Dear Ms. Smith:

Re: Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning Bylaw Amendment

Part of Lots 7, 8, and 9, Concession II EF and Part of the Unopened Road Allowance between Lots 7 and 8 (Paletta Lands)
Part of Lot 7, Concession I EF (Taylor Lands)
Files 505-12/04, 510-06/04, 520-23/04, 24T-04006/B (Paletta Lands)
Files 505-13/04, 520-24/04, 510-07/04, 024Y-04007/B (Taylor Lands)

Halton Region has received the above noted applications and offers the following PRELIMINARY comments. The comments are preliminary as the reports filed require further updates and addendums. The comments assess the proposal as set out in the 2010 amended applications:

Proposal:

The owner's draft plan (Paletta) proposes 171 single detached residential units, 20 single family condominium units and 624 cluster housing block units on existing and new municipal right-of-ways. The owner's draft plan (Taylor) proposed 31 single detached residential units and 24 cluster housing block units on existing and new municipal right-of-ways.

Background:

Paletta International Corporation and Mr. Ed Taylor have expressed interest in developing the subject lands for a number of years.

On October 3, 1996, OMB approval for development of the subject lands was granted, approving 409 residential units. The OMB approval established the principle of development of a defined density on the subject lands, and further confirmed that the development will be municipally serviced.

The applicants have indicated that the approved proposal is not economically viable and instead have filed new applications seeking approvals for increased densities. The 1996 draft plan approval does not have a lapsing date (owing to the nature of approvals at that time). Given the foregoing, there should be further discussion as to whether the 1996 draft plan approval should be collapsed and that file closed.

In 2004, the applicants submitted to the City several planning applications comprised of amendments to the City of Burlington Official Plan and Zoning By-law, along with draft plans of subdivision. The proposal sought approval for 665 residential units. The applications were subsequently appealed to the OMB. Halton Region did not provide comments on the proposal for 665 units as the appropriate supporting information and studies were not provided for review.
In 2010, the applicants amended the applications to include additional units, totalling 870 (815 units on the Paletta lands and 55 units on the Taylor lands). This is a substantial amendment (200+ units) to the 2004 applications.

The applicant has submitted the following reports:

- Planning Justification Report (July 2002)
- Planning Justification and Environmental Analysis (January 2007)
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (June 2010)
- Environmental Impact Assessment (December 2010)
- Erosion Assessment Report (May 2010)

Halton Region has assessed the 2010 proposal on the basis of the planning framework as of 2010.

Staff note that the 2010 proposal is based, for the most part, on the development limits which were previously approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 1996, (development limits often referred to as “development pods” or simply “pods”). However, the development pods need to be refined within the limits of those development pods to conform with current science and practice with respect to natural heritage features, servicing, standards, etc. Additionally, much of the documentation draws comparisons with, and utilizes decisions from, the proposal previously approved in 1996, which is not appropriate given the current applications are separate and distinct from the previous approval; the passage of time; and the changed policy framework.

**Policy Documents:**

**General:**

Halton Region has provided a brief summary of potential areas for consideration:

**Provincial Policy Statement (2005):**

Regional staff has determined the following sections, among others **may be considered** in the evaluation of the application:

- Developing Strong Communities
- Housing
- Infrastructure
- Agricultural Policies
- Water Quality and Quantity
- Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources
- Natural Hazards
- Human Made Hazards.

As many of the studies and/or information are out of date, insufficient (studies and documentation with respect to natural heritage/hazards, servicing information for the subject lands) or has not been provided (archaeological investigations, investigations into human made hazards), Halton Region is not in a position to provide detailed comments on compliance with the above noted sections of the PPS.

In addition to the PPS and the Region’s Official Plan being considered during the evaluation, the following additional documents may be considered in the Region’s review to assist in determining whether the proposal amounts to good planning which has taken current science into consideration.
• **Growth Plan 2006:**

The Growth Plan provides a framework for implementing the Province’s vision for building stronger, prosperous communities by better managing growth. The Plan directs growth to build up areas through intensification where development proposals can efficiently use existing transportation and servicing infrastructure. The Growth Plan also looks to direct intensification to specific areas and such Urban Growth Centres, intensification corridors, major transit station areas, brownfield sites and greyfields. The Plan also has policies respecting infrastructure and natural heritage systems.

The reports filed do not meet the Growth Plan definition for intensification. Furthermore, the reports do not adequately assess compliance with the Growth Plan nor do they demonstrate that the subject lands are appropriate candidates for intensification.

• **Greenbelt Plan (2005):**

The information provided within the submitted studies/reports is insufficient to evaluate the proposal with respect to the Greenbelt Plan (2005) and the relevant environmental concerns. The Region requires additional information in this regard.

**Halton Region’s Official Plan:**

The subject lands contain the designations North Aldershot Policy Area and Greenlands A and B and are further identified as being Areas Eligible for Urban Services.

Policy 137 of the Regional Plan states that the objectives of the North Aldershot Policy Area are as follows:

1. to recognize and maintain the distinct and unique character of the North Aldershot area within the context of the surrounding built up area; and,
2. to provide limited amount of development in certain locations while preserving significant natural areas and maintaining the predominately rural and open space character of the landscape.

Policy 138 of the Regional Plan speaks to permitted uses. Single detached dwellings on existing lots are permitted, however, development must be in accordance with the planning framework set out in the North Aldershot Inter Agency Review Final Report (May 1994). The applications must be reviewed against the NAIR report with the appropriate supporting information. This is discussed in further detail below.

With respect to servicing, Policy 139(3) states the following:

Permit the extension of urban services to those locations within the North Aldershot Policy Area shown as “Eligible for Urban Services” on Map 1 provided that:

(a) a feasibility study has been prepared to the satisfaction of the Region;
(b) Regional Council deems it prudent to extend services;
(c) the landowner/developer has met the financial obligations as specified by the Region; and,
(d) sufficient servicing capacity is available as determined by the Region

Development within greenlands and natural areas designations require the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). As previously noted, the applicant has submitted an EIA, however, an update/revisions to this document are required.
The applicant is also requested to provide the Region with a Site Screening Questionnaire and Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment and any associated documents which may be required upon review of those documents, to adequately address any archaeological or contamination concerns.

**NAIR:**

In 1994, a secondary planning study was conducted to address planning issues in the area of North Aldershot, which resulted in the North Aldershot Interagency Review. The result of the process was a final report that present planning principles and evaluation criteria, a character plan, land use designations and design guidelines for the area. The NAIR principles were incorporated into Halton Region’s Official Plan through ROPA #2 (which are set out as policies 137 to 139 in the Regional Plan).

The land use concept for NAIR notes the following:

*North Aldershot should remain a distinct, identifiable area defined by its special characteristics including the Escarpment, topography, habitat, vegetation, creeks, valleys and ravines, and settlement patterns. There should continue to be a diversity of uses, activities and users. Therefore, while change should be permitted, it must regard and respect the area’s existing character.*

The NAIR report established planning principles which represent the central objectives to guide the future of planning for North Aldershot. The five (5) principles are elaborated upon by Evaluation Criteria which provide a context for preparing the land use concept and represent the conditions under which planning policy will be prepared and proposals for development will be evaluated. The NAIR report confirms, however, that the Evaluation Criteria are not to be considered in isolation of, or to take precedent over the regulations and policies administered by various agencies of the government (Provincial Ministries, Conservation Authorities, etc.).

To this end, the Region notes that there are a number of outstanding issues related to applying agency and government regulations and policies, noted by Conservation Halton in their July 11, 2011 letter, some of which, being:

- Issues with respect to identification of the limits of natural hazard features and their associated allowances that are regulated such as Regional Storm floodplains, stable top of bank staking, meanderbelt widths, wetland limits, flooding and erosion hazards, and associated impacts to lots and road realignments etc.
- Creation of lots within CH regulated area
- Status of watercourses and determination of whether they are confined or unconfined
- Regulated habitat with respect to the Endangered Species Act

As such, at this time Regional staff are unable to provide support for the application, as the outstanding issues have a overriding impact on whether the proposal meets the objectives and evaluation criteria of the North Aldershot Inter Agency Review.

Regional staff strongly encourage the applicant to work and cooperate with the City of Burlington, Region of Halton and other technical agencies involved in the review of the development proposal to resolve the issues so that a proposal which respects NAIR can be achieved.

**Sustainable Halton (ROPA 38):**

On December 16, 2009, Regional Council adopted ROPA 38 which has received Ministerial approval, however, is the subject of various appeals which have yet to be concluded. ROPA 38 designates the subject lands as Regional Natural Heritage System and North Aldershot Policy Area, further identified as Area Eligible for Urban Servicing.
CIRCULATION COMMENTS:

Servicing – John Kisneris, Development Project Manager:

The owner’s draft plan (Paletta) proposes 171 single detached residential units, 20 single family condominium units and 624 cluster housing block units on existing, new and municipal right-of-ways. The owner’s draft plan (Taylor) proposed 31 single detached residential units and 24 cluster housing block units on existing, new and municipal right-of-ways.

There is a 250mm diameter watermain on Waterdown Road adjacent to the proposed subdivision. There is a 150mm diameter watermain on Flatt Road adjacent to the proposed subdivision. There is no watermain on Flatt Road Extension. There is a 150mm diameter watermain on Ireson Road adjacent to the proposed subdivision. There is no watermain on Horning Road. There is a 150mm diameter watermain on Craven Avenue. There is a 150mm diameter watermain on a small portion of Nevarc Drive. There is a 300mm diameter watermain on the southerly portion of Panin Road.

There is a 300mm diameter wastewater main on Waterdown Road at Craven Avenue, just south and east of the proposed subdivision. The proposed development does not abut a Regional Road.

The Region has reviewed the Functional Servicing Report for the above noted plans of subdivision and has the following comments:

1. The Functional Servicing Report should state the number of units approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 1996 (being 409 units).

2. The Report, Section 7.1, should be revised to read, “The South Halton Water and Wastewater Master Plan Update June 2008 and the Sustainable Halton Water and Wastewater Master Plan (30 day review period completed November 14, 2011) includes the water and wastewater servicing for the areas of North Aldershot that is approved for urban servicing”. “The implementation of the Master Plan preferred servicing strategy will ensure that adequate water and wastewater treatment capacity is available for development on the Eagle Heights and Taylor properties”.

3. The Report, Section 7.2, should be revised to read, "In 2010 the area of Panin Road and a few properties on Waterdown Road north of Highway 403 were incorporated into the zone 2 water pressure zone of Burlington". The developer’s engineering consultant should revise their plans to show the new section of 300mm watermain on Waterdown Road and the interconnections across Waterdown Road to the east side. The watermain distribution drawing should be revised to show the 100mm system water meter that is located in a water chamber approximately 190 metres north of Horning Road. The water meter is located on a 100 mm diameter watermain by-pass off the 250mm watermain on Waterdown Road.

4. Page 42. There is currently no PRV reducing pressures on Flatt Road. Hydrant readings on Flatt Road identify static pressures of 160 psi. A pressure reducing valve exists south of the existing Waterdown Road reservoir for a small area of homes located south of the reservoir and north of the North Service Road.

5. Page 43. Suggested zone contours to maintain static pressures between 45 and 100 psi are as follows:
   - Zone 2, Ground Elevations 97.5 - 134.3
   - Zone 3, Ground Elevations 132.9 - 169.6
   - Zone 4, Ground Elevations 165.8 - 202.3

6. Page 43. Section 7.4 indicates major facilities for Zone 2 are in place. It should be noted that in addition, Halton is proposing to construct Zone 2 pumps at the Waterdown Road Reservoir as part of North Aldershot servicing.
7. Page 44. Option C is not the system proposed in the 2008 Master Plan. The 2008 Master Plan identifies a Zone 3 reservoir and pumping for Zones 2, 3 & 5 at the Waterdown Road Reservoir. Zone 4 would be fed from Zone 5 via PRVs. A connection would be maintained to the Hamilton water supply for emergency purposes.

8. Page 45. Converting the existing Waterdown Road watermain to Zone 4 would deal with servicing this subdivision, but would leave Halton without the ability to service lands in Zone 5 (above 202.3 metres). It would be better for Halton to continue to pump to Zone 5 and feed Zone 4 via a PRV.

9. Page 45. Since Halton is only able to negotiate for Hamilton water ten years at a time, provision must be made in this report for a “Halton only” solution.

10. The Region notes that the requirements of the Class Environmental Assessment for the reservoir, including determination of its locations and type have not been satisfied through the Sustainable Halton Water and Wastewater Master Plan. The FSR and other documentation provided by your client and its consultant will provide a useful input to the Region’s Class EA Study for the reservoir to be carried out in the future. In particular, information regarding the mature state of the service area noted in the FSR would need to be finalized in the FSR. Through the future Class Environmental Assessment study, detailed feedback from applicable review agencies and key stakeholders will be required to determine what is acceptable as the preferred reservoir location and type. Halton Region is already aware that the Niagara Escarpment Commission has specific concerns regarding an elevated water tower.

11. The servicing report should incorporate lands external to Eagle Heights/Taylor properties as these developments may have impacts on the servicing of lands external to the proposed subdivisions.

12. Hydraulic modeling for the water system should be included as part of the Functional Servicing Report.

13. Within Section 7.5 of the Report, the owner should be advised that no local watermain or water service connections will not be permitted to come off of the 400 mm reservoir watermain feed.

14. The Servicing Report should mention of Halton’s Master Plan water capital projects for this area, which will include;
   - ID 3698, Waterdown Road Pump Station Expansion (Zones 2, 3 & 5), $5.625M
   - ID 3699, North Aldershot Reservoir (Zone 3), $5.072 M
   - ID 3700, 400 mm WM from Waterdown Road Pump Station to North Aldershot Reservoir, $2.279M
   - ID 5881, 400 mm WM on North Service Road from King Road to Waterdown Pump Station (Zone 2), $6.589M
   Please note that these costs are preliminary and subject to change with approval of the Sustainable Halton Master Plan and Development Charges Technical Report.

Options for providing a second feed to Street A should be reviewed in order to eliminate the long dead end.

15. Allowance should be made within the Taylor draft plan of subdivision for a future watermain from Street X to future development properties to the west. This is for the purposes of watermain looping or sanitary servicing should it be required. Possibly it may be accomplished with a servicing easement through Block F. Some further review should be done by the developer's consultant to confirm that this is possible.

16. Based on tributary areas and population figures indicated on sanitary drainage areas plan (Fig.7.2), the overall arithmetic calculations in the design sheet seem to be okay, except for some errors in the total population column. The errors have given rise to an overestimation of the overall total population by 75 persons which, in turn, overestimates the total peak flow by 1.2 L/s (negligible).

17. At the bottom of the twin columns on the design sheet for residential units, the total of the Single Family Housing Units is 484 (88 units existing and 376 proposed), while that of the Cluster Housing Units is 648. The subdivision
phasing plan (Fig.2.3), on the other hand, gives these totals to be 202 and 648, respectively. The total of the cluster housing units thus matches that obtained from the design sheet (based on Fig.7.2). However, the total of the single family housing units from this plan is lower than that from the design sheet by 174 units (376-202=174).

18. The 20 condominium units listed under phase 2 on phasing plan (Fig.2.3) does not seem to have been accounted for independently in the design sheet. However, there are 20 units listed under SF dwellings that are supposed to be from catchment area # 5. If that's so, SF dwelling population density has been used for the condo units and their tributary area has been that of the cluster units belonging to the same catchment area.

19. The non-residential population density used in the calculations is 90 persons per Hectare, which is also the same as that specified by the Region's Design Criteria. However, their population densities work out to be 15.21 persons/ha for Single Family Housing and 72.32 persons/ha for the Cluster Housing. These values are substantially lower than the values specified by the DC, which are 55 and 135, respectively.

20. Flow velocities along street B (N-O), street A (P-S), Flatt road (S-M) and Panin road (ZZ-Z) are lower than the minimum specified by the Design Criteria (0.6 m/s). It is recommended that the slope of the pipes be increased or re-evaluated in order to realize higher velocities (lower depths), improve conveyance efficiency of the sewers, and prevent sediment deposition.

21. Staff Report PPW90-08 – "Monitoring of Development within the Skyway Wastewater Treatment Plant Catchment Area" stated that the development within Skyway WWTP drainage area should be monitored closely until the expansion is completed.

22. Proposed developments such as Eagle Heights must be monitored closely until the time the plant is expanded.

23. The Skyway WWTP is currently undergoing an expansion and is anticipated to be complete in 2014.

24. Development may be considered if construction and occupancy is phased out until anticipated completion of Skyway WWTP expansion. However, sanitary sewer design sheet included in FSR from Metropolitan Consulting does not calculate or follow proposed Phasing scheme outlined in Fig. 2-3 Eagle Heights Phasing Plan. It is recommended that a sanitary sewer design sheet that matches the proposed phasing sequence be resubmitted to allow for better determination of maximum flow from the development.

25. We recommend that the sewer from Street X cross under Tributary 4 to the Bethel Church property and follow Nevarc Ave. & Craven Ave. to the existing sewer on Waterdown Road - Alt. 2B.

26. The wastewater main (and possible watermain) crossing tributary four should be located within a separate City of Burlington parcel and not an easement. This could be a walkway block from Street X to Nevarc Drive. The draft plan should be amended to show this block. The block should be of sufficient size to accommodate all the services, their separation distances, maintenance vehicle access, etc.

27. The next phase of the sanitary sewer construction should take into account all the existing homes on Craven Avenue and Nevarc Drive, and the rear of some Waterdown Road lots, to ensure the orderly development of sanitary sewers in the area.

28. Wastewater service laterals should be constructed to the existing properties on Craven Avenue, Nevarc Drive, Flatt Road and Flatt Road Extension, Horning Road and Waterdown Road.

29. We note that the Region has previously commented on temporary servicing for the church to be located on the institutional block.
30. The wastewater main on Street E should be constructed up to the Waterdown Road right-of-way in the vicinity of the south side of the institutional block, and up Waterdown Road to the north side of the institutional block.

31. The wastewater main on Street D should be constructed up Waterdown Road to the northerly limits of the development, approximately 25 metres.

32. The wastewater main on Flatt Road should be constructed to Waterdown Road, with a stub extending north outside of the intersection.

33. Halton Region development charges projects cannot proceed to the design stage are not considered funded until all the Class Environmental Assessment requirements are in place and there is an approved financial plan. The financial arrangement discussions must be initiated by the owner with the Region.

34. The Report states that the developer is proposing rural cross sections of the proposed subdivision roads. The City, under these developments, may be requesting some roads to have an urban cross section. The owner should undertake to have this worked out and then update the Report accordingly.

35. The Report would benefit by stating that some of the stormwater management controls like soakaway pits, infiltration trenches, grassed swales and rainwater gardens may have an impact on Regional servicing, and that wastewater mains or wastewater service laterals located in the vicinity of these features may require increased protection from infiltration. This will be discussed further at the detail engineering design stage.

36. The Report suggests that there may be servicing easements through valley lands. From an engineering perspective this may require construction utilizing casings and spacers. The suitability of such servicing and environmental impacts needs to be addressed.

37. Given the above information, the Report should look more closely at phasing and constructability of the two subdivisions, and revise the proposal for phasing accordingly.

38. Stormwater related to the Waterdown Road right-of-way, pre and post re-construction of Waterdown Road, should be confirmed as having all the necessary outlets for the treatment of stormwater for quality and quantity. If needed the owners shall make the appropriate allowances within their draft plans of subdivision.

Based on the above comments, the applicant is required to provide additional information and analysis with respect to servicing.

**Environmental Impact Assessment (2010, Savanta) – Mirek Sharp, North South Environmental:**

**General Comments**

**Background**

It is recognized that there is an existing approved draft plan for the property that resulted from an OMB hearing in the mid-1990s. The use of older information is supported to the extent to which it contributes to a fuller understanding of the site and its surrounding area; however the EIA requires further amendments and refinements for the reasons set out below.

**Regional EIA Guidelines**

The EIA should adhere to the Regional EIA Guidelines. The Guidelines have not been referred to in the Savanta EIA, and some of the requirements (e.g., refinement of ESA boundaries, and therefore Greenlands boundaries) have not been addressed. Normally, an applicant would prepare a Terms of Reference for an EIA and circulate it to the approving authority for comment, but we see no reference to one. It is strongly suggested that the applicant consult with the approving agencies to determine the appropriate content of further revisions to the EIA.
Completeness of the EIA
An EIA that supports the current (2010) plan should be a complete and stand-alone document, with complete methods, inventory, analysis of significance, impact analysis (direct and indirect), recommendations for mitigation and demonstration of conformity with relevant policies. The introduction to the EIA indicates it is an update study and omits a lot of the data and methods from earlier studies, even though the analysis relies on it. The update approach is acceptable as long as it provides all the previous data and any older analyses that are still relevant, so the reader can evaluate the conclusions with the benefit of the supporting information and the methods used to collect the data.

Policy Conformity
The EIA recognizes the 2010 Draft Plan as a “new application”. Therefore, the current policy in the relevant Regional and Provincial Plans, as well as policies of the Conservation Authority, need to be addressed. The information and analysis provided in this “update” EIA is not sufficient to demonstrate conformity with these policy documents, nor does the EIA fulfill the requirements of the Regional EIA guidelines.

Field Methods
The methods used to collect field data are unclear in some cases and inappropriate in others (e.g., breeding bird surveys in August, both recent floral surveys in August). Methods from the earlier environmental reports are not provided.

Figures
The Figures need to be provided at a scale which is readable. In addition, there is critical information that needs to be provided in the figures, including:

- an inventory figure which just shows the results of the biological inventory (ELC, location of any significant species, etc.);
- the principal features that have policy implication (e.g., woodlands, valleylands, watercourses, etc.) should be mapped separate from inventory and policy designations;
- feature boundaries shown on figures should be staked and approved by the review agencies (e.g., at present, the Region are not sure if buffers on Figure 4 are from valleylands based on approved stable top of bank or from the physical top of bank, or from the woodland edge where it is coincident with the valley edge);
- a separate figure should provide the relevant policy mapping; this should include the existing designations (ESAs, ANSIs, Greenlands A and B, etc.);
- while the Figure that overlays the proposed development on natural features is appreciated (this is often missing from EIAs), it is suggested that a constraint boundary based on features (woodland, valleylands, wetlands, etc.) be developed first, and then the development plan overlaid as to clearly identify where the proposed development avoids constraints, and where it encroaches. The encroachments can then be specifically addressed in the text with respect to why they are acceptable and the degree to which they constitute impacts (if any); and
- the stormwater figure is illegible owing to the scale and amount of information on it, and this should be provided as a larger figure.

Species Status
The status (provincial, regional and local) of various species needs to be updated, and the appropriate references used (e.g., the Halton Natural Areas Inventory). In particular, several species recently designated as “threatened”, and thus subject to the Endangered Species Act, must be addressed.

Delineation of Feature Boundaries
It is highly recommended that feature boundaries be delineated in the field with the review agencies, with the limits surveyed for incorporation onto Figures. This will facilitate agreement and acceptance of the actual limits of the “development pods”, which is essential for the application.
Significant Woodlands
We do not agree with the approach for identifying significant woodlands. The Region has developed criteria for determining significant woodlands and these should be applied to the site.

Ecological Connectivity
The ecological function of the site with respect to other nearby features (e.g., the Escarpment and other ESAs) has not been evaluated. This should be undertaken with recognition of the high degree of connectivity that currently exists within the local landscape.

Impact Analysis
As noted in the comment on the Figures, areas that are constrained by policy must be clearly mapped and overlaid with the proposed development to identify where there are direct impacts to features.

In general, the indirect impacts are not adequately addressed. The major change in land use from rural/agricultural to urban will introduce new stresses to the local landscape that have not been addressed. Most indirect impacts are density dependent, thus the proposed increased units from the original approved draft plan can be expected to have an impact on natural features, and this is not recognized or discussed in the text.

The impact analysis frequently uses the term "effect" rather than "impact". It is not clear if "effect" is being used synonymously with "impact", or if it is intended to mean something else. Given that the impact analysis is relevant to determining policy conformity, and that the language of policy uses the term "impact", its use in the EIA should be clarified. In our opinion, most, if not all, instances where the word "effect" is used represent environmental impacts.

Incorporation of Recommendations from Hearing
Section 5 discusses the 1994 EIA recommendations, many of which were adopted as part of the OMB hearing. It is not clear which recommendations were adopted during the hearing, and no explanation is provided as to why all of the recommendations from the 1994 EIA were not adopted.

Site Visits
The Region requests that the applicants agree that the Region may have access to the site as may be required.

Conclusions
We are not sure what is being implied, or what the importance is, of the conclusion that "The Plans of Subdivision are very similar to the Approved Plan ...". Given the number of units has approximately doubled, and the internal road and lotting layout have changed, we do not perceive them as very similar with respect to potential impacts to the adjacent natural features.

The EIA does not conclude that the draft plan is acceptable. Specifically, it does not conclude that the potential impacts of the proposed development are acceptable with regard to existing planning policies, and only makes a statement regarding the protection of the ANSI. By stating that it is similar to the approved plan, it seems to imply that the acceptability of the earlier plan is conferred on this new 2010 plan, however it does not clearly conclude this and the supporting argument for them being similar is not convincing.

Waste - Andrew Suprun, Waste Collection Customer Service Technician
Region waste will service once 90% completed and waste collection trucks can safely access the street for collection to commence. Collection will take place in front of the individual units curb side. Please have developer contact my self once development is ready for collection.
Health – Nadia McLennan, Health Protection Services and Fabio Cabarcas, Community Health Services:

The Healthy Environments Team requests that the developer must undertake a well monitoring program of neighbouring homes within 500m of the proposed development to address any off site well water quality/quantity concerns arising from the proposed development prior to the commencement of on-site construction/grading.

The developer must also decommission any existing wells on the subject property that will not be used as a potable water source in accordance with the Ontario Water Resources Act R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O.40.

Thank you for providing the Walkable and Transit Supportive Communities Section with the opportunity to review this subdivision application. To ensure walkability and active transportation, we have the following suggestion: Consider adding additional pathways and trails between residential blocks to enhance connectivity to the surrounding area and adjacent streets. To encourage walkability, streets should be designed on the basis of medium to short block lengths with a recommended maximum block perimeter that does not exceed 250 metres. Where block perimeter exceeds 250 metres, the provision of a block pedestrian linkage is suggested. Neighbourhoods built on a cul-de-sac street pattern system should connect to other roads and surrounding areas by looking for direct pathways. For instance, the proposed pathway on street E increases connectivity. Consider adding additional pathways and trails to create direct pedestrian connectivity between the streets and to the surrounding areas.

Transportation – Matt Krusto, Transportation Services Coordinator

Halton Region's Transportation Services Section has reviewed the above applications from a Regional perspective and has no comments.

Finance – Katherine Fleet, Intermediate Financial Analyst, Development

Please include the below note to the comments. This note is being added on the assumption that these sites will be on full Regional services.

NOTE: Regional development charges are payable in accordance with the applicable Regional Development Charge By-law and are required at the following stages: Subdivision Agreement Stage: Water, wastewater, and road (including any blocks intended for future development at the maximum density permitted under the applicable zoning by-law); Building Permit Issuance: All remaining Region-Wide Development Charges in effect on the date of issuance. Note: Any building permits which are additional to the maximum unit yield which is specified by the Subdivision Agreement are subject to all Regional Development Charges (including water, wastewater, and road not collected at subdivision agreement) prior to the issuance of the building permit, at the rate in effect on the date of issuance. It should be noted that a development charge agreement may be required to collect Regional development charges in advance of these two stages.

Conclusion

Based on the comments above, Halton Region planning staff cannot support the 2010 amended applications for 870 units as submitted. There are significant updates and supplementary information required for the Region to be able to adequately evaluate the proposal against the evaluation criteria of NAIR and the principles of good planning among other relevant documents. The applications are not supported by sufficient information addressing the natural heritage features and functions, the ability to adequately service the lands, archaeological and contamination investigations. Regional staff require additional information prior to providing additional comments or a recommendation.

Halton Region encourages the applicants to submit the requested information. Doing so will allow the Region to conduct a complete and thorough analysis of the proposal and provide a formal position on the applications.
I trust these comments are of assistance to you. Should you wish to discuss any of the contents of this letter in detail, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Laurielle Brooks, BES, MCIP, RPP
Intermediate Planner, Halton Region
905-825-6000 x7840
Laurielle.brooks@halton.ca

c. Ron Glenn, Director of Planning Services, Halton Region via email @ ron.glenn@halton.ca
Nancy Mott-Allen, Niagara Escarpment Commission via email @ nancy.mott-allen@ontario.ca
Margaret Charles, Conservation Halton via email @ mcharles@hrc.on.ca
January 7, 2016

City of Burlington
Clerks Department
426 Brant Street
Burlington, Ontario
L7R 3Z6

To Members of Council:

Re: January 12 Development & Infrastructure Committee Meeting

Proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment for 1350 Waterdown Road (File 520-02/15)

Please accept this letter as our written delegation, with comments on the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment for 1350 Waterdown Road.

We have been in contact with the subject property owner for a number of years, and are supportive of their plans to construct a place of worship. We have offered assistance, subject to all applicable municipal approvals, to construct underground services to their property at no cost to them, and in exchange they have entered into an Agreement with us to allow a servicing easement through the rear of their property to the Taylor property, which makes up part of the Eagle Heights development. The proposed servicing route through Craven Avenue and the north end of Nevarc Drive would also create an opportunity for existing homeowners to connect to these urban services. Unfortunately progress in obtaining the necessary approvals has been extremely slow, and this matter remains a “work in progress” as of today’s date.

In reviewing the staff report being presented to Committee today, we note that the property owner will be asked to dedicate the creek block, associated valleylands, and additional buffers in the area where the servicing easement is planned. Our concern is that if these lands are dedicated with no consideration of the Servicing Easement Agreement, or the years of work that have gone into this project, our ability to service our lands through this corridor would be severely impeded. Both the City of Burlington and Region of Halton are already committed to allowing urban services to connect to the OMB approved Eagle Heights development. This is reflected in Minutes of Settlement as well as in the identification of the development on lands eligible for urban services in the Region’s Official Plan. As such we must object to any actions that could prejudice our ability to construct these services.

We appreciate that no land will be dedicated as part of the applicant’s Zoning By-Law Amendment Application, and that this would likely be deferred until the approval of the subsequent Site Plan Approval application, however we may or may not have an opportunity to comment on that application and therefore must bring this to your attention at this time.
We understand that approval of urban services through our planned route has not yet been granted, and is subject to the usual engineering and environmental reviews. We are not asking you to approve anything without going through the usual process. We are simply asking that consideration be given to the Servicing Easement Agreement that we have in place with the existing property owner, the services of which would be transferred to the City of Burlington and/or Region of Halton in due course, and that no action be taken at this time that will prejudice the opportunity for these services to be installed through this route, again subject to all the usual approvals. This could involve a clear recognition that any dedication of land will be subject to the Servicing Easement Agreement.

In order to avoid any delays to the property owner's design and approval process for the proposed place of worship, we simply ask that wording be included in Council’s decision and the amended zoning that would allow us to continue to pursue this servicing route without any additional roadblocks, while still approving the applicant's Zoning By-Law Amendment request.

We have spoken with Councillor Craven, who has offered to arrange a meeting with the appropriate planners so that this matter can be discussed further, however that meeting has not yet been scheduled and will likely occur after January 12th. As such, we are submitting this letter as a matter of record, with the hopes that this may be resolved to the mutual benefit of all involved.

Yours truly,

PENTA PROPERTIES INC.

Dave Pitblado
Director, Real Estate Development

Cc: Lisa Stern – City of Burlington
    Angelo Paletta – Penta Properties Inc.
    Scott Snider – Turkstra Mazza Associates
From: Scott Snider
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 2:41 PM
To: Scott Snider
Subject: FW: 1350 Waterdown Servicing

From: Stern, Lisa [mailto:Lisa.Stern@burlington.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 4, 2017 2:41 PM
To: Dave Pitblado <dpitblado@paletta.ca>
Cc: Minaji, Rosalind <Rosalind.Minaji@burlington.ca>
Subject: RE: 1350 Waterdown Servicing

Dave,

I have not made reference to our discussions in the report for 1350 Waterdown and have simply said that proposed church can be adequately serviced.

As per my email below, it is our opinion that the servicing of the church does not preclude any development of the Taylor lands, and we have no objections to an easement on the church lands should Penta wish to enter into a private agreement with the Church.

I hope that this helps. Please feel free to give myself or Roz a call to discuss.

Lisa Stern RPP, MCIP
Senior Planner - Development
Planning & Building Department | City of Burlington
426 Brant Street, P.O. Box 5013, Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6
☎ 905-335-7600 ext. 7427
✉ lisa.stern@burlington.ca

From: Dave Pitblado [mailto:dpitblado@paletta.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 2:31 PM
To: Stern, Lisa
Subject: RE: 1350 Waterdown Servicing

Hi Lisa,

We received notice that the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment for 1350 Waterdown Road will be on the January 31st Development & Infrastructure Committee Meeting agenda. The notice states that the staff report will not be made available to the public until January 23rd, however we'd prefer if possible to resolve any questions we have in advance.

Will there be any reference in the staff report to reflect our earlier meetings and discussions, and protect the option of servicing through the future open space lands at the rear of 1350 Waterdown Road should it be determined that this route is most appropriate to connect the southern end of our Eagle Heights development? We remain concerned with the proposed open space zoning and lack of firm commitment or even reference to the existing servicing easement that the church has granted to us through their lands, and would appreciate some wording in the staff report that protects these interests, especially given that the Region has indicated to us that this is the preferred servicing route.

Please advise.

Thanks,
Dave Pitblado
Director, Real Estate Development
From: Stern, Lisa [mailto:Lisa.Stern@burlington.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 3:06 PM
To: Dave Pitblado; 'Karl Gonnsen'
Cc: Craven, Rick; Kisneris, John; 'Huycke, Adam'; Capone, Ang; Minaji, Rosalind; 'Greg'
Subject: 1350 Waterdown Servicing

Dave and Karl,

Further to our meeting last week, we had an opportunity to speak with the Region regarding the potential of servicing the Church via Craven and Nevarc as an efficient way of providing servicing to residents along those roadways and with the expectation that the servicing to the Taylor lands could, if approved, be connected across the tributary of the Grindstone creek at the rear of the church property.

It is Regional staff’s position that an Area-wide Analysis still needs to be done to determine how all of the Central Sector can be developed on Regional Servicing. As per the Region’s February 2012 comments relating to Eagle Heights, although the crossing at the church property may be the most efficient way to provide sanitary servicing to the Taylor lands, it has not been demonstrated that it would be the best way to service the whole central sector area south of Flatt Road, (including Aldershot Landscaping to the west and the lands designated for residential to the south of the Taylor lands), nor has the option been evaluated environmentally. The Eagle Heights FSR should be updated to illustrate that the proposed servicing scheme does not preclude the efficient servicing of adjacent lands. It is also my understanding that as mains may not be ultimately required from a Regional perspective on Craven and Nevarc they may not be cost recoverable.

From a City perspective, the rezoning of 1350 Waterdown Road to include a place of worship provides adequate servicing to the property via Waterdown Road, and does not prevent the servicing of the Taylor lands. As noted in the January 12 th information report to Council, staff has recommended that the ravine lands be dedicated to the City. If servicing through the ravine is determined to be the preferred option for Eagle Heights, City ownership would not inhibit this option as both the Official Plan and the Open Space zoning allow for the development of essential services within Open Space areas. The ultimate alignment of the servicing, should it be routed through the ravine, has not been determined and as such we are not prepared to recognize a formal right-of-way at this point in time. However, we certainly will be cognizant of your private easement agreement with the church and have no objection to this private arrangement.

I hope that you find this helpful,

Lisa Stern RPP, MCIP
Planner II - Development
Planning & Building Department | City of Burlington
426 Brant Street, P.O. Box 5013, Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6
☎ 905-335-7600 ext. 7427
✉ lisa.stern@burlington.ca

This message, including any attachments, is privileged and intended only for the addressee(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information contained in this email/fax. If you have received this email/fax transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone, fax or email and permanently delete this email from your computer/shred this fax, including any attachments, without making a copy. Access to this email/fax by anyone else is unauthorized. Thank you.
This message, including any attachments, is privileged and intended only for the addressee(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information contained in this email/fax. If you have received this email/fax transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone, fax or email and permanently delete this email from your computer/shred this fax, including any attachments, without making a copy. Access to this email/fax by anyone else is unauthorized. Thank you.
Zoning By-Law 2020

A Zoning By-law controls the use of land in your community, such as:

- How land may be used
- Where buildings and other structures can be located
- The types of buildings that are permitted and how they may be used
- The lot sizes and dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street.

Locate the zoning on your property

To find zoning information for a specific property, use our interactive zoning map.

Interactive Zoning Map...

If a proposed use is not permitted in a zone or if it does not meet the regulations of that zone, a Zoning By-law amendment or Committee of Adjustment Application must be made.

Please see information on Zoning Clearance Certificates.

IMPORTANT: Zoning Clearance Certificates must be approved before applying for a building permit and/or a pool permit.

If the zoning on your property is within the area of the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC), please contact the NEC for zoning information at 905-877-5191.
2.21 Uses Permitted in All Zones

The following uses are permitted in all zones, subject to Part I, Subsection 2.25 "Off Street Parking and Loading Requirements", Part I, Subsection 2.26 "General Parking Provisions", and any other regulations specified for the use and required elsewhere in the by-law; except as follows:

- Except where specifically prohibited or limited within the zone and including any exception number associated with the zone
- Except on lands zoned 02, 03, RA, RG, ME, RNA1, RNA2, RNA3, MRNA, ONA, DNA and S, and any exception numbers associated with these zones, unless specifically permitted:
- Except on lands Regulated by Conservation Halton, unless authorized by the Authority,
- Except where the zones are preceded by an H (Holding) zone prefix, notwithstanding that Agricultural and Farming, Miscellaneous Uses and Public Authorities are exempt from this provision.

a) Schools

- Elementary or secondary school, college or university, training centre or other place of learning including accessory buildings.
- Elementary or secondary schools are not permitted in GE1, GE2, BC1, BC2, MXT, MXE or UE zones.
- Lot Width: 45 m
- Lot shall abut a Major Arterial, Multi-purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road. This regulation shall not apply to: school additions up to 50% of the existing school building; portable classrooms; or accessory structures under 20 square metres on existing school sites.
- Minimum set back from any street line shall be 3 m for the first storey plus 1 m for each additional storey, except, in the downtown setbacks shall be in accordance with Part 6, Subsection 4.1.
- Minimum setback from all other lot lines: 15 m
- Maximum setback from a street line in an R02 zone: 6 m
- Separation Distance: 30 m from a railway right-of-way
- Parking: not permitted within 3 m of a residential property in a residential zone

b) Long Term Care Facilities

Permitted in all residential zones subject to the provisions of the respective zone and provided the lot abuts a Major Arterial, Multi-Purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road. Not permitted in BC1, BC2, GE1, GE2, MXT, MXE or UE zones, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number. Permitted in all other zones subject to the following:
• Lot abuts a Major Arterial, Multi-purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road
• Lot Width: 30 m
• Lot Area: 900 m²
• Floor Area Ratio: 1.25:1 maximum
• Front Yard: 7.5 m abutting a street having a deemed width less than 30 m; 9 m abutting a street having a deemed width of 30 m or more
• Rear Yard: 9 m
• Side Yard: 4.5 m
• Street Side Yard: 6 m
• Separation distance: 30 m from a railway right-of-way
• Building Height: 4 storeys maximum, or as provided for by the respective zone, whichever is greater and provided that the yard requirements of the respective zone shall also apply to buildings greater than 4 storeys.
• Parking: not permitted within 3 m of a residential property in a residential zone

c) Public and Private Hospitals, Public Health Care, Social Services

• Not permitted in BC1, BC2, GE1, GE2, MXE, MXT or UE zones, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number, when overnight accommodation is provided.
• Lot Width: 30 m
• Lot shall abut a Major Arterial, Multi-purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road
• Set back from any street line shall be 3 m for the first storey plus 1 m for each additional storey, except, in the downtown setbacks shall be in accordance with Part 6, Subsection 4.1.
• Setback from all other lot lines: 15 m
• Separation Distance: 30 m from a railway right-of-way
• Parking: not permitted within 3 m of a residential property in a residential zone

d) Places of Worship, Monasteries, Convents, Cemeteries

Includes an attached or detached manse, an accessory dwelling unit for a watchman and any other associated buildings located on the same property, subject to the following:

• Places of worship, monasteries and convents are not permitted in GE1, GE2, BC1, BC2, MXE, MXT or UE zones. Places of worship, monasteries, convents and cemeteries are not permitted in a DNA zone.
• Lot Width: 30 m
• Lot abuts a Major Arterial, Multi-purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road
• Minimum set back from any lot line or street line shall be 15 m, except, within the downtown where Part 6, Subsection 4.1.1, Diagram 6A shall apply.
• Separation Distance: 30 m from a railway right-of-way
• Parking: not permitted within 3 m of a residential property in a residential zone
c) Home Day Care

- Also permitted in an RA, RG and UE zone, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number.
- Permitted in a dwelling unit only.

f) Day Care Centre

- In an R1, R2 or R3 zone, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number, a lot shall not have more than two lot lines abutting any other lands zoned R1, R2, R3, excluding properties occupied by a school, place of worship or is owned by a public authority. Notwithstanding, a Day Care Centre is permitted in conjunction with a school or place of worship. Not permitted in GE1, GE2, BC1, BC2, MxE and UE zones, except as an accessory use to a principal use allowed in the respective zone.
- Separation Distance: 30 m from a railway right-of-way
- Parking: not permitted within 3 m of a residential property in a residential zone
- A day care centre shall be subject to the respective zone regulations
- Lot abuts a major Arterial, Multi-Purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road.

g) Group Home

- Permitted in a dwelling unit in RNA1, RNA2 and RNA3 zones, lots shall have a minimum 30 m lot width and 0.3 ha lot area.
- In apartment buildings over 3 storeys one Group Home is permitted for each 30 units and subject to one Group Home per floor.
- Minimum distance between Group Home properties: 400 m
- Minimum distance between a Group Home property and a Correctional Group Home property: 400 m

h) Correctional Group Home

- Permitted in a detached dwelling in RNA1, RNA2, RNA3, and CNA zones.
- Permitted in a detached dwelling in an R1, R2, R3 zones, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number.
- Permitted in a detached dwelling in a D Zone.
- Permitted in a detached dwelling in an RM2, RM3 zone, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number, subject to R2.4 Zone Regulations.
- Lot abuts a Major Arterial, Multi-purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road
- Minimum distance between Correctional Group Home properties: 400 m
- Minimum distance between a Group Home property and a Correctional Group Home property: 400 m
• Not permitted in any other zone

i) Emergency Shelter, Correctional Facility

• Not permitted in GE1, GE2, BC1, BC2, MXE or UE zones
• Lot width: 30 m
• Lot shall have a front or side lot line in common with a Major Arterial, Multi-Purpose Arterial, or Minor Arterial Road.
• Separation distance: 30 m from a railway right-of-way
• Setback from any street line shall be 3 m for the first storey plus 1 m for each additional storey, except in the downtown, setbacks shall be in accordance with Part 6, Subsection 4.1
• Setback from all other lot lines: 15 m
• Parking: not permitted within 3 m of a residential property in a residential zone
• Minimum distance between emergency shelter properties: 400 m
• Minimum distance between correctional facility properties: 400 m
• Minimum distance between a residential social services property and/or an emergency shelter property and/or a correctional facility property and/or a group home and/or a correctional group home: 400 m

j) Residential Social Services

• Not permitted in GE1, GE2, BC1, BC2, MXE or UE zones
• Lot width: 18 m
• Lot shall have a front or side lot line in common with a Major Arterial, Multi-Purpose Arterial, or Minor Arterial Road.
• Separation distance: 30 m from a railway right-of-way
• Setback from any street line shall be 3 m for the first storey plus 1 m for each additional storey, except in the downtown, setbacks shall be in accordance with Part 6, Subsection 4.1 Setback from all other lot lines: 3 m
• Minimum distance between residential social services properties: 400 m
• Minimum distance between emergency shelter properties: 400 m
• Minimum distance between correctional facility properties: 400 m
• Minimum distance between a residential social services property and/or an emergency shelter property and/or a correctional facility property and/or a group home and/or a correctional group home: 400 m

k) Boarding House

• Permitted in a detached dwelling only.
• Lot width: 18 m
• Lot abuts a Major Arterial, Multi-Purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial or Collector Road

l) Bed and Breakfast Home
• Also permitted in an RA zone, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number.
• Permitted in a detached dwelling only
• Lot Width: 18 m
• A maximum of three guest rooms or suites
• No exterior alteration shall be allowed which would indicate that any part of the premises is being used for any purpose other than that of a dwelling unit.
• No one other than a resident of the dwelling may be employed or have their services retained in the operation of the Bed and Breakfast Home.

m) Agriculture and Farming

Agricultural or farming uses excluding the raising of pigs, mink and chinchillas, are permitted subject to a minimum setback of 15 m from a street line or lot line for all buildings excluding a dwelling. For the main dwelling, the regulations of the respective zone shall apply.

• Not permitted in MXT zones.

n) Allotment Garden

• Also permitted in an RA and RO zone and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number.
• Not permitted in MXT zones

o) Kennel

• Also permitted in RA and RNA1 zones, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number.
• Not permitted in MXT zones.
• Minimum lot area: 1 ha.
• Kennels shall be set back 30 m from any lot line or street line;
• Parking: not permitted within 3 m of a residential property in a residential zone

p) Roadside Stand

A temporary roadside stand used for the display and sale of seasonal products produced on the agricultural land upon which the stand is located subject to the following:

• Also permitted in RA, and RG zones, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number.
• Not permitted in MXT zones.
• Lot area: 1.2 ha
• Stand Area: 20 m² maximum
• Height: 4 m maximum
• Set back from a street: 7.5 m, none required in RA and RG zones
q) Miscellaneous Uses

(i) A telephone booth;

(ii) A temporary construction camp, tool shed, scaffold or other such building or other such temporary work camp which is incidental to construction and provided it is located on the site where such work is underway and provided that it shall be removed from the site within 60 days of completing the work.

(iii) A temporary building or trailer for conducting sales of new dwelling units provided the sales building or trailer is located within the development site and that sales are restricted to dwelling units within that development only. The sales building or trailer shall be setback 30 m and parking 6 m from a residential property abutting the development site. The temporary sales office shall be removed from the site within 6 months or within 60 days of completing all sales of dwelling units, whichever is less.

A temporary office for conducting sales of new dwelling units may be established within a dwelling unit/model display home located within the development site, sales shall be restricted to dwelling units within the development only. Parking shall be setback 6 m from a residential property abutting the development site.

Model Display Homes shall be permitted in all residential zones subject to the following:

- The lands on which the model display homes are to be constructed have received draft plan approval under the Planning Act;
- The model display homes shall comply with the provisions and regulations of this By-law upon registration of the plan of subdivision;
- The maximum number of model display homes shall not exceed the lesser of 10 dwelling units or 10% of the total number of unregistered lots within the draft plan of subdivision, except for any draft plan having less than 20 unregistered lots where 2 model display homes are permitted.
- Model Display Homes must be located in groupings with no more than one proposed lot (as per the draft plan approval) between any two model display home units and no new grouping is to be initiated until such time as any previous grouping has reached 5 units.

(iv) Walls or fences required by or approved by public authority for environmental or ecological purposes or for reasons of safety.

(v) A gate house or kiosk in an employment zone for security or parking lot management.

(vi) The retail sale of Christmas trees, except on a property occupied by a residential dwelling, provided the use is removed from the site by January 1st of the following year.
Utilities

Water supply, storm water sewer or sanitary sewer (except for a commercial water taking operation in RA and RG zones)

Gas or oil pipeline

Transmission or distribution of electric power, but not the generation of electric power

Telecommunications infrastructure and other cable services

The above uses are also permitted in RNA1, RNA2, RNA3, SNA, MRNA,CNA, ONA and DNA zones.

Buildings associated with the above uses shall be prohibited on lands zoned O2, and RG, and any exception numbers associated with these zone(s), except where amended in the exception number.

Special Events

An event on behalf of a charitable organization may be held indoor or outdoor on private property in all employment, commercial, mixed use corridor, uptown mixed use centre, downtown mixed use centre and RA (Rural Agricultural) zones subject to the following regulations:

- The event is held for the primary purpose of supporting a charitable organization;
- An event shall not take place for longer than a 24 hour duration;
- No more than two events shall take place in any given facility or location within a 12 month period;
- On-site parking shall be provided in accordance with the requirements for a Convention/Conference/Banquet Centre uses as per Section 2.25, Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements;
- The event shall comply with all other by-Laws and regulations of the City of Burlington;
- All approved Fire and EMS accesses shall be maintained;
- All Ontario Building Code and Fire Code requirements shall be met;
- Where a tent or other temporary structure and/or accessory building is used for the event, it is considered floor area for the purposes of off street parking requirements;
- Where a tent or other temporary structure is deployed, it shall comply with the Ontario Building Code and all other applicable law;
- Where food is prepared and/or served all public health inspections and approvals shall be secured.

Training Centre or Other Place of Learning Including Accessory Buildings
- Lot shall abut a Major Arterial, Multi-Purpose Arterial, Minor Arterial, or Collector Road
- Separation Distance: 30m from a railway right-of-way
- Parking: not permitted within 3m of a residential property
5.0 O2 Zone [Open Space]

5.1 PERMITTED USES

- Municipal parks and public open space
- Storm water management and erosion control
- Public Utilities and services
- Cultural Heritage Resources
- Non-Intensive Outdoor Recreation uses such as walking trails, nature viewing, bird watching, etc.

5.2 BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES PERMITTED

Buildings and structures for permitted uses.
Accessory buildings and structures for permitted uses.

5.3 PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BUILDINGS

Buildings and structures intended for public assembly shall be set back 30 m from a railway right-of-way.
Contacts:
Contact Department
Numbers
Links

Service Burlington
426 Brant Street, PO Box 5013
Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6

T. 905-335-7600
Toll Free: 1-877-213-3609
F. 905-335-7675

Map this location
Email Service Burlington
4.0 RNA1 Zone Regulations

Link to Permitted Uses

4.1 Lot Width, Area, Yards

Table 9.4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Front Yard</th>
<th>Street Side Yard</th>
<th>Rear Yard</th>
<th>Side Yard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Uses</td>
<td>30 m with municipal water and sewer;</td>
<td>0.3 ha with municipal water and sewer;</td>
<td>80 m without municipal water and sewer [b]</td>
<td>0.8 ha without municipal water and sewer [b]</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>7.6m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes to Table 9.4.1

a) 5m minimum, 15m minimum combined side yards

b) Subject to adequate supply of potable water.

4.2 Building Height

a) Maximum building height: 2 storeys, in accordance with Part 1, Sub-Section 2.31 RESIDENTIAL BUILDING HEIGHT.
4.3 Private Garage Location

A private garage, attached or unattached, shall be located no closer to a street line than the distance between the detached dwelling and the street line.

4.4 Lot Coverage for Detached Dwellings

Table 9.4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Dwelling with Attached Garage/Carport</th>
<th>Dwelling Without Attached Garage/Carport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One storey</td>
<td>40% including accessory buildings and structures</td>
<td>32% plus 8% for accessory buildings and structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one storey</td>
<td>35% including accessory buildings and structures</td>
<td>27% plus 8% for accessory buildings and structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Dwelling Units and Impervious Surface

The maximum number of dwelling units and percent impervious surface shall be in accordance with Part 9, Subsection 8.

4.6 Other Regulations

Separation Distance from a railway Right of Way: 30 m for land uses sensitive to railway rights-of-way

Yard abutting a pipeline easement: 7 m rear yard; 3 m side yard

Yard abutting a P or PC zone: 6 m

Contacts:
Contact Department
Numbers
Links
3.0 Permitted Uses

The uses permitted in a North Aldershot Zone shall be in accordance with Table 9.3.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>RNA1</th>
<th>RNA2</th>
<th>RNA3</th>
<th>SNA</th>
<th>MRNA</th>
<th>CNA</th>
<th>ONA</th>
<th>DNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Service Commercial Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted in an CN2 Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Office Uses</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Institution</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Hospitality Uses</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Automotive Uses</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenced</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![c]</td>
<td>![c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Recreational Establishment</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached dwelling on a lot existing as of January 6, 1995</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse Dwelling</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Home</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Care Facility</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td>![f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Uses</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td>![g]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Farm Commercial</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td>![a]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Farm Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td>![b]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Conservation Projects</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td>![e]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes to Table 9.3.1

a) Permitted only in conjunction with a commercial farm

b) Permitted only in conjunction with a commercial farm provided the dwelling unit is for farm help

c) Only recreational establishments providing non-intensive outdoor recreational activities such as walking trails, nature viewing, bird watching, etc. as the principal use shall be permitted

d) Subject to the regulations of Part 9, Section 4, RNA1 zone

e) Permitted on existing lots having a minimum lot area of 1.2 ha, all buildings, structures or enclosures used for the keeping of animals shall be set back 30m from a lot line or street line

f) Permitted only on lots with municipal water and sewer

g) Permitted in an H zone

This page last updated December 17, 2015

Contacts:
Contact Department
Numbers
Links

Service Burlington
426 Brant Street, PO Box 5013
Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6

T. 905-335-7600
Toll Free: 1-877-213-3609
F. 905-335-7675