throughout the Official Plan, there is policy direction which specifies that lands across the Downtown Core, which includes the Subject Lands, are encouraged to have major office development accommodated. This is concerning given the post-pandemic reality and current market trends. Put another way, in the time since the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been an elevated office vacancy rate. Given this, certain lands are underutilized and can be better utilized for compact, transit-supportive, mixed use development. Policies which encourage office uses to be directed to certain areas, including the Downtown Core are inappropriate and contrary to Provincial objectives which encourage a mixture and range of uses in compact development forms to accommodate transit supportive forms and daily needs. The Subject Lands have locational attributes that lend it to being a prime development site to accommodate compact, transit-supportive, mixed-use development. However, based on the adopted policy permissions, given the Site's location within the City's Downtown Core component of the City Structure, an inappropriate and undesirable amount of office uses are encouraged by policy. This is a concern given our experience with Staff who interpret the word "encourage" to continually challenge developments which do not provide for major office uses and thereby delay the processing of good planning proposals.

This is furthered by Policy 10.2.7.4 which states that redevelopment of sites designated Downtown Mixed Use with substantial office uses should maintain the existing gross floor area (GFA) of these uses. Policy 10.2.7.4 in its entirety requires removal. The Subject Lands are currently occupied by existing, underutilized office structures. The Sites are also located within an area of the City where the most compact, tallest and densest development ought occur. However, Policy 10.2.7.4 severely restricts the ability for the Subject Lands to appropriately redevelop in a manner that provides much needed housing units in the midst of a Provincial housing crisis and restricts the owner's ability to provide an appropriate, desirable and locally informed range and mixture of non-residential uses to suit daily needs. Furthermore, office replacement policies which encourage a development to provide the same amount of existing office space to be replaced in a development does not adequately capture market trends, does not enable a property owner to 'right-size' the space to avoid significant void areas and does not reflect best practices. In our opinion, this policy is inappropriate given there is in-effect Provincial direction to encourage intensification and mixed use development, particularly in proximity to transit.

The collective policy directions outlined above requiring major office uses be directed to lands with proximity to transit services, infrastructure and amenities should be removed.

6. 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 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

Via Email

July 26, 2023

File: 1016-007

City of Mississauga
Planning and Building Department
City Planning Strategies Division
300 City Centre Drive,
Mississauga ON, L5B 3C1

Attn: Ms. Sharleen Bayovo, Project Lead
Mississauga Official Plan Review

Re: **Mississauga Official Plan Review – Bundle # 3**
Comments on Proposed New Official Plan Policies


Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. (GSAI) are planning consultants to Morguard Corporation who own a number Employment, Mixed Use and Residential sites throughout the City of Mississauga. We recognize that the Bundle # 3 policies are still of a preliminary nature, but appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on a new emerging policy frame work before a draft consolidated new Official Plan is released to the public. We appreciate any consideration you are able to provide at this early earlier stage in the process. While Morguard Corporation own dozens of sites across the City, we are providing comments at this stage on a select few sites where we see potential issues that we feel should be brought to the City's attention in advance of a consolidated Draft Official Plan being released. Among those sites are the following:

2869 Battleford Road


2869 Battleford Road is located at the northwest corner of Battleford Road and Glen Erin Drive. As depicted below, the subject lands (identified with a yellow "X") are currently designated "Residential High Density" in the 2010 Mississauga Official Plan. These lands are within the Meadowvale Community Node where they abut Meadowvale Town Centre. Community Nodes are areas designated to attract concentrations of mixed and higher density uses. The proposed Bundle # 3 Land Use Schedule and corresponding new Section 10.1.5.12 policies propose a new "Mid-Rise Residential" designation on these lands as depicted below. The proposed new Mid-Rise policies limit heights under the Mid-Rise designation to 8 storeys unless increased heights are permitted under Local Area Plan Character Area of Special Site Policies which allow heights to increase to a maximum of 12 storeys. What is proposed is tantamount to a "down

designation” of this site from a High-Rise designation to a Mid-Rise designation, seemingly without any justification considering the site is with a Mall Based Community Node. This further conflicts with the City’s recently enacted OPA 115 (Reimagining Mall) which is under appeal and pending the forthcoming Phase 2 hearing on height and density. OPA 115 acknowledges this as a high density designated site and proposes a maximum height of 15 storeys as a Mall Based Node. Therefore, as proposed, the Bundle 3 policies and designation conflict with OPA 115 that predates it. We would respectfully request that the Residential High Density designation be maintained on this site and that any future height or density limits or schedules be left blank until the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) has issued their Order on the pending Phase 2 hearing appeal.

Current 2010 Official Plan: Residential High Density



Proposed Bundle 3 Redesignation: Mid Rise Residential



Downtown Core Sites: 33/55/77 and 201 City Centre Drive

From our reading, there are no policy revisions within Bundle 3 to the current 12.1.3.5 policies that state, ***“Redevelopment of existing office buildings that results in the loss of office space will not be permitted unless the same amount of office space is retained or replaced through new development.”*** In the post pandemic world, we believe that 1-1 office replacement is not feasible and that this policy needs to be either repealed or updated, which doesn’t appear to be the case. We are not suggesting that no new office development should occur in Downtown Core, but based on recent experiences we have had with the Camrost redevelopment, a significantly small amount of office replacement may be warranted in response to what is expected to be a continued decline in office demand in the Downtown Core and elsewhere in Mississauga as working patterns continue to change. Has the City of Mississauga undertaken or commissioned any post-pandemic studies of this nature to assess future office demand?

Sections 12.2.5.1 – 12.2.5.5 (Urban Growth Centre) proposes a series of new parks and linear connections that could potentially impact the future redevelopment of 55 and 77 City Centre Drive that are on a prominent intersection of the City Centre in the Hurontario District. Further, Section 12.2.7.9 and Map 12-2-5 describe and delineate the Downtown Core Long Term Street Network and Classification which essentially change the alignment of City Centre Drive in this vicinity from circular road to a grid network with both the realignment and addition of new streets. In this regard, we would request that new language be inserted into the forthcoming consolidated Draft Official Plan that provides better flexibility for the future location of any future urban parkettes or new intersections or connecting roads based on either the receipt of new redevelopment plans/master plans or the City initiation of block or precinct plans.

1477/1547 Mississauga Valley Boulevard

Morguard Corporation own a 3.3 acre vacant parcel fronting onto Central Parkway East, east of Mississauga Valley Boulevard. These lands are within the Downtown Fairview Protected MTSA which is also an Urban Growth Centre given its proximity of existing transit and amenities. As both the proposed new MTSA policies (OPA 141) and the new Downtown Fairview (OPA 145) are subject to pending appeals, there should be no new height limitations imposed within this or any MTSA until these appeals have been addressed at the LRT.

1891 Rathburn Road East

The subject property contains a district sized shopping centre and remains designated “Mixed Use” under the new Bundle 3 policies. While these lands are not within a planned or protected MTSA or a designated Community Node, the retail landscape continues to change as we are seeing with many other district sized shopping centres (ie. Smart Centres on Dundas Street West, Queenscorp on Erin Mills Parkway) which have pivoted from purely retail to mixed use with retail and midrise redevelopment. We are pleased to see new Mixed Use policies promoting midrise built forms with some grade related retail within the same buildings. Will the City be imposing any height or density limits for these types of sites that are designated Mixed Use but fall outside of Community Nodes or MTSAs?

2920 Matheson Boulevard East & 4720-4880 Tahoe Boulevard

The subject lands are within the Airport Office Node Employment Area (ONEA). Section 13.2.2.5 states, *“Lands within the Major Nodes that are designated Office will also permit post-secondary educational facilities”*. A “Post-Secondary Educational Facility” is not a defined term under Section 20: Glossary of the current 2010 Mississauga Official Plan, Mississauga Zoning Bylaw 225-2007 or within proposed Section 18: Glossary of the Bundle 3/proposed new Official Plan policies. While the term “post-secondary” generally implies adult level colleges or universities, we request that a new definition be created for the term “Post Secondary Educational Facilities” that also permits adult training centres, trade schools and career colleges as it is not uncommon to see these types of uses within office buildings.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide input into this major component of the forthcoming new consolidated Official Plan and trust that these comments will be taken into consideration. In the interim, please contact the undersigned via email or on cell # (905) 580-2854 if you have any questions or require any additional information. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

GLEN SCHNARR & ASSOCIATES INC.



Jim Levac, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Copy: Brian Athey/Christine Cote/Mark Bradley, Morguard Corporation

March 15, 2024

File: 1016-010

Via Email: angie.melo@mississauga.ca

Chairman and Members of the Mississauga
Planning and Development Committee
c/o Ms. Angie Melo, Legislative Co-ordinator
City of Mississauga
Clerks Department
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga ON, L5B 3C1

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: Draft Mississauga Official Plan
Statutory Public Meeting
Comments OBO Morguard Corporation


Glen Schnarr and Associates Inc. (GSAI) act for Morguard Corporation who own multiple office, retail, employment and rental residential properties throughout the City of Mississauga. Our most recent submission on the ongoing Official Plan (OP) Review is dated July 26, 2023 and is attached to this submission. Morguard Corporation has a number of comments related to proposed new Official Plan policies as well as specific to several of their properties, many of which have been previously raised but remain unaddressed within the new draft OP. These are summarized as follows:

Proposed Midrise Designation: 2896 Battleford Road

The subject lands are located at the northwest corner of Battleford Road and Glen Erin Drive and are currently designated “Residential High Density” as shown below. The subject lands are within the Meadowvale Town Centre Community Node. This site is currently occupied by older rental townhouses but given its locational attributes and location within a designated Community Node, the site is a potential candidate site for future high density residential uses. Under the current OP, Community Nodes are identified as areas within the City Structure where higher density

concentrations of Mixed Use and High Density development are expected to occur. It is further worth noting that the subject lands were included within the OPA 115 (Reimagining the Mall) boundary and initially subject to a maximum height limit of 15 storeys and maximum FSI limit of 2.25. Under the proposed new draft Mississauga OP, the designation of the subject lands (identified with a yellow “X”) is proposed to change from Residential High Density to Residential Mid-Rise.

Current 2010 OP



Draft New OP



The newly proposed Residential Mid-Rise designation on this site is tantamount to a down-designation and unacceptable to our client. This proposed designation permits maximum heights of 8 storeys or heights that do not exceed the width of the right-of-way (ROW) the site fronts onto. In this case the ROW is Battleford Road which has a designated ROW width of 26 m, which is roughly equivalent to 8 storeys. In our opinion, this proposed designation is inappropriate and the existing Residential High Density designation should be retained. This down designation is inconsistent and counter to other recent policy and development initiatives. For example, OPA 115, as per the recent Phase 2 settlement and resultant revised policies, permits maximum heights of 18 storeys on these lands which clearly conflicts with this new recommendation. Further, directly across the street from the Morguard lands on the south side of Battleford Road, Council approved a rezoning/OPA application, under file OZ 17/10 W9 (BCIMC Realty) to construct a second 12 storey building next to an existing 15 storey building. Unlike the Morguard lands, this particular building is outside of the Meadowvale Community Node and was approved at a height of 12 storeys. The site specific RA4-49 zoning further allowed a maximum height 47.0 m which vastly exceeds the designated ROW width of 26.0 m for Battleford Road. Clearly, it is obvious that

the policies governing heights of midrise and highrise buildings, both within and outside of Community Nodes, is not being applied consistently.

Downtown Core Sites: 33/55/77 and 201 City Centre Drive

Morguard Corporation own a number of key sites within the Downtown Core of Mississauga City Centre at 33/55/77 and 201 City Centre Drive, which are occupied by older office buildings constructed in the 1980s. Revisions are contemplated in Chapter 12 for lands formerly located within the Downtown component of the City Structure. In the draft OP, the term Downtown has been replaced with the term Urban Growth Centre throughout the policies. Proposed revisions have been made to the Downtown Core, Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Urban Growth Centre Character Areas. Overall, these revisions appear to be consistent with those revisions arising from the City Council adopted Downtown Fairview, Cooksville and Hospital Policy Review in 2022, which culminated in the adoption of OPA 145 which is currently under appeal. Morguard are concerned with portions of the Urban Growth Centre policy framework and the draft land use framework as presented on Schedules 7, 8 and in Chapter 10. In particular, there is a discrepancy in the land use designation assigned to the above-noted sites. On Schedule 7, the Sites are not shown as being designated “Downtown Mixed Use”, however, on Schedule 8j, the sites are identified as being designated “Downtown Mixed Use”. We support the identification of the sites as being designated “Downtown Mixed Use”.

While the designations are supported, there are concerns with the Major Transit Station Area and Urban Growth Centre policy framework for designated Downtown Mixed Use lands. In particular, Policy 12.1.1.5 states redevelopment of lands which results in a significant reduction in the number of jobs that could be accommodated on the site will not be permitted (Policy 12.1.1.5) and that development must demonstrate how a concentration of jobs can be accommodated (Policy 12.1.1.6). In our opinion, these policies require revision to soften the requirement for job replacement or concentration. While the desire to have offices and other non-residential uses is understandable, the requirement for replacement of jobs or a concentration of jobs within a development is inconsistent with the development vision established by Provincial and Regional policy objectives for the Downtown Mississauga Urban Growth Centre to support the creation of a vibrant, compact, mixed-use, transit supportive, complete community and is not economically viable as evidenced by the City’s introduction of the Downtown Community Improvement Plan to try to attract development to the Downtown Core. Furthermore, the amount and density of non-residential uses is best addressed during the technical evaluation of a development application.

. We have a similar concern with the proposed Major Transit Station Area policy framework presented in Policy 11.3.2 which states that on designated Mixed Use, Mixed Use Limited and Downtown Mixed Use lands that a loss of existing non-residential area will not be permitted,


unless the planned function of the non-residential area is maintained. We highlight that while the lands are proposed to be re-designated to Downtown Mixed Use, the policy requirement for non-residential area to be retained is concerning. The above-noted policies require revision as they unnecessarily restrict the development potential of lands. It also does not adequately capture a developer's ability to right-size non-residential space based on market needs and tenant preferences. As evidence of this, the City of Mississauga themselves recently vacated several floors of office space at 201 City Centre to adopt a hybrid model allowing staff to work from home. Finally, the policy is contrary to the development vision for Urban Growth Centre lands as appropriate and desirable location for compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented and transit supportive development forms to locate in order to support the Urban Growth Centre as a whole as a vibrant, attractive, complete, 15-minute community. The requirement for office floor space to be replaced will negatively impact the ability to deliver much needed mixed-use developments in the midst of a Provincial housing crisis and potentially sterilize sites from redeveloping under these types of conditions.

1891 Rathburn Road East

Morguard Corporation own a 6.04 acre (2.44 ha) Neighbourhood shopping centre located at 1891 Rathburn Road East which is designated Mixed Use in the OP. The site is within a Neighbourhood area and falls outside of any Community Node or planned or protected MTSA. While redevelopment is not currently contemplated on these lands, the Mixed Use designation has always allowed for a more intensive form of mixed use with at grade commercial and higher density residential above grade. The new OP acknowledges that much of the future infill redevelopment the City will experience will involve Mixed Use sites in existing neighbourhoods. The proposed new Mixed Use policies found under Section 14.1.2 of the draft OP Neighbourhoods policies state that residential intensification within Neighbourhoods will generally occur through infilling. Of notable concern are policies under Section 14.1.2.2 which require development to provide one to one replacement of commercial floor space, impose a maximum midrise height of 8 storeys or not exceeding the ROW of the road they front onto, impose a maximum FSI of 1.75, require public vs private roads with specific block perimeters, and require centrally located public open space. In our view, these types of policies and height limitations will discourage redevelopment, and any types of prescriptive urban design policies should be guidelines and not policies which, depending on the characteristics and location of a site, cannot always be achieved. The policies also do not consider the existing built neighbourhood context, which includes two 18-storey apartment buildings located immediately adjacent to the shopping centre on the south side of Rathburn Road East.

1477/1547 Mississauga Valleys Boulevard

Morguard Corporation own a 3.3 acre vacant parcel fronting onto Central Parkway East, east of Mississauga Valley Boulevard. These lands are within the Downtown Fairview Protected MTSA which is also an Urban Growth Centre given its proximity to existing and proposed transit and amenities. Both the proposed new MTSA policies (OPA 141) and the new Downtown Fairview policies (OPA 145) are either awaiting Regional approval or subject to pending appeals. As earlier expressed, we are opposed to any new height limitations imposed within this or any MTSA. In this instance the proposed maximum height limitation is proposed to be 25 storeys. As a well buffered site within 800 m of the Hurontario LRT, additional height may be supported without having an unacceptable adverse impact. We believe that if the City so chooses to establish maximum height thresholds, then additional policies allowing minor increases should be entertained subject to certain criteria being met without the need for an Official Plan Amendment.



General Proposed Official Plan Policies

We have reviewed the draft Mississauga Official Plan 2051 ('Draft OP'), released on February 12, 2024. Overall, the draft policies propose revisions to Chapters 5 (Housing Choices), 8 (Well Designed Healthy Communities), 11 (Transit Communities) and select Schedules, among others. 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 Draft OP, we have a number of concerns as outlined below.

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 will be problematic and will challenge the ability to deliver high-quality housing options for current and future residents that are compatible with each other. In our opinion, the policy should be revised to enable greater flexibility by encouraging phased developments to provide a range and mixture of housing units, rather than referencing housing type. It is also an accepted planning principle to allow one housing type in a phase of development provided that a variety of housing is provided in the overall development.

'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 OP in May of 2023. Notwithstanding that the policy has been revised since the previous iteration, we remain concerned. In our opinion, the above-noted policy should be modified to encourage a reduced percentage (no greater than 20%) of larger, family-sized units (understood as being two-bedroom units or larger) based on market realities without the need for

an Official Plan amendment. Otherwise, the requirement for 50% of units to be of a certain type will challenge Provincial, Regional and local policy objectives of delivering a variety of attainable housing options for current and future residents. It will 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. 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 and in our opinion, contrary to in-effect legislative and policy frameworks. We strongly recommend 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 the City’s Inclusionary Zoning. 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 specific 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. .

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 further consideration and modification. In our opinion, the requirement for a built form to have a relationship to the width of the 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 attributes and its context. There are many excellent examples in Mississauga and other municipalities where a building's height appropriately exceeds the right-of-way width. This is particularly the case in Mississauga's Downtown Character Area.

The policy also does not account for the diverging widths of streets across the City. For example, there is a diverse and variable network of laneways, local roads, arterial roads and highways. Requiring that a built form relate to the street on which it fronts does not adequately account for the variation of street classifications and therefore, the width of the respective street onto which a building or structure fronts. 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 vague. In our opinion, the above-noted policy requires revision to provide for sufficient flexibility based on a site's locational attributes and development contexts. 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, locations and configurations can be successfully planned, designed and delivered in various ways. We also highlight that elsewhere in the draft OP, the provision of POPS is to be encouraged as one of many ways to provide sufficient landscaped and greenspaces for residents.

The above policy is contrary to the stated OP objective of encouraging POPS in appropriate locations. It will also challenge the delivery of vibrant, appropriately sized and located POPS across the City, particularly given the provision of POPS does not count for parkland dedication credit. Based on the above, we recommend that the above-noted policy be modified to encourage compliance with the applicable City Standard 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 should be revised 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. The 45 degree angular plane requirement should be removed from the above-noted policy. Also, as suggested by the word "guidelines", design guidelines are not intended to be policy but rather guide development based on the built context. As written, Policy 8.6.2.5 could be interpreted as requiring an Official Plan amendment if the design guidelines are not strictly adhered to, which is not appropriate.

Section 8.6.1., Buildings and Building Types

The draft MOP proposes refinements to the urban design-related policy framework and an evolution towards a built form-based policy framework. Section 8.6.1 of the Draft OP presents the refined built form policy framework and provides a characterization of how each built form is to be generally understood. We are concerned with the built form characterizations. The characterizations, as drafted, do not adequately capture the reality of development forms and do not provide for sufficient flexibility to accommodate a range and diversity of built forms at appropriate locations, that are compatible with the surrounding context. For the above-noted reasons, we request that the building characterizations be modified to recognize the existence and allow permission for these diverging built forms at appropriate locations across the City.

We trust that these comments and concerns will be considered and addressed as the new OP proceeds through further public consultation and appreciate the opportunity to provide comments..

Yours truly,



Jim Levac, MCIP, RPP
Partner



Stephanie Matveeva, MCIP, RPP
Associate

Copy: Brian Athey/Christine Cote/Mark Bradley, Morguard Corporation
Ben Philips, Project Manager, Official Plan Review
Councillor Kovac

Via Email

July 26, 2023

File: 1016-007

City of Mississauga
Planning and Building Department
City Planning Strategies Division
300 City Centre Drive,
Mississauga ON, L5B 3C1

Attn: Ms. Sharleen Bayovo, Project Lead
Mississauga Official Plan Review

Re: **Mississauga Official Plan Review – Bundle # 3**
Comments on Proposed New Official Plan Policies


Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. (GSAI) are planning consultants to Morguard Corporation who own a number Employment, Mixed Use and Residential sites throughout the City of Mississauga. We recognize that the Bundle # 3 policies are still of a preliminary nature, but appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on a new emerging policy frame work before a draft consolidated new Official Plan is released to the public. We appreciate any consideration you are able to provide at this early earlier stage in the process. While Morguard Corporation own dozens of sites across the City, we are providing comments at this stage on a select few sites where we see potential issues that we feel should be brought to the City's attention in advance of a consolidated Draft Official Plan being released. Among those sites are the following:

2869 Battleford Road


2869 Battleford Road is located at the northwest corner of Battleford Road and Glen Erin Drive. As depicted below, the subject lands (identified with a yellow "X") are currently designated "Residential High Density" in the 2010 Mississauga Official Plan. These lands are within the Meadowvale Community Node where they abut Meadowvale Town Centre. Community Nodes are areas designated to attract concentrations of mixed and higher density uses. The proposed Bundle # 3 Land Use Schedule and corresponding new Section 10.1.5.12 policies propose a new "Mid-Rise Residential" designation on these lands as depicted below. The proposed new Mid-Rise policies limit heights under the Mid-Rise designation to 8 storeys unless increased heights are permitted under Local Area Plan Character Area of Special Site Policies which allow heights to increase to a maximum of 12 storeys. What is proposed is tantamount to a "down

designation” of this site from a High-Rise designation to a Mid-Rise designation, seemingly without any justification considering the site is with a Mall Based Community Node. This further conflicts with the City’s recently enacted OPA 115 (Reimagining Mall) which is under appeal and pending the forthcoming Phase 2 hearing on height and density. OPA 115 acknowledges this as a high density designated site and proposes a maximum height of 15 storeys as a Mall Based Node. Therefore, as proposed, the Bundle 3 policies and designation conflict with OPA 115 that predates it. We would respectfully request that the Residential High Density designation be maintained on this site and that any future height or density limits or schedules be left blank until the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) has issued their Order on the pending Phase 2 hearing appeal.

Current 2010 Official Plan: Residential High Density



Proposed Bundle 3 Redesignation: Mid Rise Residential



Downtown Core Sites: 33/55/77 and 201 City Centre Drive

From our reading, there are no policy revisions within Bundle 3 to the current 12.1.3.5 policies that state, ***“Redevelopment of existing office buildings that results in the loss of office space will not be permitted unless the same amount of office space is retained or replaced through new development.”*** In the post pandemic world, we believe that 1-1 office replacement is not feasible and that this policy needs to be either repealed or updated, which doesn’t appear to be the case. We are not suggesting that no new office development should occur in Downtown Core, but based on recent experiences we have had with the Camroost redevelopment, a significantly small amount of office replacement may be warranted in response to what is expected to be a continued decline in office demand in the Downtown Core and elsewhere in Mississauga as working patterns continue to change. Has the City of Mississauga undertaken or commissioned any post-pandemic studies of this nature to assess future office demand?

Sections 12.2.5.1 – 12.2.5.5 (Urban Growth Centre) proposes a series of new parks and linear connections that could potentially impact the future redevelopment of 55 and 77 City Centre Drive that are on a prominent intersection of the City Centre in the Hurontario District. Further, Section 12.2.7.9 and Map 12-2-5 describe and delineate the Downtown Core Long Term Street Network and Classification which essentially change the alignment of City Centre Drive in this vicinity from circular road to a grid network with both the realignment and addition of new streets. In this regard, we would request that new language be inserted into the forthcoming consolidated Draft Official Plan that provides better flexibility for the future location of any future urban parkettes or new intersections or connecting roads based on either the receipt of new redevelopment plans/master plans or the City initiation of block or precinct plans.

1477/1547 Mississauga Valley Boulevard

Morguard Corporation own a 3.3 acre vacant parcel fronting onto Central Parkway East, east of Mississauga Valley Boulevard. These lands are within the Downtown Fairview Protected MTSA which is also an Urban Growth Centre given its proximity of existing transit and amenities. As both the proposed new MTSA policies (OPA 141) and the new Downtown Fairview (OPA 145) are subject to pending appeals, there should be no new height limitations imposed within this or any MTSA until these appeals have been addressed at the LRT.

1891 Rathburn Road East

The subject property contains a district sized shopping centre and remains designated “Mixed Use” under the new Bundle 3 policies. While these lands are not within a planned or protected MTSA or a designated Community Node, the retail landscape continues to change as we are seeing with many other district sized shopping centres (ie. Smart Centres on Dundas Street West, Queenscorp on Erin Mills Parkway) which have pivoted from purely retail to mixed use with retail and midrise redevelopment. We are pleased to see new Mixed Use policies promoting midrise built forms with some grade related retail within the same buildings. Will the City be imposing any height or density limits for these types of sites that are designated Mixed Use but fall outside of Community Nodes or MTSAs?

2920 Matheson Boulevard East & 4720-4880 Tahoe Boulevard

The subject lands are within the Airport Office Node Employment Area (ONEA). Section 13.2.2.5 states, *“Lands within the Major Nodes that are designated Office will also permit post-secondary educational facilities”*. A “Post-Secondary Educational Facility” is not a defined term under Section 20: Glossary of the current 2010 Mississauga Official Plan, Mississauga Zoning Bylaw 225-2007 or within proposed Section 18: Glossary of the Bundle 3/proposed new Official Plan policies. While the term “post-secondary” generally implies adult level colleges or universities, we request that a new definition be created for the term “Post Secondary Educational Facilities” that also permits adult training centres, trade schools and career colleges as it is not uncommon to see these types of uses within office buildings.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide input into this major component of the forthcoming new consolidated Official Plan and trust that these comments will be taken into consideration. In the interim, please contact the undersigned via email or on cell # (905) 580-2854 if you have any questions or require any additional information. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

GLEN SCHNARR & ASSOCIATES INC.



Jim Levac, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Copy: Brian Athey/Christine Cote/Mark Bradley, Morguard Corporation

February 14, 2025

GSAI File: 1016-010

(Via Email)

Mr. Ben Philips

Project Manager, Mississauga Official Plan Review

City of Mississauga

300 City Centre Drive

Mississauga, ON L3B 3C1

RE: Mississauga Official Plan 2051
Morguard MCC Limited
33, 55, 77 and 201 City Centre Drive, City of Mississauga

Glen Schnarr and Associates Inc. (GSAI) are the planning consultants to Morguard MCC Limited (the "Owner") of the lands municipally known as 33, 55, 77 and 201 City Centre Drive, in the City of Mississauga (the 'Subject Lands' or 'Site'). On behalf of the Owner, and further to the Mississauga Official Plan Review Comment Letter, submitted by GSAI, dated March 15, 2024, we are pleased to submit this Comment Letter in relation to the ongoing Mississauga Official Plan Review initiative.

As Staff and Council are aware, the Owner and 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 Site. This Letter provides our comments on the draft Mississauga Official Plan 2051, released in January 2025.

We have reviewed the draft Mississauga Official Plan 2051, released in January 2025 as well as the Official Plan Review Matrix prepared by City of Mississauga Staff. Based on this review, we highlight that while certain concerns previously raised have been addressed through the removal of certain policies, two (2) concerns remain. Our comments are further described below.

1. Built Form

Chapter 8 provides the City's refined built form and site development policy framework. 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 and elevates urban design guidance to policy. For example, the general built form and site development policies contained in Chapter 8 of the draft 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. We request that the elevation of urban design guidance to policy and the built-form based policy framework be revised to enable flexibility and high-quality built forms that effectively and appropriately respond to local conditions.

2 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), Policy 8.6.2.5, and 8.6.2.6. 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. Lastly, we highlight that following Policy 8.6.2.6, there is an illustrative graphic, labelled as Figure 8.9. Figure 8.9 is as follows:




Figure 8.9. Angular planes allow for more gradual transitions between low-rise neighbourhoods to adjacent higher rise developments, while enhancing the pedestrian environment.

The above-noted policies and the above illustrative graphic are concerning as we believe they are overly restrictive and unnecessary. As the policies as drafted suggest, there are various ways and tools available to ensure appropriate transition can be provided. There is also ambiguity given transition is not defined. 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 concerning. This concern is furthered by the above-noted policies 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 requiring that an angular plane be applied as a means to control transition is overly restrictive, misleading and contrary to good practice. If this policy is not met, an Official Plan Amendment would become necessary, notwithstanding that a redevelopment proposal may be appropriate. In our opinion, any angular plane requirement should be removed from the above-noted policies. Angular planes are one of many urban design guidance tools that can and should remain in the area-specific Built Form Standards. 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 the findings of the Mayor's Task Force which highlighted that urban design considerations can be an added hurdle or hindrance to expedited development approvals. This would be the case if

urban design guidelines became policy as proposed. Additionally, the illustrative graphic provided by Figure 8.9 should be removed to eliminate confusion or policy misinterpretation.

Conclusion

In summary, we remain concerned about the proposed policy directions outlined in the draft Mississauga Official Plan 2051 and continue to request that modifications be made. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Our Client 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.



Jim Levac, MCIP, RPP
Partner



Stephanie Matveeva, MCIP, RPP
Associate

cc. Mayor Parrish and Members of Council
Owner