

CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	1.1	Missing key direction for the Mobility Hubs.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	1.1	Without the specific details that will be developed through the Mobility Hub Area Specific Plans it is unclear how the policy will accomplish the goals of the Plan. That is, how much growth will be directed to each Mobility Hub Area.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	1.4	Without filling the gaps in Section 8 of the Plan the Plan is not in alignment with the Strategic Plan.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	1.4	Do not see our proposed Vision anywhere.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	1.5	Principles: Sustainable Development –do not see economic or social aspects, Diversity and Adaptability – see diversity related to Natural Heritage but nothing else. Adaptability is not addressed. Community – see it in bits and pieces but Neighbourhood re. interacting, supporting each other or identifying opportunities. Invigorated Rural Areas – Looks fairly well covered. Interconnectivity – Looks fairly well covered . , Accessibility and Equity – Accessibility appears covered. See nothing on Equity. Health and Vitality – Looks fairly well covered.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	1.5.1 b)	North Aldershot – why a distinct role? Shouldn't that eventually either be urban or rural?
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	1.5.1 c)	The Plan is intended to accommodate minimum population and employment growth yet it fails to indicate the amount of growth that is targeted for each of the intensification areas – this additional information is required.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	1.5.1 g)	Provides for the efficient, effective, and financially responsible...

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	1.5.2	The language is vague, referencing only active and sustainable transportation choices. Provide greater detail on how land use aligns to multi-modal transportation
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	1.5.3 f)	Promotes health, safety and social well-being ... health care facilities, recreation facilities, parks ...
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	1.5.4 d)	Proposed new item d): "supports and encourages the community to identify opportunities to build active creative neighbourhoods
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	General	Concerned that there is not sufficient detail to understand where and how much growth will be directed to achieve Provincial growth targets.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	General	Explanation of the differing titles and roles that the Downtown area of the City holds.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	General	Significant gaps in Section 8 of the Plan (specifically the Downtown Land Use policies) challenge the plan's ability to achieve the objectives set out in this section.
30-Jun-17	Shane Cooney, ADI Development	General	Premature to comment on the Plan being an effective tool to guide growth in the future. We are looking forward to receiving additional information requested by the HHHBA.
30-Jun-17	Robert Molinaro, Molinaro Group	General	Premature to comment on the Plan being an effective tool to guide growth in the future. We are looking forward to receiving additional information requested by the HHHBA.
30-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	General	The overall success of the Official Plan will be greatly contingent on the mobility hubs, the Urban Growth Centre and transportation corridors to accommodate growth within the planning horizon (2031).
30-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	General	Premature to comment on the Plan being an effective tool to guide growth in the future. We are looking forward to receiving additional information requested by the HHHBA.
29-Jun-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA	General	All growth will occur in an intensified form- directed to primary growth areas. Agree. The Plan lacks detail on how those areas will function.

29-Jun-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA	General	What population growth has been achieved to date (relative to the targets set in the Regional OP and the densities set for urban growth centres and mobility hubs in the original and updated Growth Plan) what remains to achieve these targets and where will that growth occur. We understand this information is being developed but believe the information is absolutely critical before finalizing the mobility hub Area Specific Plans or the Official Plan. At this time we are unable to support the Official Plan as it does not provide our industry with the information it requires to understand if the City is meeting our requirements to accommodate growth nor does it allow our industry to submit a development application and have an understanding as to whether or not it meets the intent of the plan.
29-Jun-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA	General	Grow Bold the Plan must be unapologetic and guide future development applicant to successfully providing economically feasible, quality developments that are in keeping with big picture City goals that marry the City's vision with the growth targets mandated by higher order government.
8-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	General	In the absence of population and employment distribution numbers and significant revisions to the failed precinct planning framework to adequately accommodate the required future growth within the mobility hubs and the connecting corridors, City Council, the public and the development industry is being misled. Significant and "bold" planning framework and policy changes are required to enable the City to accommodate the minimum population and employment targets that have been established. The current draft of the New Official Plan fails to indicate how the City of Burlington is planning to accommodate the minimum Provincial requirements outlined in Places to Grow and the Growth Plan. The overall success of the New Official Plan will be greatly contingent upon the success of the Urban Growth Centre to accommodate required growth within the planning horizon of 2031.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	Introduction	The plan does not set out development ready provisions as they are absent clear intensification targets.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Introduction	City is evolving into a "complete city" or "complete City", but definition is only provided for a "complete community". Suggest harmonizing the language, e.g. "a city of complete communities", using only "a complete community"

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Introduction	Economic and social aspects of sustainable development are not well introduced, particularly with respect to create neighborhoods. Maybe Complete Community definition covers daily needs. Nothing addresses the social side.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Introduction	Adaptability and climate resilience are not addressed.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Introduction	The focus on intensification areas with little mention of direction to the few remaining greenfield areas. The OP could benefit from an introductory statement like: "Development of the remaining greenfield areas will be consistent with the strategic directions in this Plan and integrate sustainability as appropriate."

CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.1 general	Do not see enough reference to people or connectivity.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.1 general	Suggest deleting Paragraph 6, "A new sense of shared purpose ..." does not contribute to the overall message of the section.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.1 general	Paragraphs 7, 8 & 9 are confusing with respect to "city building" and key messages. Specific wording recommended in comments.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.2.1 d)	Last sentence, "Limited growth will be directed ..." is redundant
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.2.1 e)	Specific edits for clarity recommended in comments
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	2.2.2 d)	How does the Green System differ from the Natural Heritage System?
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.2.3	The plans referred to are outdated. While it is recognized that the implication of changes to the plan is not simple, references elsewhere in the document point to future plans (i.e. Walkers Cumberland future GO). Updated mapping should be included in the document.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.2.3	Built Boundary. Reference is made to 8300 units to be added between 2015 and 2031. We have on two occasions requested a status report on where the City is at with respect to the above and the general status of achieving overall population targets. Please provide as soon as possible.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.2.3	We have requested a status report as to the gross density target to date of the urban growth centre to understand if densities being proposed through the OP and Mobility Hubs studies will bring us close to or achieving this target. Please provide as soon as possible.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.2.3	For the Designated Greenfield Area, where did the development density target of 45 people and jobs per ha come from.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.2.3	For the Designated Greenfield Area, the plan should make reference to the fact that the Growth Plan will require these targets to increase considerably (currently 50 p+j/ha and ultimately 80 p+j/ha) in the near future, and certainly within the horizon of this OP.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.2.3	While there are other maps including locations of the other provincial plans there does not appear to be information on the Parkway Belt West Plan within appendices.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.2.3 d) ii)	Could the yearly number be included, as in 519 units per year from 2015 to 2031? This may help some with a better perspective on growth.
26-May-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.2.3 d) iii)	A minimum density of 200 people and jobs is required by 2031. We would like to obtain an understanding of how the City is planning to satisfy this minimum growth requirement. We are of the opinion that unless significant changes are made to the City's land use policy framework, it may be impossible for the City to achieve the minimum density target by 2031. While we note that the "Downtown Mobility Hub" is significantly larger than the "Urban Growth Centre", we also recognize that the majority of this additional area is comprised of what may be considered as existing residential neighbourhoods that are to be protected. Therefore, as the residential neighbourhoods are intended to be protected and will not change to accommodate significant redevelopment and intensification, redevelopment and intensification policies are most appropriately focused on the "Urban Growth Centre" as defined on Schedule "F".
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.2.3 e)	Land use in this area in North Aldershot is significantly influenced by the large land-areas owned and controlled by RBG, and by the planned Cootes to Escarpment Park. Suggest that these be referenced, and that their influence on land use planning be noted.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	2.2.4	At minimum provide a rationale for how the 55% ratio of employment to general population was determined. In absence of that, conduct a comparison with other cities aiming to grow economically to determine whether a more ambitious target than this is feasible.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.2.4	Could a percentage increase per year be included to help readers gain a better perspective on growth? This would show growth of less than 1% per year over 25 years.
26-May-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.3 general	Unless significant changes are made the City cannot achieve the target of 200 people and jobs per ha by 2031 in the Downtown Urban Growth Centre.
26-May-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.3 general	Intensification within the Downtown Mobility Hub will be focused within the UGC.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	2.3 general	To the previous comment (2.2.2 d) Is the Green System redundant?

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.3 general	Paragraph one does not read well. It should be reworked.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.3 h)	It is appropriate to specify the densities expected through the Growth Plan for these mobility hubs. Please include.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.3 m)	This should be reworded to say "Mixed Use Nodes and Intensification Corridors will be a focus for re-urbanization.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	2.3.1 g)	Mobility Hubs are being planned as major intensification areas. Consideration must be given to prioritizing the City's needs within the urban area over potential environmental constraints.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.3.1 j)	Since City is indicating it will designate a new Walkers/Cumberland GO station as a mobility hub, consider mentioning Appleby/Dundas as potential future mobility hub location once Dundas Street BRT is underway.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.3.2 c)	Does this mean that every area in the city can be changed by a municipal comprehensive review or is it just employment lands?
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	2.3.3. b)	This policy is rigid and limited. Limiting growth to infill and ADU is short sighted. There are many opportunities for redevelopment such as closed school sites which pose an excellent opportunity for redevelopment. So long as redevelopment is thoughtful and provides for compatibility it should not be discouraged.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.3.4	a) and b) only state what they are. Are these areas to be protected or can they be developed or intensified? This may not be clear to the public.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	2.3.4 b)	Again, how does the Green System differ from the Natural Heritage System?
26-May-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.4 general	Pleased to see that the Downtown will be the recipient of the majority of the City's forecast growth, height and density. Effective new planning policies are required to achieve these goals and objectives - these policies are not provided.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	2.4 general	Add a clause to address the transportation needs in the employment lands, such as "development in employment growth areas shall include implementation of appropriate transit services and design principles to promote walkable and bikeable options".

30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	2.4 general	5353 Lakeshore Rd. (Lakeside Plaza): The Growth Framework inappropriately constraints the subject lands' potential and will preclude significant opportunities for a mix of uses and height variation - a variation that is highly appropriate given the subject lands' size, location and the local context.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.4.1 b)	There's no reference to low rise which seems odd, given that some of the development and redevelopment that occurs will be low rise.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.4.1 c)	The term public expenditure needs clarification, a definition, etc. It is unclear that this infers investment by the City to facilitate/ensure successful private development.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.1 d)	Language around mobility choices is weak. We need to prioritize & support active transportation/transit not just provide choice. Suggest that language be strengthened to indicate prioritizing active transportation/transit.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.1 e)	e) To limit the introduction of unplanned <i>intensification</i> in established neighbourhood areas". This objective is vitally important and needs to be supported in any fashion possible as we have lot of this.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.1 e)	This is a vague statement. Is the word unplanned necessary?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	2.4.2 b)	Why would the growth framework not apply to greenfield areas such as Bronte Creek Meadows and 1200 King Road? Specifically, the western portion of 1200 King Road is part of the Aldershot Mobility Hub Study Area and identified as Primary Growth Area, yet this policy states the Growth Framework shall not apply.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.4.2 d)	The term "justified" in front of the frequent transit network appear throughout the document. In our meeting we indicated this doesn't read well, nor does the reader understand the use of this term. It is recommended that the "justified" be removed, and some reference to current and potentially expanded "frequent transit network" be included. Please note there is a lack of consistency with the inclusion of justified or not throughout the document.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.1 c)	Should we list tools similar to employment lands?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.1 e) i)	Could not find the Section 2.3 Urban Structure objectives. Do you mean 2.4 Growth Framework Objectives?

5-Apr-17	David McKay, MHBC	2.4.2.2	1450 Headon Road: Draft Secondary Growth Area policies discourages Official Plan Amendments for increased height and or density/intensity.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.2 (b) (i)	What does significantly mean? 5%, 25%, or 100%. This is unclear.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.2 a) i)	Should be Schedule P-1 not B-1.
30-Jun-17	Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT	2.4.2.2 a) ii)	Supports this policy.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.2 b) (iii)	Add 50 units/ha so do not greatly exceed 25 units/ha as have the capability to go up to 75 units/ha which could lead to over intensification.
30-Jun-17	Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates	2.4.2.2 c)	2095 Prospect Street: This policy is too onerous and would preclude redevelopment of the site in question. It is not clear how this policy supports or encourages intensification and additional rental housing within the City. Please consider modifying the policies to permit this kind of redevelopment.
30-Jun-17	Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates	2.4.2.3	619 and 625 Maple Ave: This policy would preclude any OPA on these lands for additional density. It is not clear how these policies encourage or support intensification and the creation of a broader range and mix of housing. It is requested that modifications be made to permit the higher density stacked townhouse form.
28-Jun-17	Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates	2.4.2.3	431, 425, 419, 415 Burlington Avenue and 1421, 1415 and 1407 Lakeshore Road: The existing St.Lukes Neighbourhood policy permits only existing uses and single detached dwellings (Burlington Ave) and the ENA policies prohibit privately initiated. Together that means a significant portion of these lands cannot redevelop. This is contrary to the direction that Urban Centres should provide for a broad range of uses at a density higher than the surrounding area.
28-Jun-17	Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates	2.4.2.3	352, 348, 344 Guelph Line and 353 and 359 St. Paul Street: The draft Official Plan should contain policies which allow for intensification at the edges of neighbourhoods such as along Guelph Line to provide an opportunity for a range of housing types in these neighbourhoods.
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	2.4.2.3	Too limited. Fails to acknowledge that change and transition can happen in an area. Further it does not permit a proponent to make an application that does not meet those criteria but may still be appropriate, compatible and meet the needs of a segment of the population.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.3	Specific edits for established neighbourhoods provided in comments
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	2.4.2.3 b)	Suggest the following revision: Within Established Neighbourhood Areas, the following forms of intensification shall not be permitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • re-zoning in accordance with the current definitions of Zoning Bylaw 2020; • land assemblies; • plans of subdivision • removal of more trees than stipulated in 4.3.2. Within Established Neighbourhood Areas, the following forms of intensification may be permitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consents to sever, subject to policies in Chapter 12, Implementation and Interpretation, of this Plan;
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.3 b)	We like the idea of introducing policies that prohibit privately initiated Official Plan amendments for increased density beyond that permitted through the underlying use designation. Strong language is needed that prevents any Official Plan Amendments beyond existing maximum density.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	2.4.2.3 c)	5166 - 5170 Lakeshore Road: The language "shall not be supported" is inappropriate and removes the decision making ability of Council and presupposes that any application for increased density cannot be supported. Remove this policy language from subsequent drafts.
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	2.4.2.3 c)	Stating this (Official Plan Amendments for increased height and or density/intensity beyond that which is currently permitted in the underlying land use designation shall not be supported) outright is shortsighted and does not acknowledge the need to evaluate a development application based on its own merits.
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	2.4.2.3 d)	A proponent should be permitted to bring forward an OPA, the assessment of which should be based on its merits. It should not be left to the City.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	2.4.2.4	Re-assess major gateways to the City and areas where mixed development is being encouraged to see if there is language that can be added to encourage innovative developers to invest in model community building without jeopardizing the retention of adequate employment lands
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.4	Does this go as far as saying the city will go out and recruit business to come to our city? As we have limited experience in implementing incentives, we should learn from other municipalities who have been successful and replicate their practices.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.4 c)	Do you really want this? You could be leaving yourself open to investing in whole lot of infrastructure when you do not have the resources? You intend to prioritize everything the same? Should consider Employment Secondary areas.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.4.2.4 d) (viii)	Do we not want to use DPS in other areas particularly in recognized growth areas?
26-May-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.5 general	The use of the phrase "reflecting the existing character of adjacent development" is unsuitable. The policy should strive for new development in harmony with existing development. Similarly the use of the term "compatible" is problematic as this term has been deferred in the existing Official Plan and has never been approved. We would like to discuss different wording with the City that is not only acceptable to the development industry but also approvable.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	2.5 general	Strengthen the commitment to environmental stewardship by including specific strategies for green space and tree canopy development/ conservation in all development and redevelopment policies and objectives.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.5 general	General - In this section, it is important that "fit" be understood. In this light, there needs to be an improved understanding of the definition of compatibility, as this is very subjective in nature. Further, a definition of "land use vision" is required. While we recognize this was discussed in one of the meetings, and industry was referred to Chapter 8, this discusses priorities, and the term land use vision is not included in the chapter.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	2.5.1 a) vi)	Flexibility should be added. Within the build boundary and the urban area it can't always be zero impact to NHS or the development does not proceed. Allow for creative solutions.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.5.2	Not sure if this addresses the concept of building better buildings. It may be covered in Chapter 7.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.5.2 a)	What are you to use for measuring TDM?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.5.2 a)	What happened to grading as a compatibility criterion? It made good sense.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	2.5.2 a)	Consider the following as potential intensification criteria: Section 4 criteria, Sustainability Building and Development Guidelines, District Energy Evaluation, Carbon Analysis of proposed fuels, and triple bottom line assessment.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.5.2 a) (v) b)	This section needs further discussion to understand implementation and its effect on developments. It suggests working arrangements between private developers.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.5.2 a)(vii)	Public service facilities and specific uses, and their proximity to transit is more a function of City transit planning and site location, vs. a requirement to be satisfied through a development proposal. It is listed as a "shall be evaluated", however is outside of the control of private development.
26-May-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.5.2 a)iv)	This policy is confusing and should be reworded to focus on fit and the mitigation of adverse impacts.
8-Jun-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.5.2 b) i)	what is land use vision? Staff will address in section 2.3
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.5.2 b)& c)	This section is problematic since all neighbourhoods in the city are now existing. This takes all mid and high rise buildings and moves them to the periphery of a neighbourhood, because the requirement uses the word shall. There are areas within the mobility hubs, and potential throughout the City, that can accommodate mid and high rise and are not on the periphery of a neighbourhood (i.e.. The draft concepts based on public input from the mobility hubs shows a number of locations where mid and high rise are proposed and NOT on the periphery of a neighbourhood. This needs to be rectified.
26-May-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	2.5.2 b)i)	What does "land use vision of this plan" mean?
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	2.5.2 e)	The industry needs a better understanding of what criteria will be used to determine if an area-specific plan is required in conjunction with a development. Further, the OP needs to be careful that area-specific plan and financial analysis, as referred to in 6.5.2 Policies are not interchanged.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Where relevant, include brief cross-references to Chapter 4: Environment & Sustainability to give more weight to the 'sustainable' part of the chapter title and connect to the Strategic Plan: A Healthy and Greener City, as well as cross references to Chapter 6: Infrastructure and Transportation where appropriate. In fact, cross-referencing like this throughout the OP document would demonstrate how the Strategic Plan themes are woven into the OP, and how the various chapters are interconnected and support the four SP directions.

30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Insert brief cross-references to Chapter 8 to tie together the principles outlined in Chapter 2 to the more detailed implementation of these principles. In particular, a discussion of building footprint vs. height would offer more concrete planning guidelines to ensure that intensification meets the goals of pedestrian and cycling connections and affords sufficient room for green spaces in redevelopment projects.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Add clearly stated objectives and solid policies to support the inclusion/preservation of green space, both in the downtown core and other high intensity development nodes.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	At minimum, a cross reference to the section on Agricultural System in Chapter 9 would strengthen the plan for sustainable growth in Chapter 2. The production of food locally is a key pillar in the overall sustainability of a community.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	The chapter doesn't indicate the importance of reducing energy usage / reducing GHG in the built form. This seems like a significant gap, and a missed opportunity. Integrate messaging about the impact of built form on energy consumption and GHG emissions, and the City's goal of reducing both through better land use planning.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Clarify City System as both an interconnected system of land use areas, and a strategic framework. Current language is confusing.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Language around prioritizing active transportation/transit should be strengthened.

CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	3.1 c)	We encourage the City to commit to using surplus lands for affordable housing, as a priority over other development.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.1.1.1 a)	The policy objective sets out that sufficient supply of suitably designated and serviced residential land is maintained to meet existing and future housing needs. Burlington is already in non compliance with this policy. Old thinking.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	3.1.1.2 f)	Additional options should be provided, beyond having to met the CHMC regulations, allowing for conversion to take place. As an example, City of Hamilton policies allows for the proponent to either A) meet (at or above) CHMC vacancy rates, or B) obtain 75% approval from all tenants in the building prior to being able to convert a property to condominium tenure.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.1.2.1 b)	How do you plan to encourage affordable housing? With land values skyrocketing, construction costs increasing, development application and development charges increasing and supply/demand forces inflating housing prices throughout the GTA how exactly does one build "affordable" housing anymore? Builders will not build if it means losing money doing so. Even if reduced price housing is somehow offered it is sold out immediately and resold at market value for a significant profit.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.1.2.2 b)	How does the designation of land for affordable housing happen when development in Burlington is now limited to reuse of existing lands (*size restrictions and great cost)? Notifying a landowner at the time of development approval is way too late as costs have already been incurred. What exactly does "made available" mean?
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	3.1.2.2 d)	The commitment to processing priority for affordable housing should be as clear as stipulated in 3.1.3.2 g).
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.1.2.2 d)	Not fair practice. At least when the OMB existed developers could appeal non-decisions after 180 days. Will the municipality be able to accept applications fees and then sit on applications as long as they want with no recourse?
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	3.1.2.2d)	Revise wording to "The City may give processing priority to development applications which will provide the type, size and tenure of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being needs of City residents"

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.1.3.2 b)	Notifying a landowner at the time of development approval is way too late as costs have already been incurred. What exactly does "made available" mean? If the City wants land for this type of housing, then they need to buy it.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.1.3.2 g)	Not fair practice. At least when the OMB existed developers could appeal non-decisions after 180 days. Will the municipality be able to accept applications fees and then sit on applications as long as they want with no recourse?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.2.1 d)	How long will the City-wide Post Secondary Institution Strategy take? When will it begin? In meetings with City staff we've been told they want to undertake this study before determining appropriate uses at Bronte Creek Meadows. What if no institutions want to come to Burlington? Will lands be designated and placed on hold indefinitely just like the employment lands that remain vacant for decades? How is this fair to landowners who may have a different vision for their private property?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.2.2 c)	This contradicts discussions we've had with City planning staff regarding Bronte Creek Meadows.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.2.2 i) and ii)	If Bronte Creek Meadows, a designated greenfield area, is not considered a desirable location for a post secondary institution, which is fine, why are we being forced to wait until after this study is completed.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	3.3 general	Please clarify does the Special Resource Area/Linkages include NHS Linkages, as defined in the Draft New OP. In particular, can Linkages be provided for the purposes of parkland dedication (as set out in section 12.1.3.6)?
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	3.3 general	Current Parkland Dedication rates do not address changing needs in intensification areas. Update the City's Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan to reflect the new needs of the City.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	3.3 general	The OP addresses green space in general terms. Prepare a Green space Inventory and Acquisition Plan.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.3.2 d)	Land for new parks doesn't exist anymore; therefore the entire parkland dedication idea needs to be revamped or removed.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	3.3.2 e)	Provide a timeline for the update the existing Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan for accountability purposes
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.3.2 f)	If those trails or connections don't exist already there's likely not going to be much of an opportunity to create them now.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.3.2 g)	There is no land for development of new parks.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.3.2 i)	There is no opportunity for more "neighbourhood" type developments like we've seen in the past. If the park doesn't already exist there's likely not going to be much of an opportunity to create them now.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.3.2 j)	On what land? Does the City have significant undeveloped land holdings, or will efforts be made to purchase such land?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	3.4.3 d)	So in other words the provision for public art will be a condition of approval? What if the developer doesn't want to spend money unnecessarily for the sake of public art? What does public art have to do with planning approvals and development? Where in the Planning Act does it state public art is a requirement? If the City wants public art, then pay for public art.
29-Jun-17	Roger Goulet, PERL	3.5 general	Appendix G 'Cultural Heritage Landscape Study Area' map encompasses the Mount Nemo Plateau and slopes. Since the Province did not accept the NEC Escarpment Protection designations for the Mount Nemo Plateau, the City needs to strengthen its rural protective policies for this unique Plateau.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5 preamble	Suggest adding the wording "... archaeological resources, many of which are privately owned and are located..." and also, replace irreplaceable with important
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.1 b)	Like the idea of the objectives but less heavy handed...HB is not in favour of stewardship or custodial language which deems people are not "owners"
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.1 d)	Reject the sentiment that this could be done at all costs to the Burlington taxpayer or worse the home owner. Recommend adding language such as "...To minimize, wherever economically feasible, the demolition, destruction...."
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.1 f)	Character areas are not clearly defined and therefore do not fall under the OHA, so this should be modified to Heritage Conservation District or omitted completely
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.1 h)	Recommend continuing to emphasize significance. We appreciate the "valued" language as it assumes a monetary value and we endorse this thinking.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.1 k)	Need to be clear that not all cultural heritage resources are City owned...there is a distinction that needs to continue to be appreciated.
29-Jun-17	Roger Goulet, PERL	3.5.2.1	Does this OP policy include the possibility of reviving the 'Rural Cultural Landscape Conservation Designation' for the Mount Nemo Plateau? If not, why not?

16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.1	Heritage Burlington, Council and Staff have dialed back the rhetoric that once characterized heritage exchanges, demonstrated clear respect for property owners and expanded our incentive program. The policies related to Cultural Heritage Resources must continue to build on the positive and constructive relationship that we have established over the past few years. Going forward, it will be imperative that the policies in the OP provide direction to Council and Staff to ensure we maintain our “carrot not stick approach” and a development “tool kit” comprised of both financial and non-financial options that would permit designation, where necessary and at the same time, not penalize the owner(s) of the property.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.1	Suggest adding: a) The City shall recognize the word and spirit of the Council approved 2012 report” NEW APPROACH TO CONSERVING BURLINGTON’S HERITAGE”
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.1	Suggest adding: b) The City shall acknowledge and adhere to the principle that the conservation of privately-owned cultural resources may be accomplished with the assistance of the community at large, not solely at the cost of the individual property owner.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.1 a)	As mentioned above, it is important to distinguish between what is City owned what is not. Specific wording recommended in comments.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.1 c)	Omission of cemeteries. Historic cemeteries are equally valuable. Specific wording recommended in comments.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.1 d)	What context would the City have non-government funding? Also, important to emphasize the use of both financial and non-financial tools
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.1 e)	Standards are already mentioned and limit us. For example, our tax rebate program is an initiative but not a standard per say. Specific wording changes recommended in comments.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.2 a) & b)	Wherever possible it is important to emphasize the significance. This ties back to the OHA as well. Also, emphasize the new approach and our collaboration with property owners and other groups alike. Specific wording recommended in comments.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.3 & 3.5.2.4	Again, we’d like to see significant cultural and not just cultural referenced throughout these sections and not limit the City to certain options.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.5 c) & v)	Again, we are looking to have options and not limiting...options may be outside our borders e.g. across Derry Rd to Milton or to Hamilton
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.5.1	The word “major” needs to be defined and best financial so this does not include taking down a tree but more about a development over \$100Ketc...Might this be something included in the NEC or other provincial legislation?

16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.5.2	Some Archaeological companies do not respect the cultural sensitivity of the peoples they are excavating or perceive the project as being more important than heritage they are excavating. These archaeological excavations result in the discarding archaeological objects from an excavation to hasten an excavation and reduce the likelihood that further research into the site will continue. The purpose of requiring monitors on an excavation, while not always required in a Stage 2 excavation under the Ontario Heritage Act, will ensure that Burlington actively respects the heritage of the people and culture they are excavating, while taking a leading role in encouraging other Municipalities to preserve their archaeological heritage. This guideline presently does not exist in the Burlington Heritage By-Laws, but it is recommended that the City enact.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.5.2	Suggest adding: The City of Burlington shall under archaeology excavations have monitors on site from the beginning of any stage 2 excavation until the research on the site concludes in adherence to the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport legislation of the Ontario Heritage Act.
16-Jul-17	Heritage Burlington	3.5.2.5.2	Suggest adding: Monitors shall be on the excavation site to register objects found and control the sensitivity of actions taken by the archaeologists ensuring relevant objects found are recorded, and preserved in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Include access to food in the definition of a complete community and create a section in Chapter 3 to address it, or at minimum, a cross-reference to section 4.9.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Provide more clarity on the strategy for the transition period from our communities today to complete communities
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Add appropriate policies to the OP in the "Complete Communities" and "Transportation" sections to achieve the goal of walkability, and include the adoption of a walkability score tool to measure results.

CHAPTER FOUR - ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.1 general	Amend the Mineral and Aggregate Resources section to clarify what objectives/policies apply to new/expanded quarries and those that are already licensed/closed.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.1 general	Climate Change and Air Quality fifth line, add “effective” after “sustainable”.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.1.2	Address GHG and fuel emissions as part of Climate Change Objectives and Policies.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.1.2 a) (ii)	Should have a definition for “transit”
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.1.2 a) (iii)	Or build intensification so existing or planned transit can be used.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.1.2 a) (ix)	Could effective on-site non-fossil fuel energy generation not help?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.1.2 a) (x)	How will this help?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.1.2 a) (xi) & (xii)	Proposed additions: 1. Control air emissions from manufacturing operations AND encourage energy conservation
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.10.2.2 b)	How much effort is being put into this? Settlement areas are almost on top of some of these deposits.
14-Jul-17	PERL	4.10.2.2 j) (i)	Clarify that the NEP does not permit / allow mineral extraction in any part of the NEP, except through NEP amendment within the Escarpment Rural designated area. The wording in (i) implies that mineral extraction is allowed in NEP Escarpment Rural areas. Not so.

30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.2 general	Include the urban tree canopy as part of the natural features on the City's Natural Heritage System.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.2 general	Make a stronger commitment to the Cootes to Escarpment Ecopark System and how the City plans to support its expansion.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.2 general	Emphasize tree protection in the Natural Heritage System sub-chapter.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.2 general	Add a section regarding the protection of spawning areas, dens and nests from human disturbance, if they are located within the natural heritage system and don't interfere with existing human activities. The goal should be to protect, preserve, restore and enhance the productivity and biodiversity within the city's natural heritage system.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.2 general	Encourage habitat protection for endangered species in all land uses, including urban parks, and areas zoned for residential, commercial and industrial use.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.2 general	Include natural corridor improvements and enhancements such as wildlife bridges and tunnels to cross major roads and railways to reduce collision risk and level of human disturbance.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2 general	Why would you ever want to strike a "balance between protection and enhancement of the Natural Heritage System and community growth and development" - Dangerous statement to put in here
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2 general	How is this different from the Green System?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.1 e)	It should be the other way around. Not enough importance is placed on the role of agriculture and the challenges it faces because of competing NHS policies. At the pace which NHS policies are getting more and more restrictive to farming activity, agriculture is being strangled out of the Prime Agricultural Area. NHS is important, but without agriculture, we don't eat.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.1 g)	Consider adding "and away from NHS"
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.1 j)	Consider adding "and water quality"
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.1 l)	This encourages illegal trespass onto private property and farmland. Rural property owner rights are infringed upon every day because of policies like this one.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.1 Objectives a) , b) and f)	Change objectives to start "To maintain, enhance and restore"

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.2 c) (vi)	Is Hamilton Conservation Authority not involved on east side of Burlington?
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.2.2 f)	Further refinements that occur at a draft plan of subdivision stage through a study accepted by the City and Region as set out in policy 4.2.2.f), could further trigger a requirement for an additional OPA, shortly after the completion of the above OPA. Greater flexibility should be provided in the language of policy 4.2.2.f) of the Draft New OP to allow for City discretion regarding requirement for multiple OPAs related to the refinement of the NHS.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.2.2 f)	It is unclear if the "other components within it" refers to components within the Natural Heritage System or within the Key Natural Heritage Features. We believe it is the former. Revise reference to "other components within it the Natural Heritage System"
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.2 General Policies, b)	What about Natural Heritage shown on Schedules C and N??
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.2 j)	What are Major and Minor Changes? These should be spelt out.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.2.2 j)	There may be some ambiguity between what is a minor refinement and a major refinement requiring an OPA. Policy 4.2.2.j) should allow for City discretion regarding when an amendment is required in circumstances of major refinements. Suggest revising policy to remove reference to "minor" and modify from shall to may require an amendment.
29-Jun-17	PERL	4.2.2 j)	"Major changes...or removal or addition of Key Natural Features on Schedule N..., shall require an amendment to this Plan." This Policy should also require public meeting(s).
29-Jun-17	PERL	4.2.2 k)	"...the review of a development application, it is found that there are natural heritage feature(s) or function that have not been adequately identified or evaluated, or new information has become available, the applicant shall be required to have an Environmental Impact Assessment prepared..." This Policy should add {or potential for species at risk}. This became determinative in the denial of the Nelson Aggregate new quarry application on Mount Nemo. The applicant, Nelson Aggregate, did not identify the presence of endangered Jefferson Salamanders.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.2 l)	We lost 40 acres of designated Prime Agricultural Area, all because we let the property go fallow as part of normal farm practices, and have been fighting the Provincial Government for the past 5 years unsuccessfully to try to farm our land. The word "existing" should be deleted.
29-Jun-17	PERL	4.2.2 m) (i)	"...prohibited development and site alteration within: a. b. c. d. This Policy should add e. {significant woodlands designated within the Natural Heritage System}.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.2 m) ii)	The "no negative impact" test is no longer appropriate given its subjective nature. Any development or site alteration could be argued to have a negative impact depending on a person's point of view. It should be a matter of identifying the impact and then determine if/how compensation can be provided to mitigate that impact.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.2 m)i)c)	Placing a prohibition on development and site alteration over the entire rural area (Natural Heritage System) will end agriculture as we know it. Ploughing a farm field has been interpreted by Provincial authorities, as evidenced by the example given related to policy 4.2.2 l), where ploughing our designated Prime Agricultural Area would result in fines and possible imprisonment.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.2 n)	Again this is the old way of thinking. Subdivision applications where blocks of land can be dedicated to the City won't be happening like they used to.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.2 p) i)	Good. This needs to be emphasized to the public, not just hidden in the Official Plan which most residents don't ever read.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.2 p)ii)	Arguably, by designating private lands as NHS and enforcing what can and cannot be done on that property the City does have an interest in those lands. If property owners are left with no opportunity to use their property the way they want the City should be forced into a position of either purchasing the property, or at least waiving any and all property taxes. This is expropriation without compensation.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.2.2.b)	Missing a reference to Schedule C
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	4.2.2; Schedule J	Key Natural Features have been broadly expanded upon. They should only reflect what is clearly defined so as not to remove agricultural land from agricultural use or fragment the agricultural land base.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.3 c)	Why do there have to be this many different sets of policies essentially enforcing the same thing, and this many different sets of approvals, applications, fees etc. This causes confusion for landowners trying to cut through the red tape when trying to submit a development application.

14-Jul-17	PERL	4.2.3 d)	Changes to the Greenbelt NHS boundaries...add must be approved by the Province.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.3 h (i)	Fourth Line, Consider adding "and/" before "or".
14-Jul-17	PERL	4.2.3 h)	Requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. Add: that EIA must comply with Greenbelt development policies; and must be approved by the City, Region and where appropriate Conservation Authority.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.3 j)	Policy 4.2.3 h) identifies the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for any development proposed within 120m of a Key Natural Feature for the purpose of identifying a vegetation protection zone. Why then is a 30m minimum dictated without the benefit of an EIA? If 30m is needed why make the proponent spend thousands of dollars on a report which, even if it recommends 15m is still going to be enforced at 30m. Either eliminate the need for an EIA or let the EIA dictate what zone is appropriate under the site specific circumstances.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.3 k)	(i) "no alternative" – How often does this occur?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.3 k)	(ii) "Impact ... minimized to the maximum extent possible" – how often does this occur?
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	4.2.4	OP should clearly state that EIA requirements do not apply a building or structure requires only a building permit.
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	4.2.4	OP should clearly state that EIA requirements do not apply to a building or structure that requires only a building permit.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.2.4 a) (i) b.	Should a smaller size than 1000 square metres be used?
14-Jul-17	PERL	4.2.4 f)	Add that, through the EIA process the boundaries of Key Natural Features must also be corroborated by the Niagara Escarpment Commission where appropriate.
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	4.2.5	Natural Heritage Securement. Language could be altered from MAY to SHALL and should only apply in the case of development requiring an Official Plan Amendment and only in the case of Key Features and/or Escarpment Natural Area to prevent agricultural land from being removed from agricultural use.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.2.5 c)	What if a landowner does not want to dedicate their land free of charge? Development land is at a premium, and isn't cheap, so what gives the City the right to just take it? The comment above with respect to the 30m minimum zone in combination with this policy ensures the City will acquire valuable land at no cost, which is not fair to the landowner. At minimum, this land should at least count towards parkland dedication, which it currently doesn't. It's one thing to require dedication of roads, but this policy allows for the possibility of taking otherwise useable property.
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	4.2; Schedule J	The Natural Heritage System (NHS) should be an overlay on the Rural Land Use Map, not a designation.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.3 general	Need more solution focused mechanisms in place to protect the tree canopy. All development proposals and infrastructure projects, including City projects, should be required to preserve existing healthy trees and require the integration of trees into parking lots and other impervious areas.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.3 general	Assess the results from the implementation of the Urban Forest Management Plan and a review of any new related policy based on experience to date (e.g. violation of tree protection agreements during construction).
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.3 general	Should we not mention something about a Tree Bylaw?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.3 general	The Urban Forest Management Plan needs to be updated. It is more than five years old.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.3.2 d) i)	Replace "should" with "shall": the location of existing healthy trees shall be considered when establishing the location and building envelope of a proposed development
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.3.2 e)	Replace "should" with "shall": Replacement and compensation planting requirements shall consider onsite tree removals that occurred prior to and after the submission of a development application.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.3.2 g)	Add: "that are fed from surface drainage into lower elevation ground without curbs (to reduce the need to water the trees)" in the Zoning By-law.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.3.2 Policies d)	What about replacing unhealthy trees with healthy trees?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.3.2 Policies e)	Great idea!!

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.3.2.(d).(iii)	Good policy. Why can't this same concept apply to the Natural Heritage System in cases where development is desirable, but with it comes the need to remove trees. Given the significant challenges with development nowadays, this sort of flexibility and openness to creative solutions which can result in a win-win scenario should be encouraged.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.4 general	This section refers to freestanding townhouses not being allowed. Are condominium tenured townhouses acceptable?
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.4.1.1 and 4.4.1.2	Section 4.4.1.1 and 4.4.1.2 appear to be two separate lists of different objectives for Watershed Management. We presume that Section 4.4.1.2 was intended to be titled "Water Resource and Stormwater Management Objectives" based on subsequent section titles.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.4.1.1 c)	What about protection of species like fish etc.?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.4.1.2 l)	What about controlling the quantity of water running off building or site?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.4.2	What about a policy to encourage stewardship of watersheds by Local Land Owners?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.4.2.1 a)	Is there not a partnership with Source Water Protection as well?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.4.2.1 c)	What Schedule is used for Urban Watershed Plans?
14-Jul-17	PERL	4.4.2.1 e) (i)	Add endangered and threatened species to the inventory of items included in the inventory of environmental data to be included in sub-watershed studies
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.4.2.1 f)	Should reference subsection (e) not (d)
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.4.2.1(d)(xi)	This policy should allow for recommended ranges for buffers and setbacks. Modify the text to "criteria <u>and/or</u> recommended ranges for buffers or setbacks from development"

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.4.3	Many of these policies reflect the old way of thinking, when there were opportunities for the construction of stormwater management ponds in new subdivisions. Now that development will be restricted to infill intensification, some of these policies may warrant a second look to ensure they reflect the new reality of what development in Burlington will look like. New systems are now available to manage storm water.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.4.3 p)	Is Source Water Protection Committee not involved here?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.4.3 q) (i)	Why are we then reconstructing Waterdown Road?
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	4.4.3(a)(iv)	This policy says that planning for stormwater management shall maximize the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces. This is not always possible given that development necessarily reduces the amount of pervious surface on an existing site, especially in greenfield situations. Add the qualifier "to the extent possible".
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.4.4.(f)	Why not? Any land for preservation purposes that the City takes from the landowner (excluding roads) should count towards the parkland dedication requirement.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5 general	Do not need to strengthen OP policies, but rather to act upon it. Note issues with implementation of waterfront policies as currently written, including the sale of publicly owned waterfront land.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5 general	Section 4.5 talks about the waterfront and shoreline, its uses, and development along it but does not reference expanding public ownership and use along the shoreline and waterfront. Want to see it explicitly stated.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.2.1 b)	Entertains more areas of public accessibility, but only key access points and parks. There is nothing to suggest the city wants to own its shoreline and open it up for the use and enjoyment of its residents and the public at large.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.5.2.1 c)	Can now drive dune buggies on the beach?
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.2.2	Add a policy stating that COB cannot sell any publicly owned waterfront, shoreline lands

29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.2.2 b)	Expand this to cover acquisition of land with the intent to eventually create new public access everywhere along the waterfront or shoreline, not just Windows to the Lake or Bay. Establish a shoreline fund or accept land donations and trusts, or easements.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.2.2 f)	Provide more clear direction in this policy, such as: This trail should be a shoreline trail immediately abutting the lake or bay; if this cannot be achieved, a near shoreline trail located in the general vicinity of the lake or bay – with the expectation that efforts will be made to attempt to obtain sufficient lands abutting the lake or bay to eventually place the trail adjacent to the water.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.3.1 c)	Suggests clarification: Looking to enhance public accessibility by obtaining new or additional waterfront open spaces as public spaces, or is the public being allowed to use private spaces, or do you care which? Prefer the city clearly state that obtaining additional publicly accessible lands is a priority.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.3.2 a)	Remove "where feasible". should be mandatory, until all options have been exhausted and it still can't be achieved.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.3.2 e)	We wondered who gets to decide whether the distance is sufficient to accommodate both the development and the Waterfront Trail. Certainly, the situation at Blue Water Place indicates that there is a standoff on whether it fits or not. We want the City to be the deciding body.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.5.3.2 e)	Is this fair to those who currently own land on the bay and lake and have access to boating?
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.3.2 e) (ii) and (iii)	We were curious about the wording in one being "Should" and "would" and the next being "If" and "shall". We didn't know if they meant anything different as they were inconsistently worded. We thought consistent wording would be better, unless there is a nuance we are missing.
29-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	4.5.3.2 e) (iv) and 4.5.3.2 i)	We were not sure if these two are different as they seem to say the same thing? Either eliminate the duplication or make the distinction clearer.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.7 general	Include a mapped inventory of brownfield sites in the OP.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.7 general	Include objectives and policies to test and, where necessary, remediate sites within Natural Heritage Areas or flood plains that have evidence of potential contamination.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	4.7 general	This wording requires the landowner to incur significant remediation expenses before even finding out if re-development is possible. Wording should be added such that "confirmation regarding the level of contamination is required to ensure that they are suitable or have been made suitable, or can be made suitable for the proposed use. If the property owner hires a consultant who writes a report documenting the necessary remediation efforts, that should be sufficient for the sake of proceeding with development applications. The actual remediation work would then become a condition of approval, whereby the landowner could invest the money knowing that the ultimate development proposal is approved.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	4.7.2 k)	Good to see
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.8 general	Include a policy to ensure adequate (e.g. heavy equipment) vehicular access to former waste disposal sites in the event of development encircling the site, so that future site remediation, if required, is possible.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.9 general	Include objectives and policies to support local food production to promote the local economy, support farmers, and reduce Burlington's carbon footprint. Durham and Ajax Official Plan as examples.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.9 general	Allow temporary, permanent and pop-up farmers' markets on residential, institutional lands and in underserved areas, and modify definition of farmers' market to "one to multiple vendors" to allow for pop up markets.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	4.9 general	On September 24, 2012 the City of Burlington endorsed the Halton Food Charter. The OP should make reference to this.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Strengthen linkages between policies in this chapter and other chapters and add more emphasis on climate change mitigation and adaptation planning strategies.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Strengthen linkages between policies, for instance The City's Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP), transportation and economic development.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	General	Add more emphasis on climate change mitigation and adaptation planning strategies.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Modify intro so the description of Sustainable Development matches with the new Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives write-up.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Consider adding a section to cover the re-development of golf courses as well as ongoing maintenance around Natural Heritage. Also need as North Aldershot still allows Golf Courses although Rural area does not allow.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	General	Policies of the Plan refer to both Key Natural Features and Key Natural Heritage Features, as italicized defined terms. Only Key Natural Features is defined in Chapter 13. Please confirm that Key Natural Features and Key Natural Heritage Features are intended to be the same thing. Revise to consistent terminology throughout the Draft New OP, if required, or provide clarification on how these terms are different, including a separate definition for Key Natural Heritage Features.
14-Jul-17	PERL	Section 4.10 - General	PERL supports stronger environmental, health and safety requirements and policies, which reduce the negative impacts from mineral extraction operations on people, communities and the environment. One of the desired outcomes of the Cornerstone Standard is for Municipalities and developers to specify that suppliers of mineral aggregates be certified under the Cornerstone Standards, à la FSC.

CHAPTER FIVE - ECONOMIC ACTIVITY			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.2	The City's own studies have demonstrated that there is in fact a surplus of employment land. While we agree that viable employment land should be preserved, non-viable land, land which is not desirable for employment uses as demonstrated by decades of being on the market with no interest, should be considered for alternative uses. Bronte Creek Meadows is over 300 acres of developable land within the urban area that could be generating income for the city, which instead remains vacant farmland surrounded by urban development on 3 sides, and the environmentally sensitive Bronte Creek Provincial Park on the other.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.1.1 b)	Bronte Creek Meadows is not located in an urban growth centre, nor a major transit station area, so why does the City continue to insist that this property remain vacant indefinitely for major office or major institutional development, when neither have shown any prospect of ever happening for over 60 years?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.2.2 a)	The City's own studies have demonstrated that there is in fact a surplus of employment land.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	5.2.2 b) (vii)	This seems vague – not sure what it means.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	5.2.2 b) (x)	“shall meet at least two of the following conditions:” Why two, rather than one, three or some other number of conditions?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	5.4.1 c)	Can the OP be more specific about the kinds of support (or incentives) to be considered? E.g. Full property taxes levied on unused properties, favourable development charges to re-purpose older buildings, etc.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.4.1.(d)	All development can be transit supportive if transit exists in the area, which is under the City's control. All development can provide opportunities to facilitate walking and cycling, if the infrastructure exists beyond the property boundaries, which again is under the City's control. For Appleby GO, which has no residential nearby, the majority of users will continue to require a car. As part of the development of this area as a Mobility Hub, high density residential uses should be included to create an area and bring in a population that will use transit, walking, and cycling options.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.4.1.(d)	While we understand the goal for this area to be the "Prosperity Corridor", something needs to be done to rectify the traffic issues which currently make these properties undesirable. The QEW is often a parking lot, causing traffic to divert onto Harvester Road which again grinds traffic to a halt. Traffic movement along these corridors during rush hour is often horrific.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.4.2 a)	This property is not in a Primary Growth Area, is not within a Mobility Hub, is not along the QEW Corridor, and has displayed absolutely no desirability for employment uses for decades, yet for some reason it remains a "priority" for the City? It's time to change the thinking, and consider alternative uses (i.e.. mixed use).
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.4.2 b)	The City can spend all the money it wants on studies, that does not change the reality that the property is not desirable for employment uses. Why is only a portion of the site the focus for the Area-Specific Plan, what's happening with the balance of the site? When is this Area-Specific Plan being developed, and will the landowner have any involvement? In the likely event that even after the City goes to the time and expense of preparing this Area-Specific Plan the property remains undesirable for the uses the City wants, then what? This is over 300 acres of underutilized land within the urban boundary in a City with no other land available. At what point can alternative uses be considered on at least a portion of this property, or is the intention to continue to let this property remain vacant for decades to come? The City is losing millions of dollars every year by not having this property develop for what the market wants, not what the City thinks the market wants.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.4.2 c)	Same comments as before, this property just is not desirable from an employment perspective. Strong efforts have been made by the landowner and BEDC for over 7 years to convince employers to come to this property, and in each and every case, they've determined that the property is not desirable. While people may think that perhaps the landowner was

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	5.4.4	On Appleby Line, the area has a high rate of commercial retail business. Need for increased diversity of employment with advanced technology or professional business development. Would like to see a target sector including office space and limit 'retail' commercial space, in comparison to 'prestige'. Where "prestige" employment, would like to see a minimum building height (2 stories).
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.5.1	Add an objective to the effect "To understand the need to find a proper balance between Agriculture and NHS when NHS policies negatively impact farming within Prime Agricultural Areas."
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	5.5.2 a)	Consider sale of property currently used for recreational purposes be zoned for agriculture purposes on Class 1(+).
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	5.5.2 e)	Why? Are there enough farm properties within the urban area to warrant this?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Provide timelines to complete area-specific plans (McMaster Innovation District and Bronte Creek Meadows) and Employment intensification Study
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	In conversations with BEDC, they mentioned it would be beneficial to define "Mixed Use" by degree or range of use.

CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.1.1 b)	Please identify the “ areas in the Growth Framework”
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.1.1 b) and 6.1.2 b)	How are you going to prioritize new development such as the Northwest corner of Dundas and Walker or Evergreen that is ready to go?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2 general	What kind of programs does the city have to promote and facilitate carpooling-car sharing or bike –sharing? The Awareness sub-committee of the SDC could implement some free workshops for residence to increase environmental awareness. Or assigning some budget for Burlington Green to run the workshops
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2 general	need to consider when we should prioritize transit over cycling and cycling over transit. Cycling cannot have priority over transit all the time as more people will use transit over cycling in the long run.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2 general	Change “Public Transit/Transportation definition to “Transit/Transportation” definition which should include bus (public/school), taxis, for hire, car/bike share/rental, autonomous cars, etc.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.1.1 g)	Like the context sensitive design concept. Design guidelines are definitely good to need to be flexible to make this work.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.1.1 h)	Will <i>complete streets</i> strategy truly work in all instances? A lot of streets are not wide enough.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.1.2 c)	Should effectiveness not also come into play? I would rather be carrying out the right thing inefficiently than the wrong thing efficiently This holds true in a lot other areas.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.1.2 j)	Can the OP address the need for Area-Specific Plans to better coordinate economic activity opportunities with required MTO approvals to facilitate long term planning with developers?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.10.1 b)	How the city does support sustainable transportation choices? And what are these choices?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.10.1 d)	This policy makes no sense. For example the building would be permanently built with reduced parking yet the implementation would not have been completed to the satisfaction of the City.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.10.1.(c)	Is this realistic in Burlington today? Is Burlington prepared to allow the high density residential and mixed use development that is needed to provide scenarios where residents can live, work and play all within a distance that encourages non-automobile modes of travel?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.10.2 e)	That's a great idea, but it is recommended to add a more detailed plan or program in the policy
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.10.2.(b).(ii)	What does this mean? QEW already has HOV lanes, is the City considering something similar for City streets? How much worse will that make traffic congestion?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.2.1 b)	Yet you've already indicated that the City has no intention of widening roads to increase capacity. Where is this additional capacity going to come from?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.2.1 c)	Does this even apply to Burlington anymore? Where are there developments occurring that are sufficient enough in size to require this policy? Development now is limited to infill and re-development. In most cases, if not all, the major road network is already in place, and no new roads are being built.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.2.2 a)	Does this policy include the streets that new developments are applying for their permits at the moment in them?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.2.2 d)	What are daylight triangles? Please define.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.2.2 m) and n)	Need to outline what are the consequences of "LOS'E" or better or "LOS "F". These terms mean nothing to the general public.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.2.2.k)	What is the purpose of this policy? Private landowners cannot develop in the rural area in a manner whereby new public roads will be required. If the Province builds a highway, they're going to do whatever they want with little regard to what the City of Burlington wants. If by chance a new road does get constructed in the rural area, is there really any need to give consideration to pedestrian traffic and transit connections? How many pedestrians do you expect to see in the rural area?
30-Jun-17	Burlington for Accessible Sustainable Transit (BFAST)	6.2.3	That the City commits to undertaking a comprehensive transportation study, such as the one completed by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, that analyzes the costs and benefits of a system based primarily on roads vs. one that puts more priority on transit
30-Jun-17	Burlington for Accessible Sustainable Transit (BFAST)	6.2.3	That the City makes a commitment in its Official Plan to increase transit funding to a level that would enable it to meet and exceed its own stated goal of a 15% modal share for transit
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.3.1	There is nothing in this that states there will be investment in a more convenient, affordable and reliable transit system. It only states that the city will promote the use of transit. It should be clear that the city will invest dollars in a better transit system not just promote it.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.3.1 c)	Does touch on the implementation of a frequent transit system but it should be clear that there will be a financial commitment to make a better transit system.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.3.1 e)	How can you possibly carry this out under a <i>complete streets</i> strategy?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.3.2 a)	With the coming of BRT along Dundas Street and Evergreen, should east of Appleby Line on Dundas Street not be considered Frequent Transit Network candidate?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.3.2 e)	It is recommended to bring some explanations about the "Region of Halton's Transportation Master Plan" or to mention where this master plan can be found.
29-Jun-17	Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee	6.2.4	Cycling can fill in the transportation gaps in low density neighbourhoods that cannot be serviced by transit. Both transit and cycling should be prioritized together.

29-Jun-17	Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee	6.2.4	The fundamentally critical ingredient to building a culture of cycling is a minimum grid of safe cycling infrastructure designed for all ages and abilities. In other words, a AAA Cycling Network. Others might call this “8-80” infrastructure, building for the “interested but concerned”, or a “low stress” cycling network. In effect, these terms all refer to something that is more or less the same thing: a connected grid of cycling routes, safe for people of any age—from children to seniors—and any ability. Recommend that strong policy language supportive of a minimum grid of all ages and abilities cycling routes be included in the Official Plan.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.4	The way Burlington was laid out does not lend itself well to major active transportation goals, particularly north of QEW. There are primarily segregated areas of residential, commercial and employment, all of which for most residents are a fair distance from each other. Active transportation may become more prevalent as mixed-use re-development takes place over the coming decades, but for now and the foreseeable future the automobile will remain the mode of travel most heavily relied upon. Canadian winter will also place limits upon active transportation initiatives. Of course active transportation should be encouraged, but not at the detriment to automobile users that make up the majority of the population.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.4.1 b)	It is recommended to consider about Health and safety of bike riders
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.4.1.(b)	What percentage of the population do you expect to see riding bikes and walking to nearby municipalities as part of their commute? Given the growing traffic congestion problems in this City, an off-road system where possible would be a far better option, but then again where can you create this system when the City is already built out? If cyclists make up only 1% of the population in Burlington, let's not start narrowing roads or creating "road diets" to satisfy just that 1% at the expense of the 99%.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.4.2	A policy should be incorporated such that barriers should be provided to protect cyclists wherever feasible.
29-Jun-17	Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee	6.2.4.2 a)	The language in this policy statement could be vastly strengthened with the addition of a few words: “Municipal cycling facilities appropriate for all ages and abilities <i>shall</i> be provided...”

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.4.2 b) and d)	Changes made to these theses schedules could impact other areas in the Plan with unknown consequences. Saying an unapproved schedule takes precedent what is an approved schedule is dangerous.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.5.2 b)	This item needs to be reviewed for safety matters
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.5.2 g)	What is the definition of "appropriate locations"
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.5.2 g)	Define "Appropriate Locations"
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.2.5.2.(c)	This policy contradicts the City's intentions for all but one of the Mobility Hubs, where high density residential and mixed use are planned right along the rail lines. Widely accepted construction methods are available to mitigate noise and vibration in high density buildings, therefore this should not be a concern. This policy should be deleted.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.6.1	Does this include an oversight on the possible contaminant emissions by transportation systems?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.2.8.2 b)	In what situations is heavy truck traffic restricted? And what kind of goods movement?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.3.1 c)	Should be compatible
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.3.1 f)	Where is the policy encouraging this?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.3.1.(c)	There is an "o" missing in the word "cpatible".
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.3.2 j)	This will restrict the usage of electric vehicles and is a barrier
29-Jun-17	Darlene Presley, MHBC agent for TransCanada PipeLines Limited	6.3.2 r)ii)	Replace "right of way" with "centre line"

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	6.5.1 a)	Support this objective.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.5.1.(d)	Agreed, therefore the City of Burlington and its residents need to stop opposing every development opportunity that arises just because it's a little different than the type of development than we're all used to in this area. Mobility Hubs and Primary Intensification Areas offer the most development potential for the high density highrise developments that this City needs. Burlington needs to embrace change and the idea of 25+ storey buildings in these areas, otherwise developers are going to invest elsewhere.
29-Jun-17	Halton-Hamilton Home Builders Association	6.5.2 i)	It is the opinion of or members that no individual development should be required to analyze their impact on the overall infrastructure model to determine its financial impact on the City. This work can and should be conducted by the City through its Development Charges By-laws, as may be updated from time to time, and the background studies done to prepare them. The City is very aware of its goals for intensification, and through the development of the OP is directing growth to specific areas. It is the City who should be responsible for ensuring this is done. This needs to be clarified.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.5.2.(e)	Agreed. Same comments as above.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	6.5.2.(g)	Our experience with several of our properties suggests otherwise.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	general	Add appropriate policies to the OP in the "Complete Communities" and "Transportation" sections to achieve the goal of walkability, and include the adoption of a walkability score tool to measure results.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	general	The OP addresses most of the issues raised in the Strategic Plan related to transportation and BG looks forward to seeing more detail in this regard in the Transportation Plan.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	general	BG particularly supports the development of a robust public transit system as a key strategy in reducing Burlington's carbon emissions. We are therefore disappointed that there appears to be a major disconnect between what the OP is saying and the reality of our public transit funding. Burlington contributes the lowest per-capita amount for transit of any comparably-sized city in the province. The same figures showed that while ridership is steady or increasing in most GTHA communities, Burlington's fell by more than 15% over the three years following major cuts to the system in 2012-13.

CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7	General: Chapter 7, as discussed at meetings, results in a lack of flexibility that was provided for, and built into the Sustainability guidelines.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7	Paragraph three indicates that “proponents shall implement the policies of this chapter....”) and we are concerned that this statement will override the use of “should”, “consider”, etc. elsewhere in the document.
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	7.1	The language in this chapter is overly prescriptive and many of the details should be left to other guidance documents like Site Plan Guidelines, Urban Design Guidelines and Sign Guidelines. The language could result in the need for an Official Plan Amendment to address these policies. The plan should recognize that simple, but attractive designs for affordable, special needs and assisted housing is appropriate. Requiring special design treatments could render these housing types unaffordable.
6-Apr-17	John Armstrong, Armstrong Strategy Group representing MasonryWorx (Verbal delegation at April 6, 2017 Council meeting)	7.1	Quickly review and update the design standards and guidelines following the implementation of the OP. DG Should take into consideration the optimal amount of glass versus other materials. Amount of glass should be reduced.
6-Apr-17	John Armstrong, Armstrong Strategy Group representing MasonryWorx (Verbal delegation	7.1	As intensification occurs, bring quality of architecture and attention to details to rear facades of residential development and not only to the front facades. This would enhance the “urban ribbon system”.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.2	Add “ and costs ” after “infrastructure demands”. Beyond environmental, economic, and social considerations, should you consider cultural.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.1 d)	Use Place Making approach previously sent to staff. We do not feel this is planner jargon.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.1 d)	It has been noted previously that proximity of a project to public transit is outside of the scope of any private developer. This section requires a developer to “ensure” that projects “.... Are well served by public transit”. While we believe we understand the intent of the statement, it is not executed properly and is easily misconstrued.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.1 i)	We recognize a goal of the City is to create design guidelines. We support this approach. However, it should be a separate document that does not form part of the OP, but, like other documents, is listed in Appendix A-5 for reference. Further to this point, there are many locations throughout the document (as noted above) where detailed minutiae has been embedded into the OP, which if not specifically addressed would require an OP Amendment. We strongly urge staff to remove all such detail and include them in documents such as a Design Guideline.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.2 b)	This statement may have far reaching implications, not considered by staff. A new residential zoning by-law may then require even a small residential renovation to require innovations. Staff should review and revise as appropriate.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.2 d)	Delete “The preparation of” – not needed)
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	7.1.2 d)	It is not appropriate for Policy 7.1.2 d) to elevate any City-approved design guideline to be considered City policy. Guidelines are non-statutory documents that are not subject to the approval process set out in the Planning Act. Any urban design directives that the City considers “policy” should be set out as policy in the Official Plan. See Policy 12.2.2.r), which appropriately addresses how guidelines should be used.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.2 d)	This section refers the reader to the appropriate documents and guidelines that form policy of the City, in Appendix A. Appendix A includes draft policies that are not yet in effect at the time of the OP. These should be removed.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.2 e)	Need to develop urban design brief guidelines used in Development Applications.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.2 f)	Draw from the current and past members of the SDC for the Urban Design Panel. Need this tool in place to help ensure design excellence is achieved.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	7.1.2 f)	Strongly opposed to this. An additional level of subjective review of applications will do nothing but frustrate and lengthen the approvals process.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.2 f)	This section should be revised to read: "An interdisciplinary staff committee and/or an outside advisory body....." We assume this refers to the BUD/Design Review Panel. As such this should clearly be stated.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.2 g)	Urban design award is a good idea. What other tools are you going to consider?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.2 h)	What does this mean? How?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.2 h)	How are you going to get Senior orders of government to implement design objectives?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.3 e)	This doesn't make sense because it leaves the entire City open for review with no prioritizing. It would be better to require any application to identify whether a landmark significance exists then address how to retain and enhance it. Consider that the Heritage Committee look at it and prioritize.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.3 f)	Distinctive and recognizable designs may not mean good designs. As such it may not be appropriate to model new developments after them.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	7.1.3.(a)	This type of wording is misleading to the public. Burlington is built out, there are no new communities being built. What will be built however are more dense, taller forms of development that will not "maintain and support physical character". The NIMBY groups will hang their hats on wording like this in the Official Plan, putting Council and Planning Staff in a challenging position. Why not be more honest and up front with the public and just acknowledge that change is coming, and not everybody is going to be happy about it.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	7.1.3.(c)	The City is already built out, are the gateways not already known and in existence? Seems like an unnecessary use of funds and staff time preparing additional studies for this.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.4	General: Many of the clauses in this section refer to improvements to the public realm, through municipal undertakings, reconstruction, etc. It must be recognized and acknowledged that improvements in level of service versus those improvements required for new population cannot be paid for through Development Charges. Further, new development should not be seen as a primary mechanism through which improvements in the level of service is provided for our City. Specifically, the City must develop a Section 37 Bonusing standard/policy in which the protocol for these provisions is provided.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.4 c)	<i>Human scale</i> needs to be in italics. Does not make sense when use only "scale" definition in Chapter 13 with human in front.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.4 e)	Will also help tourism.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.4 i)	Are there design standards for Public Safety regarding safe sidewalks, accessibility, etc. that needs to be considered?
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5	General: This section includes many details that we feel are inappropriate level of detail for an Official Plan, and more suitable in a site plan or design guideline. It makes it onerous on developments to implement some of this level of detail without the need for an OPA. Further, it may ease changing trends or desires for vision to put these types of criteria in a guidelines, allowing for changes by the City without the need for a public OPA. We recommend that a clause that references various documents be included to replace much of this detail and refer you to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c) as a good example of such a clause.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	7.1.5 a)	Again, this type of wording is misleading to the public. Burlington has traditionally been a lowrise, low density City. With Provincial intensification mandates and the City's own "Grow Bold" tag line and Tall Building Guidelines, issues of compatibility will undoubtedly arise. Look at downtown, a Mobility Hub and Primary Growth Area surrounded by 1 and 2 storey homes. If compatibility is the goal, then downtown will remain as-is, or under-developed with 4 storey buildings. If intensification and growth is the goal, compatibility will have to at times take a back seat to the achievement of the greater good for the City as a whole.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5 b)	If a real issue do not allow it to be built.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 b)	the reference in this clause to buffering measures suggests that there will be buffering in all instances. We suggest that the wording be revised to “.... And buffering measures (if appropriate)...”
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 c)	The wording “.... And reduce the adverse impacts of shadowing.” Suggests an improvement over existing conditions. We suggest that “reduce” be replaced with “minimize”.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5 g)	What are “terminus lots”?
7-Jul-17	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD	7.1.5 h)	1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: The prohibition of blank facades impact commercial buildings that cannot provide consistent windows and openings at ground level due to the requirements of internal operations. Replace "shall" with "shall, where possible".
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5 n)	Not possible if no transit.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 n)	As noted in a number of instances above, it is outside of the scope of private development to control the location and availability of public transit. Thus it is not necessarily possible to “connect to public transit”. This section needs revisiting.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 o)	This clause is problematic as all projects may not have publicly accessible open space at grade. Further, this is an example of site specific detail which is better included in a site plan guidelines or design guideline. If the OP is approved with this in, one may require an OP Amendment if this is not achieved.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5 q)	How do you intend to avoid acoustical walls? We have them all over the place. May need some guidelines.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 r)	This clause refers to “upgraded level of architectural treatment”, however this term is neither defined nor explained within the document.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 t)	We believe this clause should be revised to read: “The location, amount, position and design of ground related parking areas....” as an underground parking lot may not have access to, nor may it be desirable to provide access to pedestrian destinations.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 u)	Please clarify if it is the city's intent to mandate underground/internal parking outside of mobility hub areas, for smaller types of developments, etc. It will be rare that it is not possible, but may make smaller projects economically unfeasible.
7-Jul-17	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD	7.1.5 u)	1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: Request clarification as to what considerations are intended under the "where feasible" language. Policy should be revised to "encourage" underground, internal or above-grade parking where appropriate.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 v)	Please clarify how it will be determined where bicycle parking facilities SHALL be required.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5 z)	Should provide guidelines how this should be done.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 z)	This clause suggests there is a move on the City's part to prefer solar heat provision to other sustainable goals such as green roofs, etc. all of which are beneficial to the environment but rarely able to be provided together. This should be clarified. Further, it is noted that the City has prepared a separate sustainability guideline and perhaps no reference to specific items such as this should be included within the document, rather a reference made to that guideline and the City's expectation that it be followed.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5 b) b)	Please ensure that this reference to building design is in keeping with the wording recently approved through the revised Tall Buildings Guidelines.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5.1	General: It is surprising that there are sections in this chapter for both Mid-rise buildings and Tall Buildings, yet there is not reference to low rise construction. Further, the entire section on mid-rise buildings reads as a design guideline, and has no place in a high level document such as an OP. It is recommended that similar to the recently approved Tall Buildings Guidelines, a separate document be prepared for mid-rise should this level of detail be desired as policy by the City. We recommend that a clause that references various documents be included to replace much of this detail and refer you to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c) as a good example of such a clause.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5.1 a)	Should provide guidelines fairly quickly in support of this.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5.1 f)	Stipulate in guidelines.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.1.5.2	General: As noted above, this level of detail is not appropriate in the OP, given the City has recently approved a document outlining these requirements. We again recommend that a clause that reference the Tall Buildings Guidelines be included to replace much of this detail, and refer you to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c) as a good example of such a clause. This then allows the flexibility for that guidelines to be updated to reflect current trends and objectives, as may be deemed appropriate from time to time, without the need to carry out an OPA.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	7.1.5.2 a)	The proposed location of the Uptown Core is troublesome from the perspective of car traffic and the Region's intent to make Appleby an arterial road. Recommend staff take a very hard look at whether this is the absolute right location to planned mixed-use, walkable urban core. Appleby Line and Dundas Street would make a better location for an anchor hub as it is a near where the 407 commuter buses, Dundas BRT, Appleby Line Express Bus Route, and connections to Milton can readily be met.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.1.5.2 d) (i)	Put "human scale" in italics
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.2.1 a)	Add an additional objective to improved energy generation efficiency and reduce greenhouse gases.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.2.2	These are out of order with Appendix A17 and some are voluntary. One mandatory is missing.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.2.2	General: As noted above, this level of detail is not appropriate in the OP, given the City has recently approved a document outlining these requirements. We again recommend that the details in this section be removed, and limited to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c), which is a good example of such a clause. This then allows the flexibility for that guidelines to be updated to reflect current trends and objectives, as may be deemed appropriate from time to time, without the need to carry out an OPA. This is perfectly explained in Clause (f) in the same section.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	7.2.2 f)	If it is mandatory you may want to make an amendment to the plan.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	7.2.2 g)	This section needs reviewing, as it implies that Area Specific Plan will be required. Please refer to other sections of this document regarding our concerns on Area Specific Plans.
-----------	--	----------	--

CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
7-Jun-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA	8	The document reads very prescriptive -more in keeping with a secondary plan and even site plan guidelines/conditions, which we do not consider appropriate for this high level document.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1 general	The Plan established a hierarchy within the Urban Area. Good.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1 general	The Downtown Urban Centre is the highest in the hierarchy and then the Uptown Urban Centre.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.1.1 b)	While this section encourages higher intensity uses within the Urban Centre, the use of the term "retaining compatibility" is inappropriate as this section should address "fit" and the mitigation of potential impacts.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.1.1 b)	What does higher intensity uses mean?
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.1.2 g)	Urban areas are intended to be priority locations for land assembly. How does this work?
8-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.1.2 g)	Please review this section and consider to address matters including "priority locations for land assembly and incentives"
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.1.2 h)	Is there a hierarchy with which these sections apply, in the event of discrepancies?
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.1.2 l)	These site design policy appear to be too specific and arbitrary. Should these not be considered in a different policy or regulation?
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.1.2 l)	As noted elsewhere in these comments, we are very concerned with the level of detail provided in this section, that is more appropriate as site plan comments, design guidelines, etc. It is inappropriate to have this level of detail in an OP, dictating detailed design of projects.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.1.2 l) (x)	What about the impact of light on park, open spaces, and natural heritage?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.1.2 l) (xi)	Architectural features and setbacks will not totally fix. It is important to get the height, massiveness and transition correct.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.1.2 m)	Will the new parking standard be in place prior to adoption of this OP? Is the requirements for these plans to be provided only if the proponent is seeking to lower the standards proposed through that process?

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.1.2 n)	In many instances, providing open space in an intensified development (i.e.. A tall building) is not appropriate. Please advise how this “appropriate amount” is to be determined.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.1.2 o)	In many locations within this draft document, the term “justified frequent transit network” is used. We suggest the elimination of the word “justified” as discussed with staff during our meetings.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.1.2 p)	A discussion needs to occur about Area-Specific Plans. These, as per the document definition, include secondary plans, neighbourhood plans, etc. which are typically prepared by the City. There further needs to be an understanding of how it will be determined when/where these are required. Please see our other comments which relate to area-specific plans elsewhere throughout this document.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.1.2 q)	There needs to be an understanding that in many instances, commercial uses provided by a developer proponent provide for a range of zoning uses. They do not become tenants or owners of said commercial spaces. It would be more appropriate for the City to have verbage to discuss what they may desire carrying out to promote an end user/lessee in providing such service. A proponent can only provide zoning for such use, not provide the actual service.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.2	There is a gap in the Downtown Urban Centre Policy. Until such time as the policies intended to be included in the secondary plan for the Downtown are available, we are unable to comment in detail – Depending upon the proposed policies, significant revisions to the entire New Plan may be required.
30-Jun-17	Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront	8.1.1.2	Policies for downtown should enable the existing eclectic character of the downtown to continue.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.1.2	Exactly, so why are there competing policies where sometimes this Plan says growth is going to happen, whereas other policies suggest growth can only happen if it's compatible? If intensification, higher densities, and tall buildings are meant to be built in the downtown area, then strong policy direction needs to be given, not mixed messages. Developers who attempt to build structures of any significant size downtown to achieve this policy are faced with nothing but pushback.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2	General: This section lacks considerable detail as a whole. Reference is made to establishing minimum density targets, but no detail is provided in terms of quantum of population or jobs to be achieved that will apply to this area of the City. There are no guiding objectives provided to give the reader an idea of the direction where this section "may" be going. It is understood that most information will come through the Mobility Hubs study. However, in its current form, the OP does not provide anything concrete on which a proponent could submit an application and understand if they were in conformity or not. This is not a supportable position.
22-Jun-17	Tony Millington, Millington & Associates	8.1.1.2	559 Brant Street (NoFrill Plaza): A park like setting is being proposed for a large portion of the site to allow for a connection through to the residential community to the east. Fragmenting these lands will do a lot of damage.
22-Jun-17	Tony Millington, Millington & Associates	8.1.1.2	559 Brant Street (NoFrill Plaza): A suggested mid-rise scenario does not allow the food store and the existing commercial tenants to function properly.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.2	It is important to finish the Site Specific work in this area quickly so we do not lose control of it.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.2.1 k)	Public Art should only be referenced in relationship to Section 37 benefits. The Plan appears to be missing some key elements of Section 37 policy. Concerns about Section 37 benefits being unique across the City.
8-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.2.1 k)	City staff agreed to delete the reference to public art which was agreed to being a Section 37 contribution/benefit and replace it with "cultural assets". It was explained by City staff that "cultural assets" are a consideration within the public realm.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.2.1 l)	The precinct system has failed to accommodate growth required in the Urban Growth Centre. All tall buildings have required Official Plan and/or Zoning By-law amendments. The city should consider a new approach.

8-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.1.2.1 l)	In respect of the continuation of the Precinct Planning framework for the Downtown, I clearly indicated that the current framework has failed and that such a framework should be replaced. The rationale for this is that the current rate of development/redevelopment/intensification is failing to meet minimum growth requirements. At 60 new residential new units per year (the current average for the Urban Growth Centre), I indicated that it would take the City 54 years to reach the minimum targets for 2031. In addition, I indicated that to meet the current minimum population and employment targets for 2031 at least 15 new 24 storey buildings or 44 new 8 storey buildings would be required within the Urban Growth Centre by 2031 (one new high rise every year from now until 2031) – a 43% increase to the existing residential housing supply within the Urban Growth Centre. I also indicated that the failure of the existing Precinct Planning framework is demonstrated by the fact that all new tall buildings within the Downtown have required official plan and zoning amendments.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.1.2.1 j)	Old way of thinking. How does this work with infill development where space is already at a premium? Large area development in Burlington where parkland can be dedicated is essentially finished. Development in the future will be on postage stamp properties where an old building gets demolished and re-developed. Where is this open space and parkland going to come from if it doesn't exist already?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.2.1 j)	The bottom of each street should have a view and access to the lake such as the bottom of Elizabeth or Martha Streets.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.1 l)	Are we continuing with the term “precinct system”?
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.1 n)	It should be acknowledged that while providing for adequate parking, it is the intent to minimize excess parking to support walkability, transit, etc.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.1 o)	spelling error support
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.2 a)	Further detail should be provided in this section to inform the reader as to where the City currently stands relative to this target. This has been an ongoing request and is critical to understanding the growth of the City.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.2 b) i)	“Shall” should not apply to the provision of commercial uses along pedestrian pathways.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.2 e)	The City may want to consider changing “shall” to “should” for the maximum size of individual commercial uses. There may be other uses (e.g. an urban gym facility) that exceed this size.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.2 i)	There needs to be an understanding of “development close to cultural heritage resources”. Close is not defined.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.3.2	This section suggests that gentle intensification measures such as secondary suites, accessory dwelling units, which may be appropriate for these areas will not be allowed.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.4	General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details.
29-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.1.2.4	441 Maple Avenue: The results of the area-specific plan for the Downtown Mobility Hub will provide revised policies. Is each site/block being assess as to its development potential?
29-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.1.2.4	441 Maple Avenue: Would like the City to provide the detailed terms of reference and current City and consultant work program for the Downtown Mobility Hub study.
29-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.1.2.4	441 Maple Avenue: Clarify the intended process and timing for the future policies providing direction for lands within Mobility Hubs.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.1.2.4	360 Torrance Street and 2160 Lakeshore Road: The results of the area-specific plan for the Downtown Mobility Hub will provide revised policies either through the finalization of the Official Plan or through a future amendment.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.5	General: On the mapping documents, these areas are referred to as “Waterfront West”. The wording and mapping sections of the document should be consistent.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.5	General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.5 d)	The wording in this section is problematic in that it says that “.... Waterfront shall come into public ownership” however is done through applications for redevelopment, which suggests that other options are available. The City should explain its intent for acquiring these lands, depth of expected acquisition, etc.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.7	General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.1.2.7	419 Pearl Street: The results of the area-specific plan for the Downtown Mobility Hub will provide revised policies. The evolving directions from the Mobility Hub Study need to ensure a comprehensive block development approach in the Downtown.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.8	General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.9.2 a) iv)	This section refers the reader to Subsection 8.2.4, which does not exist.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.11 b)	This section refers to specific sites by anecdotal historical names, that may not be known to the reader, nor in the future may they be known by staff. It is recommended that these be revised to street addresses.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.12	General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.13	General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.2.14	General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3	General: There are no quantum population or job target numbers provided to indicate how development is to occur in this primary growth area. Further, substantial detail is provided that is inappropriate for an OP document – it is more appropriate to a design guideline or site plan guideline (reference to fencing locations, landscaping, location of banners, façade articulation, etc.) This section is indicative of BOTH of our major concerns – lack of high level details, and yet detailed minutiae in other instances, neither of which is appropriate for an OP.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.3	The proposed location of the Uptown Core is troublesome from the perspective of car traffic and the Region's intent to make Appleby an arterial road. Recommend staff take a very hard look at whether this is the absolute right location to planned mixed-use, walkable urban core. Appleby Line and Dundas Street would make a better location for an anchor hub as it is a near where the 407 commuter buses, Dundas BRT, Appleby Line Express Bus Route, and connections to Milton can readily be met.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.3.1 e)	How do you intend to ensure social, cultural and entertain uses are in place. They have a long way to go.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3.1 k)	It may be appropriate to provide a map of this area.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.3.11 b)	Is this feasible given the amount of traffic coming from the proposed CN container shipping terminal on Tremaine?
	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.3.2 h)	Great idea to link Dryden Avenue to Millcroft Park.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3.2 i)	Detailed criteria for developing specific properties are included in the OP. We do not consider this appropriate in an OP document for any specific property, that should be handled as part of a rezoning or site plan application.
4-Apr-17	Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting	8.1.1.3.3	1860, 1880, 1900 Appleby Line: Policies recommend that approx. 25% of the subject lands be redesignated to Uptown Centre. Redesignating the entire site to Uptown Centre will meet the intent of the new Official Plan and the objectives of the Uptown Urban Centre.

22-Jun-17	Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting	8.1.1.3.3 and 8.1.1.3.4	1860, 1880, 1900 Appleby Line: Given the planning justification supplied, the Official Plan should designate the entirety of these lands Uptown Central designation subject to the development criteria established in policy 2.5. This would have the effect of permitting residential uses on 100% of the site subject to the development criteria. The City should accept applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments after Council adoption of the Official Plan.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3.3.2 a) i)	This section refers to freestanding townhouses not being allowed. Are condominium tenured townhouses acceptable?
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3.3.2 b)	Two permitted uses may not be applicable nor desirous in residential forms. Please clarify.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3.3.2 d)	It is recommended that a statement such as this (the portion of individual use's floor area above or below the first storey shall have not maximum) be included in the Downtown sections of the OP.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3.3.2 e)	Is it the City's intent that all buildings have commercial/retail uses on the ground floor? I.e.. Traditional townhouses, stacked townhouses/back to back and variations therein cannot be provided within the Uptown area?
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.1.3.3.2 f)	Are the zoning clauses here still appropriate? There are now Tall Building Guidelines that were not in place when the specific policies were implemented. Further should details such as this be in the OP? Note: We discontinued reading the remainder of the Uptown Section based on the following: It is understood that a detailed review of the Uptown Area was carried out previously. However, this work may not be the current direction the city wishes to take, nor should details such as this be included in an OP simply because they are available. We are not supportive of zoning and/or site plan level details being included in any area of the Official Plan document.
27-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	8.1.1.3.7.2	1830 Ironstone: Why have recreation and entertainment uses been deleted from the permitted uses? What does "accessory" mean? Does it relate to retail and service commercial uses accessory to, and on the same lot as an employment use or does it mean more broadly accessory to the broader Uptown Business/Employment area? The policy is not clear.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.1.3.7.2 a) (i)	What is this?

27-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	8.1.1.3.7.2 b) and c)	These policies are far too limiting. Recommending the removal of the FAR limits in this designation (Uptown Business Corridor). This level of detail is best left to the implementing zoning by-law.
27-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	8.1.1.3.7.3	Too prescriptive to determine that the built form of redevelopment be directed to the Heron Way right of way. It is also requested that the site specific policy acknowledge the long term home improvement use on the site.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.2	Pleased with the direction however the Plan fails to provide details on the number and type of development expected in Mobility Hubs.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.2	General: This section refers to “accommodate(ing) a significant share of the City’s future population and employment growth”. It is our position that an understanding of significant is appropriate, through analysis of growth necessary to achieving the 2031 targets, and allocating them to the specific growth areas and mobility hubs.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.2	92 Plains Road East: It is unclear how policies that apply to mobility hub lands will address current applications under review and how they will be impacted.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.2	1085 Clearview Avenue and 1082 St. Matthews Avenue: Within the Aldershot Mobility Hub area, the residential low density policies and any associated policies are deferred and are currently under review through an area-specific planning exercise.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.2	Ensure that Mobility Hub areas contribute adequate levels of high quality public green spaces and outdoor amenities that elevate the quality of the broader public realm within and adjacent to the primary hub boundary.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.2	Burlington Mobility Hub: Total land area available for development in the near to long term may be inadequate to create complete community when considering the requirements for parks and open space, parking requirements and level of density.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.2	Aldershot Mobility Hub: Mixed Use Employment provision along Western edge and parts of the Eastern edge of Waterdown Road do not currently permit residential uses.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.2	Aldershot Mobility Hub: Through the area-specific planning process. Consider properties with a full range of permitted uses including residential, especially at the intersection of Plains Rd. E. and Waterdown Rd.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.2.1 j)	Downtown MH: Encouraged to see that tall building forms are to be accommodated.

26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.2.1 m)	Downtown MH: Similar comment on 2.5, 2.5.1 and 2.5.2. The policy should strive for new development in harmony with existing development.
8-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.2.1 m)	replace reflect with respect.
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	8.1.2.2	General: We have noted our concerns with use of the term Area-specific plan. It is recognized elsewhere in the document that the OP will incorporate information from the Mobility Hubs Study to inform development. Therefore references to the 2014 Opportunities and Constraints Study is inappropriate as it will be out of date for the completion of this document.
8-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.2.2	Agreed that additional comments would review Section 8.1.2.2 in more detail and provide to City staff.
26-May-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	8.1.2.2 b)	Downtown MH: Suggest that this policy be revised to establish what the key objectives of the City are in relation to the Mobility Hubs.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.1.1i)	How is development to be offset by a range of open space? Is this through the provision of parkland dedication or some other mechanism not yet described?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.1.2	there many be too many sub-categories defined through b) to g) inclusive. In reading through, we see the distinction, but suggest that these may limit potential for some areas which may, over time, be more appropriately re-classified from one to the other.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.1.2 j)	There needs to be clarification provided with respect to “priority locations” for redevelopment: there is no reference here that these locations are secondary to the primary intensification areas of the urban growth centre, Uptown growth centre and mobility hubs.
7-Jul-17	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD	8.1.3.1.2 n)	1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: The OP should include permissions for the addition of stand-alone infill buildings to existing sites to accommodate short and medium term infill that would otherwise be designed to meet the intent and standards of the in-effect OP and ZBL.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.1.2 q)	We question the inclusion of the reference to Primary and Secondary Growth Areas – does this clause not apply to mixed use nodes regardless of their location?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.1.2 r)	Earlier in our comments we have noted concern about “Area-Specific Plan(s)” – this wording seems very appropriate and should be included elsewhere where we have raised this concern.

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.1.2 t)	This clause includes a reference to a “full extent of development intensity” not being made available due to soil contamination. It is our position that money invested through redevelopment to mitigate these issues often is justification in itself to warrant increased intensification, otherwise development becomes unviable. This should somehow be addressed in the document, and if elsewhere, a reference made for the user to cross-reference.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.1.2 v)	We again comment that some of the detail provided in this section is more appropriate in a zoning by-law or site plan guideline. Throughout the OP as a whole, this needs to be addressed. In some instances, parking requirements in (viii) to (x) may make it impossible to provide parking. Remaining clauses past (x) are again too specific for this high level a document.
30-Jun-17	Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT	8.1.3.1.2 v) i)	Suggests adding language "where possible". May not always be achievable due to grading and other constraints.
30-Jun-17	Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT	8.1.3.2.1 a) & b)	Support these policies that support a for a wide range of retail and service commercial uses and flexibility to introduce mixed use.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.2.1 e)	the sizing of these areas (for all land use designations) should be more flexible, to allow fit and compatibility and intent to drive how intensification occurs. It may be that a site 18ha is appropriate in this form of redevelopment. This comment applies to all forthcoming designations throughout the document.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.2.1 f)	Whereas the guiding principles of the Nodes and Corridors section refers to mid-rise and tall buildings, your largest and theoretically most intense version of redevelopment within your nodes and corridors precludes tall buildings. We believe there are opportunities throughout the City where tall buildings can and should be embedded into the OP, and it is a missed opportunity to exclude them at this stage.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.2.1 h)	This clause requires clarification – are you referring to lot coverage of at most 50%? Is this appropriate in a redevelopment and intensification situation?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.2.1 l) ii)	Typo " a multi-residential <u>or mixed use</u> building form"
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.2.1 n)	Are these public outdoor amenity spaces intended to be public or privately owned?

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.2.1 p) iii)	Throughout the document there are references for motor vehicle dealerships and the number of entrances. The reference in the document is to one "curb cut" – this is a construction term and really has no place in an OP. If the intent is to limit the number of access points, a terms such as that is more appropriate. However, all of the detail in (p) is again zoning and/or site plan related and should not be included in an OP.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.2.1.(f)	Why arbitrarily cap building height in intensification areas? During the presentations with Brett Toderian, the planner from Vancouver that the City has brought in and spent considerable time consulting with, he has expressed how focus should not be on number of storeys, but instead on design. If a 15 or 20 storey building with superior design is possible, and financially viable, why would the City handcuff progress by inserting an arbitrary height cap? Again, this displays an old way of thinking.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.3.2.2 b)	1385 North Service Road: Supports policies to increase density and height of future development of Mixed Use Commercial Lands. However property is not easily accessible due to physical constraints and natural barrier, which may not allow for its maximum development potential.
30-Jun-17	Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT	8.1.3.2.2 c)	Supports this policy as it allows for flexibility to accommodate new uses in response to market demand.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.3.2.2 d)	Consider replacing "The following uses may be permitted" to "The following uses shall be permitted".
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.3.2.2 d)	Consider replacing minimum and maximum building heights with minimum and maximum densities to provide flexibility for scale and massing of new development.
30-Jun-17	Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT	8.1.3.2.2 f)	Understands that this policy does not establish minimum height for lands designated Mixed Use Commercial Centre
7-Jul-17	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD	8.1.3.2.2 f)	1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: Clarify if policy pertaining to Mixed Use Commercial Centres is intended to require or encourage a two storey minimum height. Requiring a two-storey minimum building height in the implementing zoning by-law would limit the potential to add stand-alone infill buildings to existing sites.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.3.2.2 h)	1385 North Service Road: The limitations set out by this policy may restrict future development on the site.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	8.1.3.2.2 i)	1385 North Service Road: Retail and service commercial uses may not be feasible at-grade given the site's existing physical constraints, low visibility and access to the site.

3-May-17	Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited	8.1.3.2.3	3091 Appleby Line: The site-specific policies are no longer relevant and are essentially inconsistent with the thrust of the proposed Mixed-Use Commercial Centre designation.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.2.3	As noted above, we believe there are lost opportunities for redevelopment by limiting existing specific parcels to approved zoning (in the absence of other rationale, we have assumed this to be the case). Further, this section precludes the development of grocery stores, which are elsewhere virtually protected. This seems counter-intuitive.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.2.3.(d)	This section goes on to discuss permitted uses, prohibited uses, and square footage caps. Why is this included in the Official Plan, when these are Zoning By-Law level details? Why is the City prohibiting residential uses, supermarkets/grocery stores, department stores, warehouse clubs, and retailing of non-work related apparel within this Mixed Use Commercial Centre?
26-Jun-17	Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited	8.1.3.3	North-west and north-east corners of Dundas Street and Walkers Line: The proposed Neighbourhood Centre policies are largely driven by older plazas in mature neighbourhoods in South Burlington.
26-Jun-17	Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited	8.1.3.3	North-west and north-east corners of Dundas Street and Walkers Line: There is no evidence to support the introduction of a 2 storey minimum policy for Neighbourhood Centres in a suburban location like this node. The two sites should not be lumped-in with the other sites.
7-Apr-17	Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited	8.1.3.3	North-west and north-east corners of Dundas Street and Walkers Line: The 2-storey is simply not viable. The policy is an attempt to create a new hybrid land use that would significantly diminish the existing land use permissions.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.3.3	5353 Lakeshore Rd. (Lakeside Plaza): Although the site is not identified as a formal intensification area, it has been identified by Council as an area for which intensive mixed use redevelopment should be explored.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.3.3	5353 Lakeshore Rd. (Lakeside Plaza): Consider a special policy approach for the Lakeside Plaza which does not highly constrain the objectives that can be achieved by such a significant and unique site.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 b)	The last sentence of the paragraph should be revised to read "that is more appropriate at for each location."
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.3.3.2 d)	Add townhouses

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 e)	Our comment above regarding specifying land sizes applies to this comment as well.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.3.3.2 f) and 8.1.3.6.2 g)	Have a concern with townhouses particularly back to back and stacked townhouses. Some of the developments have been awful and are going to lead to slums.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 g) ii)	We believe the limitation to 6 storeys inappropriate. There are locations within the City where higher buildings are accommodated successfully into areas such as these. Please review and reconsider.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 h)	Reference is made to clause (f) in this paragraph, which should be corrected to reference paragraph (g). Further, you have specific criteria for redevelopment of areas in subsection (i) – any applications for redevelopment would have to undergo a ZBA (rezoning application) and therefore these clauses can and should be eliminated from this section as they can be appropriately included in said ZBA. This subclause also references two further subclauses, both as (a). And, the maximum height here refers to 11 stories whereas mixed use is up to 12 stories. (There are a number of instances where 11 and 12 stories are incorrectly mixed and should be reviewed and corrected throughout the document).
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 i)	Reference is made here to subsections (f) and (g) which should be revised to (g) and (h). We again question the maximum of 11 stories.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 l) ii)	We believe this clause to be unnecessary. If you are able to justify a full residential development, why would the location be dictated here?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 m) and n)	The limitation in size for specific uses seems more appropriate in a zoning bylaw than an OP.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2 p)	The wording in Section 8.1.3.2.2 n) refers to the same requirement for another land designation, but is better worded: there is includes “will encourage” not “shall require”. We believe with the clarification requested in that section, “will encourage” is more appropriate.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.2h) iv)	Reference is made here to underground parking. We believe that a viable alternative is a parking structure, either standalone or incorporated into a building. This comment applies throughout the OP document – in some instances it is included as an option and elsewhere not.

30-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	8.1.3.3.3	5111 New Street: Dependant upon discussions with staff regarding how policy will be implemented in the case of an in process application there may be further comments submitted.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.3.3 a)	Again the reference to (f) and (g) should be to (g) and (h). Further, there is again an inconsistency between references to maximum heights of 11 and 12 stories. Further, the reference to Guelph Line and Upper Middle is not included in (h). We also believe there are other locations (i.e.. Including but not limited to Brant and Upper Middle) that are also appropriate for this type of development. Subsection (ii) is another example of where the inclusion of a parking structure, as discussed above, is an appropriate alternative to underground parking.
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	8.1.3.4	2384 Queensway Drive: Please reflect the Council approved decisions related to 2384 Queensway Drive. Specifically, OPA 103.
5-Apr-17	David McKay, MHBC	8.1.3.4	1450 Headon Road: Stacked townhouses would meet the intention of the Local Centre designation and be compatible with the surrounding area.
5-Apr-17	David McKay, MHBC	8.1.3.4	1450 Headon Road: A proposal for the subject lands may contemplate a total commercial gross floor area greater than 1,200 sq.m given the size of the site.
5-Apr-17	David McKay, MHBC	8.1.3.4	1450 Headon Road: It is unclear why the draft OP would impose a height restriction of 4 storeys.
5-Apr-17	Colin Chung, Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	8.1.3.4	3505 Dundas Street, Local Centre; We suggest that the City consider policies that would allow for stand-alone medium density residential uses adjacent to residential uses, on a site specific basis and where appropriate. Additional provisions could include: where mixed uses are maintained along road frontages adjacent to employment lands and retail and service commercial uses, where the amount of stand-alone medium density residential being requested is small and where the stand alone medium density residential being requested is adjacent to other residential uses. This flexibility is consistent with the Mixed Use Node/ Intensification Corridor policies which require development to be compatible with adjacent residential uses in terms of form and intensity. Request that internal to the subject parcel be considered for stand alone medium density residential.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.4.1 b) and c)	The references and objectives to “provide opportunities for a limited range” In (b) and “to retain a significant retail and service commercial presence” seem at odds with each other. This should be reworded for clarity.

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.4.2 c)	Our comment immediately above also applies to the reference to a limited range of issues here.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.4.2 d)	It appears the intent is that there be no entertainment, recreational uses in this category (thus eliminating uses such as neighbourhood pubs or eateries).
27-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	8.1.3.4.2 d) (iv)	2258 Mountainside Drive: Restricting offices on the ground floor is not appropriate or reasonable for this particular area
27-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	8.1.3.4.2 e)	2258 Mountainside Drive: Staff need to confirm that the extent of the Local Centre designation exceeds the minimum one (1) hectare threshold
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.4.2 f)	Again we believe that the height limitation (max. 4 storeys) is too significant.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.4.2 h) through j)	Please refer to our comment above re limitation of square footages for specific uses, which we believe more appropriate in a zoning bylaw.
27-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	8.1.3.4.2 j)	2258 Mountainside Drive; Maximum individual retail use floor area of 600 sq.m. at grade is too restrictive and limiting for grocery store uses.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.4.3 b)	Reference is made to specific sites which are existing, and are exempted from the above height limitations. These are examples of GOOD intense use of land that can be seen as examples of how to intensify elsewhere. We suggest that these are rationale enough to re-look at the height limitations in these various categories.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.4.3 c) and d)	We believe the limitations on these properties precludes flexibility in redevelopment. This is a recurring theme in the various land use designations.
26-Jun-17	David A McKay, MHBC	8.1.3.5	3050 Davidson Crt. : Policies should allow for a certain amount of retail stores below 1,000 sq.m. which would allow for flexibility to occur when a full or partial redevelopment of the subject lands occurs. Alternatively, the plan could include a policy to allow a reduction below 1000m2 subject to a market study through a Zoning By-law amendment.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.5.1 a) iii)	This is not a characteristic and should be removed from the list.

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.5.2 b)	Part of our various discussions re the OP and the Mobility Hubs was the notion that a mixed employment/residential mix was being considered for intensification in employment areas, on the basis that it did not limit the employment, but was rather in addition to that “amount” of use. Some reference to this should be included in this section.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.5.2 e)	The wording should be revised to “the City shall support.....” as is included elsewhere in the document.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 e)	We again refer you to our concerns above to “shall” and “frequent transit network” and the use of “frequent” in this context.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 f) ii)	There seems to be inconsistency in the document with respect to motor vehicle dealerships. While outside of our association’s scope, it is evident and brought to your attention to address.
28-Jun-17	Ed Forthergill	8.1.3.6.2 h)	2071 and 2090 Quesway Drive: Amend the Urban Corridor policies to eliminate the floor area ratio and maximum building height and include them in the implementing Zoning By-law.
28-Jun-17	Ed Forthergill	8.1.3.6.2 h)	2071 and 2090 Quesway Drive: If a limit is to be established, suggests that a floor area ratio of 6.0:1 be used to reflect expectations based on current built form and applications that are being considered by the City.
28-Jun-17	Ed Forthergill	8.1.3.6.2 h)	2071 and 2090 Quesway Drive: If a height limit is required, suggests a limit be set at 25 storeys given the site's location within a mobility hub area.
28-Jun-17	Ed Forthergill	8.1.3.6.2 i)	2071 and 2090 Quesway Drive: Retain policy to permit an increase in floor area ratio beyond the 6.0:1 limit recommended, subject to criteria.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 j)	We again note the discrepancy between 11 and 12 stories. There are references to nodes within Mobility Hubs. It is our opinion that a statement should be made that all areas within a mobility hub are subject to that plan and outside of this type of classification. Otherwise, references within the respective mobility hub should have these definitions and clarifications within those sections of the document. As these uses are as yet undetermined, it seems inappropriate to make specific requirements available here – it predetermines the outcome of the mobility hubs study areas.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 j) ii)	Subsection (ii) should again include the option for a parking structure.

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 j) iii)	Subsection (iii) refers to community benefit. This is more appropriate when a Section 37 bonusing policy is in place.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 l) and m)	A clause should be included that where lands are within a mobility hub, those rules supersede this section. Further, reference is made to "within the podium of a mid-rise or tall building", however tall buildings have been excluded from these land designations. Subsection (m) may be re-worded as follows: "An alternative target may be established through an area specific plan, such as the Mobility Hubs study."
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.3.6.2 m)	We need more affordable family units. Suggest increase to 50%.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.1.3.6.2 m)	92 Plains Road East: Requirement of minimum of 30% of residential units within a mid-rise development in mobility hubs to consist of two bedrooms or more seems relatively high even for a mobility hub and will reduce the units provided within smaller development and increase the required parking. Suggest revising the criteria to developments of a particular unit count and reducing parking requirements.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 v)	Our concerns related to the level of detail required for motor vehicle dealerships is noted above.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.2 w)	This section belongs in the Mobility Hubs section. There needs to be consistency in the approach here.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.6.2.(h)	As policy 8.1.3.6.(b) states, "Development in Urban Corridor areas shall be designed to incorporate a compatible and intense mix of retail, office, employment and residential uses, and amenities and public service facilities...". Placing an arbitrary cap of 6 storeys limits the potential for this "intense mix" of uses, and should be increased.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.6.2.(j)	11 storeys is not nearly enough! These are the MAJOR urban growth and intensification areas, why would the City arbitrarily cap growth at 11 storeys? What's the point of Tall Building Guidelines if 11 storeys is the cap? These should be 25+ storeys, otherwise it's a wasted opportunity if and when development within these areas present themselves. Failure to provide sufficient height and density within the Mobility Hubs and growth areas will put the remainder of Burlington's lowrise neighbourhoods at risk of "incompatible development" in the future. The Paradigm development at the Burlington Mobility Hub is already 20+ storeys, therefore this policy doesn't even respect what's already been built.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.6.2.(m)	We understand the intent of this policy, but urge caution when dictating number of bedrooms, as this could have substantial cost implications that will price these units out of the market for many people.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.6.2.(n)	Consideration should be given on a broader scale than just the specific property upon which the development is proposed. If the proposed development of a single use building compliments the broader corridor area, why would flexibility not be included to at least allow for this possibility?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.3	Further clauses in this section area again too detailed for a document of this high level.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.3	We again note our concern that the limitations on existing properties should be reviewed in the context of a future rezoning and new OP, as they current zoning may limit opportunities for redevelopment and intensification. Further, the level of detail for some properties is best left in a zoning bylaw vs. an OP
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.3 b) v)	There should be a minimum building height.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.3 b) vi)	We question "majority" vs. "all"
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.3.6.3 c)	Is this what current zoning for the ADI development?

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.6.3 d)	We note that there is only one instance in the entire version of the OP where a tall building is allowed. This illustrates the core of our main concerns with the document – that while great effort has been made to create a Tall Building Guideline, at this time only one building in the entire City has as of right official plan approval, and that only limited.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.6.3.(b)	This property is located within the Appleby GO Mobility Hub, and along the Fairview Street Urban Corridor, where major growth and intensification is intended to go. Why would the City place such restrictions on this property? Residential and a mix of higher density uses SHOULD be permitted on this property, which is one of the only vacant properties in the vicinity of and within easy walking distance to the Appleby GO station. This policy as written contradicts the City's plans for Mobility Hubs. Also, where did the 3,000sq.m figure come from? The current zoning permits a maximum of 5,600sq.m, which should remain in place.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.6.3.(c)	This is the ADI Developments property which is being developed with townhouses. Not only does it not provide retail for the residents, it is located within the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub, and represents under-development. This should therefore place even more importance on the remainder of the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub to be developed at higher densities with both residential and retail uses to meet the goals of the Mobility Hubs.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.7.2 f) ii)	We question why industrial buildings are limited to two storeys if they can be built higher therefore using employment lands more efficiently.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.7.2 i)	We again recommend that there be a blanket statement within each designation that refers users to the Mobility Hubs sections that supersede these sections, to ensure there is no conflict in statements once the Mobility Hubs work is complete.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.3.7.2 k)	Why not quote exact heights here?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.7.2 k)	We recommend that for consistency, similar verbage to this replace similar clauses for other land use designations that refer to FAR, square footage, etc.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.1.3.7.2 l)	Our same concerns apply to this set of motor vehicle policies.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.1.3.7.2 m)	Link to subsection 8.1.3.6.2 u) makes no sense
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBBA, Submission B	8.1.3.7.3	Our previously noted concerns apply.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.1.3.7.3.(a).(ii)	It is well known that Aldershot needs a new grocery store, why would the City prohibit a grocery store on this large undeveloped property, a portion of which is within the Mobility Hub where significant residential and mixed use development is planned? The City's construction of the South Service Road would create an ideal scenario for a supermarket in connection with the greater development of this property as a whole. The only other property of sufficient size to build a grocery store is already being developed by ADI Developments as townhouses.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.2 general	Saw nothing outlining how Bronte Meadows was going to be handled. Site specific study?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.2 general	Several cross referencing issues noted
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.2.1.1 j)	Is there not a longer term strategy developed than 5 years?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.2.1.1.(a)	So even though the City's Land Needs Study demonstrated a surplus of employment land, and even though the comprehensive review process allows for re-designation requests, the City has already put it's foot down and closed the door on any opportunity for re-designation, even in cases where there would undeniably be positive outcomes for the City?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBBA, Submission B	8.2.1.2 d)	This is a good example of how a clause can be worded to eliminate the need for zoning and/or site plan level detail.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBBA, Submission B	8.2.1.2 e)	These type of details are inappropriate in an OP and are better left for a zoning bylaw and/or site plan guideline. The "intent" of what is desire here is covered in clauses such as (d) above, and/or other recommendations/suggestions made in Part A of our comments.

23-Mar-17	Marcus Gagliardi	8.2.2.2 f) and 8.2.3.2e)	Some of the development criteria recommended for recreational uses in order for them to be permitted as stand-alone uses on employment lands cause concern. The criteria requiring that the site has direct access to at least one Major Arterial Street or Multi-Purpose Arterial Street allows very few sites to permit these uses. Additionally, the comments found tension between forcing the use to the periphery while stating that the intent is to serve the employees in the area. Consider: located within 500m of a 'Highway Interchange Crossing'; uses be located within 500m walking distance of existing and/or planned public transportation; remove the requirement forcing recreation uses on the periphery of the employment areas, in our opinion, will decrease the number of employees the recreation use is able to serve.
29-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.2.3	901 Guelph Line: Our client continues to request that the subject lands be removed from the City's employment land base to allow for the comprehensive development of the site as a unique mixed use community. A concept for a complete, connected, affordable community was developed that would meet the needs for employment but would add significant community benefits and integrated residential development in addition to showcasing the potential for sustainable building practices comprehensively across the site. The redevelopment of the site has the potential to provide 329 people and jobs per ha where currently this site provides 6 jobs per ha. Numerous technical supporting documents were submitted at the time of the request for conversion including a Preliminary Servicing Review; Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan; Traffic Impact Study; Economic Benefits Analysis; and a Planning Justification Report. The City's assessment of the conversion request did not, in our opinion, fully consider the context for the site not only within the area but within the City's urban structure as a whole, nor did it comprehensively review the above-noted technical information provided. It assessed the conversion based solely on the principle of existing land use and viewed the site as a large parcel of land with good access in an employment area and did

29-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.2.3	<p><i>901 Guelph Line continued ...</i> to the Burlington GO Station or the Fairview Street Urban Corridor. The follow-up response from City staff on this matter has been that the urban structure provided in the Draft Official Plan is firm, will generally not change in future drafts, and complements the City's local vision. We would hope that the continued public process is intended to allow for ongoing review and discussion and that such elements of the plan are not fixed until such time as Council makes this decision. We have provided staff with details about the proposal and rationale for consideration of these lands for conversion, through this Official Plan review, given the site context, constraints, and locational opportunities. We further provided staff with a policy structure for how the opportunity for the site's inclusion in the mobility hub can be addressed. It is our opinion that the employment designation applied to this site is limiting in nature, out-dated and that conversion of the subject lands is both appropriate and desirable as well as in alignment with the majority of the Council approved conversion policy. The current proposed Official Plan framework would create a restrictive policy framework which would stagnate any</p>
29-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.2.3	<p><i>901 Guelph Line continued...</i> We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the new Official Plan as it applies to our client's lands and look forward to meeting with you to further our comments and requests outlined herein, being that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject lands be converted from employment (as justified by the supporting studies submitted by our client) to allow for the site to develop as a gateway site to the City, which includes a mixture of uses (employment, residential, retail); and, • The subject lands be considered as "Special Site Area" within the context of the Burlington Go Mobility Hub
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.2.3.3	<p>441 North Service Road: The site specific policy has been removed. Please ensure that the existing facility and its range of supportive uses are reflected in the draft Official Plan. Please also ensure that the expanded facility being considered through a zoning by-law amendment is also recognized in the Official Plan including the lands on which the expanded parking area is located.</p>

30-Jun-17	Debra Kakaria, MHBC	8.2.3	3455 North Service Road: The addition of stand alone recreational is not permitted by the draft policies on this site. Consistent with earlier submissions additional flexibility had been sought to allow the securement of additional tenants. There appears to be an opportunity to discuss a collaborative solution that achieves the City's objectives and allows the site to be developed. At a minimum the site specific policy established in OPA#89 should be maintained.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.2.3.2 e)	3007 & 3200 Harvester Road: There would be some value in considering allowing a broader area to be considered a lot /occupied employment site for the purposes of the retail, service commercial and recreation uses permitted.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.2.3.2 g) vi)	Enhanced landscaping is not required for any other land use. Why here, and why this level of detail in an OP?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.2.3.3 a)	The level of detail in the subclauses is more appropriate in a zoning bylaw and/or site plan guidelines.
30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.2.3.3 g) i)	3007 & 3200 Harvester Road: Maximum flexibility is required to support a range of development options as the office market for this location is limited due to several constraints.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.2.3.3 g) v)	Reference is made here to a “comprehensive site plan” – is this an Area Specific Plan?
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	8.2.3.3 h)	While not familiar with the specifics of this site, we question why a parking structure or underground parking would NOT be permitted.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.3 general	Ensure that intensification in established neighborhoods has tighter controls, including rules that prevent developer-initiated OP amendments and zoning by-law changes
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	8.3.2	Add the clause “maximum density in residential low density areas should not exceed the lesser of 25 units/hectare or existing zoning.

5-Apr-17	Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting	8.3.2.1	143 Blue Water Place and 105 Avondale Court: Concerns related to height and the provision for new right of ways in residential low-density designation. Policies are too restrictive and redundant. Policies require that other ground-oriented dwellings, not including single and semi-detached housing types be compatible with the scale, urban design and community features of the neighbourhood. Compatibility is a defined term. This approach to determine maximum height is appropriate as it does not limit redevelopment to existing by-laws or lands immediately around any property.
5-Apr-17	Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting	8.3.2.1	143 Blue Water Place and 105 Avondale Court: The subject property is a private road which provides access to several residential units. New OP policies seek to encourage new redevelopment projects to dedicate these roads to the City. It is unclear how this provision is intended to be implemented. Compensation to the landowner should be made.
5-Apr-17	Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting	8.3.2.1	800 Lasalle Park Road: Requests that the subject lands be designated Residential-High Density. High-rise uses comply with the development criteria (2.5.2 b).
5-Apr-17	Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting	8.3.2.1	800 Lasalle Park Road: Concerns related to height and the provision for new right of ways in residential low-density designation. Policies are too restrictive and redundant. Policies require that other ground oriented dwellings, not including single and semi-detached housing types be compatible with the scale, urban design and community features of the neighbourhood. Compatibility is a defined term. This approach to determine maximum height is appropriate as it does not limit redevelopment to existing by-laws or lands immediately around any property.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	8.3.2.1	Add the clause "except for townhouses"
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.3.2.1	Specific edits suggested for residential low density
30-Jun-17	Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates	8.3.3	619 and 625 Maple Avenue : The stacked townhouse form being considered for this site exceeds the maximum density established in the Medium Density Residential designation.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.3.3.1 b) and c)	Change maximum density to 50 units/ha and use Residential Policy Direction A 1. "Create the potential to permit ... to specific requirements" Use three requirements listed in original brief. This has the potential to intensify 3 fold. Two fold is bad enough.

29-Jun-17	Elissa Quintanella / Cheryl Selig	8.3.3.2	238 Sumach Drive: The features of the parcel support consideration for Residential - Medium Density designation with a site specific increase in density range for efficient redevelopment of the lands. The site is 1.5 ha (3.6 ac) in size and irregular in shape which does not lend itself to a lower density development that is consistent with the provincial and municipal growth objectives. The site is adjacent to residential uses with natural features directly south. These natural features introduce some environmental constraints, which could impact the extent of developable lands on site. The site itself is able to integrate a medium density development with the adjacent low density uses in a manner that provides for adequate buffering to the adjacent residential uses, provides appropriate on-site amenities areas and adequate parking facilities. Moreover, a medium density form will introduce additional housing options and uses to the mix of employment, recreational and low density residential uses already existing in the neighbourhood. It is our opinion that a site specific Residential – Medium Density designation is appropriate and represents good planning.
29-Jun-17	Elissa Quintanella / Cheryl Selig	8.3.3.2	<i>238 Sumach Drive continued...</i> With regards to the request for a site specific exception to allow an increase in density range to 110 units per net residential hectare (roughly 160 units, 1.49 net area), the current proposed Residential - Medium Density designation density range does not allow for the site specific features of this site and the ability to accommodate a larger amount of units in a stacked townhouse form on a site of this size. The size of the site functions well as an infill site for medium density but is inefficient for low density development. Given the planning justification supplied the Official Plan should include a site specific policy related to 238 Sumach to increase the density to 110 units per net hectare.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.3.3.2 c)	Both addresses are west of William O'Connell Boulevard.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	8.3.4.1 c)	We do not agree with this. Any building intensification going above 185 units/ha should have an Official Plan Amendment. This will provide our citizens an early warning of what is taking place and provide them with an opportunity to comment on it.

30-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	8.3.4.1. e)	5166 - 5170 Lakeshore Road: It is too restrictive to require that High Density Residential developments provide a functional outdoor common amenity area at grade level for use by residents. There are many examples where outdoor amenity is provided above grade. The City should consider means of building in flexibility in determining what constitutes outdoor amenity area.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	8.4.1	Add a specific natural corridors section or references to this use in CHAPTER 8 LAND USE POLICIES - URBAN AREA and CHAPTER 9 LAND USE POLICIES - RURAL AREA. The natural corridor land use links Green Belt and Niagara Escarpment Natural Heritage Systems to each other and Lake Ontario.
14-Jul-17	PERL	8.4.2.3 a) (i) (ii)	The "Major Parks and Open Space" designation reference to (Wellness House) needs to be updated, since Wellness House is not located within the delineated private or public open space. According to Schedule C Land Use - Urban Area, Wellness House is within 'Urban Centres'. There should not be a public health care building within the private open space owned by The Villages of Brantwell.
13-Jun-17	Al Ruggero, Rexton Developments	8.6 general	Grahams Lane and parallel to the CNR: Lands previously designated "Mixed Use Corridor Employment" and "Residential Medium Density" and "Residential High Density" are being proposed to be designated to Infrastructure and Transportation Corridor. This change is not supported and will adversely impact the development potential of these lands.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.7.1.1.(b)	Why prohibit drive-thrus outright? Would it not be more appropriate to allow them subject to appropriate design? Burlington is and will remain for a very long time car-dependent, therefore there is substantial demand for the convenience that drive-thrus offer.
7-Jul-17	Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD	8.7.1.2	1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: Clarify if new accessory drive-throughs will be permitted on these lands.
30-Jun-17	Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates	8.7.1.2 a) and b)	Objects the proposed specific prohibition of DT in OP. Ops do not need to be prescriptive like ZBL. A specific prohibition is not justified as the existing policies would have to be complied with no matter what the proposed use to ensure all policy requirements to direct built form, density, etc. are achieved.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	8.7.1.2 b)	Why must this be tied to a Zoning By-Law Amendment application? Drive-throughs with good design should be permitted in these areas as of right. What is the justification for the prohibition against drive-throughs?
30-Jun-17	Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates	8.7.1.2 b)	"shall be prohibited" in this context is not acceptable wherein the policy provides for a ZBL amendment.

30-Jun-17	Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates	8.7.1.2 b)	Objects to the specific need for a zone change in the noted areas.
30-Jun-17	Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates	8.7.1.2 b)	The context or notion that a DT cannot exist with or abutting a mixed use type zone permitting sensitive uses is not acceptable. Planning policies are encouraging mixed uses and intensification in close proximity to heavily traveled vehicle corridors.
18-May-17	Jean Roy, Canadian Fuels Association	8.7.1.2 d)	The Draft OP indicates in its section 8.7.1.2 d) that: "An accessory drive-through shall not be located between a building façade and a public right-of-way". This restriction should not apply in the case of a motor vehicle service station as in such a case locating the drive-through near the public right-of-way and between the building and the public right-of-way is often the most appropriate location as it is then located away from adjacent properties and doesn't conflict with the fuel pumps area. For safety reasons, locating the drive-through on the same side of the building as the fuel pumps is not usually feasible.
30-Jun-17	Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT	8.7.1.2.1 d)	Suggest adding language to clarify the intent of the policy (e.g. pedestrian access) to allow for flexibility in the location of drive-throughs provided safe pedestrian access is provided.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	"Affordable" needs to be carefully defined. In one context it suggests a variety of housing options and general market availability designed to allow greater access to a diverse population, in another context it specifically means providing housing for low-income families.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	General	there appears to be an approach to limit height in redevelopment, versus embracing it where appropriate. Given the inability to submit an OP amendment application within two years, the City is curtailing its ability to grow within the next two years, given the limitations here and the preliminary information provided through the mobility hubs study.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	General	There are many references throughout the document linking "shall" with the provision of transit. We emphasize that while this is an appropriate goal of the City, private industry is not able nor is it appropriate to require private industry to provide transit. Accordingly, verbiage should be included, and the numerous clauses within the Official Plan as a whole should be changed, to reflect that it is the City who will provide transit, and that it will be directed to the nodes and corridor type locations where you would like to see intensification occur.

8-Jun-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	General	In respect of the continuation of the Precinct Planning framework for the Downtown, I clearly indicated that the current framework has failed and that such a framework should be replaced. The rationale for this is that the current rate of development/redevelopment/intensification is failing to meet minimum growth requirements. At 60 new residential new units per year (the current average for the Urban Growth Centre), I indicated that it would take the City 54 years to reach the minimum targets for 2031. In addition, I indicated that to meet the current minimum population and employment targets for 2031 at least 15 new 24 storey buildings or 44 new 8 storey buildings would be required within the Urban Growth Centre by 2031 (one new high rise every year from now until 2031) – a 43% increase to the existing residential housing supply within the Urban Growth Centre. I also indicated that the failure of the existing Precinct Planning framework is demonstrated by the fact that all new tall buildings within the Downtown have required official plan and zoning amendments.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	General	Significant detail is provided for specific properties. Without a proper understanding of the specifics of the properties in general, we offer that it would appear that many of the clauses and requirements are based on current zoning permissions. Whereas this may be what the City is desirous of maintaining, it may be more appropriate to review some or all of these properties to see what the highest and best use may now be, regardless of how recently the zoning was implemented. We consider this to be counterintuitive to moving forward with a new OP and new zoning, to embed current zoning into the new OP that may be a lost opportunity for good redevelopment.
17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	General - 8.1.3	Further, there are again references to the areas being “highly accessible by public transit” – in the form of “shall”. This is NOT within the control of private developers, and therefore this issue should be addressed (in general, throughout the document as this is only one of many instances where such a reference is made”. It must be clearly understood that it is not the intent of the City to require private industry to develop and improve the City’s transit offerings.

17-Jul-17	Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B	General- 8.1.3	We applaud the fact that the intent for these areas is to intensify “generally within midrise and tall building forms”. However, in reviewing the details, we note that tall buildings are not allowed within any of the classifications throughout this section.
-----------	---	----------------	---

CHAPTER NINE - LAND USE POLICIES RURAL AREA			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
29-Jun-17	PERL	9.1 general	PERL supports the Rural Community policies.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.1.1 b)	Hard to do when the NHS regulations override agriculture, and the setbacks and buffers keep encroaching further and further into agricultural land, and the mere presence of certain birds or salamanders makes farming no longer possible on Prime Agricultural Land. While I know municipal and regional planners disagree completely with the private sector farm operators, the NHS policies are strangling agricultural operations and making agriculture more and more difficult. Farmers should not need Planning Degrees or a team of lawyers to farm their land.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.1.1 c)	Missing severances of surplus farm dwellings. Why have the policies with respect to these types of severances been deleted from the Official Plan?
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	9.1.2 c)	The OP should permit the severance of surplus farm dwellings as per the Greenbelt Plan and the Niagara Escarpment Plan.
13-Jul-17	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate	9.1.2 d)	Suggested additions to policy: (i) the development envelope shall be located within 120 m of a municipal road and shall not exceed one hectare in area. (ii) The development envelope shall be located so as to minimize impacts on the viability of the current and future agricultural use of the lot. (iii) A new or replacement dwelling shall not be greater than 225 sq. m in size
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	9.1.2 j)	Location and construction of infrastructure and utilities in the Rural Area. It is necessary to provide the utmost protection to the agriculture and natural heritage systems ... Please make the referenced section much stronger to provide the utmost protection
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	9.2 and 9.3	On Farm Businesses. Language in the Burlington OP should reflect the new Provincial plans as much as possible.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.2 general	Agreed, so why then does the government over-run it with regulations and policies that threaten the viability of agriculture? The way the NHS policies are enforced are having a negative impact on agriculture. The NHS cannot always come first.
13-Jul-17	Agriculture Sub-Committee	9.2 general	The Bruce Trail should be recognized as a permitted use throughout the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area and subject to the Development and Growth Objectives found in the NEP.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.2.1.(a).(v)	Agreed. All Provincial and Municipal planning documents say this, yet in practice, normal farming practices and the right to farm are being negatively impacted as priority is always given to NHS over agriculture. It should be the other way around.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.2.2.(c).(i)	Agreed, good policy, unfortunately in practice it's not working this way. Policy needs to be added that makes it abundantly clear that Agriculture comes first, even in cases where there are conflicts with the NHS.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	9.2.3 (b)	Definition of types of events seems rather vague, but also overly restrictive; should include events which raise awareness of local agriculture. Types of events allowed is very restrictive- allowing only events directly related to the farm operation or related to on-farm diversified use producing value-added agricultural products eliminates a farm's ability to host private events such as weddings, which may provide a much needed boost to bottom line while also functioning as a promotional tool to encourage interest in their agricultural products or encouraging agro-tourism in general. If the size, type and number of events were restricted, why not allow this use, as long as it doesn't negatively impact agricultural operations, natural areas or neighbours? It is another means of building in flexibility and enabling farms to be creative in adapting to being in a near urban context while remaining competitive at a level that allows them to invest in other types of agriculture related expansions and/or improvements
14-Jul-17	PERL	9.2.3 a) (xiii)	The policy should not prevent nature viewing and pedestrian trail activities on private lands, assuming owner permission. This is the current practice in parts of the rural area. The City should not discourage public enjoyment of our rural areas.

14-Jul-17	PERL	9.2.3 b)	We do not agree with this policy. A private landowner having a farm property should be able to host 'special events' unrelated to their farm operations.....The City should not prevent NGOs' ability to use special events for fundraising in support of our mission.....The City should not require an amendment to the zoning bylaw, or a temporary use bylaw for special events. Bylaws take too much time and resources, effectively preventing Special Events. The current "permit" process is more than adequate,.....
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	9.2.4	Specific wording edits suggested to Prime Agricultural Area policies in comments
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	9.2.4	Should there be restrictions on aggregate extraction in the prime agricultural land designated area as it all seems to be prime land and just requiring a swap at time of rehabilitation seems unwise.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	9.2.4	Not sure why the criteria applicable to areas outside the Greenbelt Plan area do not apply to those within, seems like we are putting too much faith in the Greenbelt Plan which is something that is out control of the municipality and could be impacted by changes in Provincial government.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	9.3 general	Add a specific natural corridors section or references to this use in CHAPTER 8 LAND USE POLICIES - URBAN AREA and CHAPTER 9 LAND USE POLICIES - RURAL AREA. The natural corridor land use links Green Belt and Niagara Escarpment Natural Heritage Systems to each other and Lake Ontario.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.3 general	As explained above, that is not always the case in reality.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.3.1.(b)	Directly contradicts what is said in policy 9.3.1.(g): "To protect or enhance Key Natural Features, without limiting the ability of agricultural uses to continue." So which is it? Is agriculture permitted within Key Features or not?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.3.1.(m)	The unfortunate and certainly unintended reality of this policy is that it encourages illegal trespassing onto private property and farmland, where people feel they can do whatever they want, go wherever they want, and damage whatever they want, all on property that they do not own. Rural property owner rights are infringed upon every day because of policies like this one.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.3.2.(c)	Object to the word "may" be permitted. If the agricultural operation is existing, it "shall" be permitted as of right. Let's not forget that most of the rural area farm land has been farmed for the past century, well before the government started introducing restrictive policies and designation labels.
14-Jul-17	PERL	9.5.2 f)	"Major rock cutting and blasting for road construction within Rural Settlement Areas. The regrading of the existing land for road construction shall be discouraged." Should require City 'site alteration permit'.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	9.5.3.(b)	This is somewhat unfair to the purchaser of a rural settlement area lot, who may have purchased the lot with a particular home design in mind, only to find out after the fact that the City of Burlington may restrict the size of the house because of "other factors". How does a purchaser do their due diligence in this case without spending tens of thousands of dollars on studies and drawings BEFORE buying the lot?

CHAPTER TEN - LAND USE POLICIES NORTH ALDERSHOT			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
29-Jun-17	Hugh Handy, GSP Group	10	We understand that the maps and policies that apply to the North Aldershot area are not proposed to be changed as part of the City's new draft Official Plan. We request that we are informed of any future studies and plans undertaken by the City as they pertain to this property.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	10.3.6 (b)	New public roads will be built to rural standards: We'd like clarification on what exactly this means (defined somewhere else in the plan?) but we question whether this is sufficient as we are trying to achieve a 'balanced' transportation system and there are plans in the works to widen a number of our rural roads to improve safety for cycling.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	10.4.1.1	Do these policies apply to Eagle Heights? If so, we have concerns, given that not all lots proposed are single detached dwellings.
20-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	10.4.4 (c)	Need to be careful that lower density appearance is not confused with sprawl
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	10.4.7 f) (ii)	Use Audubon (or similar) standard for any expansion/change of golf operations
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	10.5.1	The policies break out the various development pods in Eagle Heights into "Sub-Areas", and dictate the maximum number of residential units permitted in each. We have an active application that exceeds these maximum number of units. These numbers warrant further review and discussion given the pending OMB Hearing. There are also policies regarding "Building Envelope Control" that should be deleted, given that this additional requirement was not identified in the OMB Decision.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	10.5.1.1.(i)	What does this mean? By whom? Is that valley not already in a natural state?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	10.5.1.2.(h)	What does this mean? This area is farmed, and the "natural vegetation pattern" has never been altered. What needs to be restored? We disagree with the need for this statement.

PB 47-17

29-Jun-17	Hugh Handy, GSP Group	General	We understand that the maps and policies that apply to the North Aldershot area are not proposed to be changed as part of the City's new draft Official Plan. We request that we are informed of any future studies and plans undertaken by the City as they pertain to this property.
-----------	-----------------------	---------	--

CHAPTER ELEVEN - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & ENGAGEMENT			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.1	"The City is known for its sound decision-making processes". Is this a goal? Or something already achieved? If so, it would be better to back it up with a reference (i.e. According to...).
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11 Preamble	suggest identifying which strategic plan you are referencing i.e. 2015-2040
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.1.1	Objectives are general - It would be better to explain more about "how" the City is going to implement these
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.2.1	As Environmental awareness is a key factor in engaging the public community, we propose to add an item specifically for Environmental awareness maybe into this section or section 11.3.1 Procedures. The city could implement Environmental awareness seminars or workshops for residents/or consider a budget for this. Other possible engagement strategies could be inclusion in councillors' newsletters, website posting area, and automated e-mail notifications.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	11.2.1.(j).(v)	Misleading policy. This gives the impression that land use planning matters will be voted on by the public, which is not the case. The public in general are not land use experts, nor have the knowledge to qualify them to make land use planning decisions. If the City's intention is to leave decision making in the hands of the public, then NIMBYism will rule the day. Surely that is not the intent of this policy.
20-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.3.1	Outline what citizens can do in terms of asking questions and providing opinion at each public meeting (Neighbourhood, Statutory, Recommendation to Committee and Council).
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.3.1	Provide recommendations four weeks in advance of Planning and Development Recommendation meeting. Allow time to properly analyze.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	11.3.1 a)	Ensure that there is adequate time for submissions made to Council. Add new policy in 11.3.1.(a), between (viii) and (ix)"at the public meeting, adequate time shall be provided to enable persons who are interested in the amendment to make submissions that fully and fairly address their concerns"

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.3.1 a) (xi)	In what circumstances does the City consider a high level of public engagement to be required? Provide reference to document that fully spells out this process or better describe in Official Plan.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.3.1 a) iv)	Please consider adding more advisory committees and persons who have expressed interest to the circulation list.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.3.1 a) ix)	Consider changing “adequate time may be allowed” to “adequate time shall be allowed”. Does the fact that it is a statutory public meeting imply that staff should analyze all public comments?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	11.3.1 a) xi)	How is this defined? What is considered to be a ‘potentially significant impact’? Who makes this decision?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	11.3.1.(a).(xi)	What does this do to application processing timeframes? The Planning Act still requires municipalities to make a decision within 180 days from the date an application is deemed complete.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Numerous editorial suggestions (e.g. punctuation, minor wording changes) made in comments
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Graphic 11-1	Could this be turned into a 2 x 5 table giving examples of situations when the City would employ one type of engagement over another?

CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	OP Section	Comments
30-Jun-17	Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates	12.1	Absent any direction on transition there may be some need to provide further comments in relation to an in-process applications Appleby Village OPA and ZBLA (505-01/14 & 520-05/14). Please confirm how transition will be addressed.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.2.1 c)	Define "minor".
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.3.1.2 e)	What municipal requirements does that include? Agricultural zones will be re-developed as "urban zone" after interim period. Can this be explained a little more clearly?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.3.1.5.2	Suggest adding the following policy: Community benefits provision shall be considered where the increased density and height conforms with the intent of the e Plan and the increase in height and density is compatible with adjacent existing or proposed development.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.3.1.7.2	a) Items (i) to (v) Not clear enough regarding timing
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.3.1.8.2 b) vii)	Safety matters should also be addressed.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.3.3.2 d)	Energy conservation could be added to the items
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	12.1.3.5.2	Supports the designation of Community Improvement Plan Areas along key corridors.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.3.6 a)	Instead of saying "acquire land" perhaps suggest that new developments will need to develop parkland when a new development takes place. Instead of may which gives developers a loop hole, suggest using the words "will be required" to ensure compensation if parkland is not developed.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.3.6.1	What land? Burlington is built out, if the park doesn't already exist, there's not likely to be a new one. The entire Parkland Dedication policy is outdated, and based on a model that no longer exists in Burlington.

20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.3.6.2	Again, this is the old way of thinking, back when Burlington had residential greenfield developments. Those don't exist anymore. Given that there is limited to no land available for new parks, perhaps it is time to do away with Parkland Dedication and associated fees in Burlington, given that the parks already exist, and are maintained via a portion of our property taxes.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.3.6.2.(d)	Same comment as above. The collection of these fees will not be going towards new parks, so is there even a need to collect it anymore?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.3.7.2 a)	More info about the program would be great
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	12.1.4.2 e)	This policy appears to allow either solely employment or solely intensification. It appears to ignore mixed use, non-intensification Area- Specific Plans (such as Evergreen). What is the purpose of this policy? Amend the second sentence 12.1.4.2.e) to permit a wide range of uses.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.4.2.(c)	This is an unfair policy. If the City wants an Area Specific Plan, do an Area Specific Plan. Don't pawn this responsibility and cost onto a developer and make them pay for it. This adds significant time and expense, and certainly does not meet your goal of making development and investment in Burlington desirable.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.4.2.1.(a)	This policy goes on to list 17 different studies which, if policy 12.1.4.2.(c) is enforced, means the private landowner that wants to develop a specific property now has to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars studying the broader area in connection with this Area-Specific Plan which should have already been completed by the City? How is this reasonable?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.1.4.2.2	Why such a high density of 300 people and jobs per ha? What is the make-up of the 28 percent?
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	12.1.4.2.2 k)	As part of area-specific planning, requirements for sustainable building practices "shall be identified" should be strengthened to "shall require" minimum percentages of sustainable infrastructure.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	12.1.4.2.2 k)	City should consider providing incentives for development proposals that exceed base performance targets to encourage development proponents to raise established minimum standards for development.

30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	12.1.4.3.2.1	It is not clear how the Secondary Plan, once adopted, will be integrated into the City's Draft New OP. Proposed approach in the implementing OPA: 1: delete the Tremaine Road Special Planning Area overlay from Schedule B and be replaced by the appropriate components of the urban structure. 2: delete the Land Use Designation to be Determined and replace it with the appropriate land use designations. 3: Delete section 12.1.4.3.2.1. Details of implementing the OPA will be discussed through the Secondary Plan process.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.5.1.2.(b)	This will add considerable time and cost to development applications, delaying the process further. The City already has an Official Plan and Zoning By-Law that guide development, there is no reason to delay a developer at the time they submit an application and make them wait what could easily take well over a year or more to complete all of the studies needed for an Area-Specific Plan. If the City has certain areas they feel require an Area-Specific Plan, then do them now.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.5.1.2.1.(a)	Sounds reasonable in theory, but in practice this never runs smoothly. The agencies need to be held accountable to respond within a reasonable amount of time. It should not take months of pushing, constant reminders, and follow-up attempts to obtain agency comments. If the City is going to manage this, firm commenting deadlines need to be given, and if the agencies don't comment, they missed their chance. This has caused major problems for us in the past, where multiple Region of Halton staff for example, did not return our calls or emails for a period of well over two years.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	12.1.5.1.2.1.(c)	When developers pay applications fees, that fee covers all municipal review costs. Why then, if the City does not have the staff time or expertise to review a study and needs to hire a peer reviewer, is that at the developer's cost, given that they're already paid for this review? If the City decides a peer review is needed, the City should pay for it using the application fees already secured from the developer, or if the developer needs to pay for the peer review, then the City should be crediting back a portion of the unused development application fee. Forcing a developer to pay twice for the same work is unfair.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	12.2.2 g)	What is "minor"? Provide examples.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN - DEFINITIONS			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	Definition	Comments
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Affordable Housing	Is this realistic in the GTA anymore? Housing prices are market driven, and not something that can be forced by a municipality. How can a developer produce housing and sell it at a reduced price when property values, planning applications fees, development charges, construction costs, etc... cannot allow them to do so? If people want to find "affordable housing" perhaps they need to look outside of the GTA.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Ancillary Employment Use and Area of Employment and Employment	Provide detailed definitions of employment uses with examples.
29-Jun-17	Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity	Assisted Housing	Habitat for Humanity would like confirmation that current and future projects for which we are proponents are considered under the definition of assisted housing. Although Habitat for Humanity projects are not always subsidized through a government program, they are subsidized through private donation and the housing serves the same function and purpose. Please revise to include non-government subsidies.
8-Jun-17	Mark Bales Carriage Gate	Compatible	Stress the importance of "fit" and challenges with the term. Commit to review. Fit and Harmony should be the goals
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Development	The definition appears to be very limiting.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Enhancement Area	Revise to be consistent with the Region of Halton term: Enhancements to the Key Features.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Flooding Hazard	Items 3, 4 and 5 could be revised to 2a, b and c.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Hazardous Lands	The term Hazardous Lands is defined but the term Hazard Land is also italicized within the New Draft OP document. As these are the same thing, change all Hazard Land references to Hazardous Lands.

5-Apr-17	David McKay, MHBC	Mid-Rise	Definition of Mid-rise building would like height to 6 storeys in the subject property. OPA proposing additional height would not meet the development criteria.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Mixed Use	Include "Mixed Use" in the Definitions section to make clear the City's intention in including this term in the OP; i.e. identify a minimum requirement for space allocation such as percentage of space by type (retail, commercial, residential), etc. to qualify as an acceptable Mixed Use. Confirm Mixed Use development has an inherent benefit to the community as a component of "placemaking". Suggest: Mixed-use development is a type of urban development that blends residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, or industrial uses, where those functions are physically and functionally integrated, and that provides pedestrian connections.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Placemaking	Suggest adding: Placemaking is a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces, the public realm and communities that involves including people in the discussion of designing public spaces that reflect shared value and support healthy communities.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Regulatory Flood Plain	The term Regulatory Flood Plain is defined but not used in the OP text. Flood Plain is the correct term and is defined in the draft OP. Delete Regulatory Flood Plain from the definitions.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Right to Farm	Sounds great in theory, but other agencies are enforcing this differently. As previously mentioned, we have over 40 acres of designated Prime Agricultural Area in rural Burlington that had been farmed for nearly a century that we cannot farm anymore without facing threats of fines and/or imprisonment, all because of conflicting NHS policies and the potential that a salamander could walk across the field twice a year. There are major conflicts between NHS and Agriculture that have been expressed many times to all levels of government, yet the government has done nothing to assist.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Service Commercial	provide an example or two with definition.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Significant	Items 5 to 8 under the Significant definition would appear to have been erroneously included under this definition as they are also repeated below in the Significant Wetland definition, which is where they are more appropriate.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Stable Slope	Within the definition of Stable Top of Bank the term Stable Slope is italicized but there is no definition for this term provided. Add a definition or un-italicize.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Sustainable Development, Sustainability, Etc	Need a better definition of Sustainable Development. Here's a suggestion - Sustainable Development as a pattern of resource use that "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". In order to preserve the natural world, economic, social and environmental factors must be jointly considered and harmonized.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Transit	Define "transit" .
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	Urban Agriculture	Broaden the definition of urban agriculture to include animal agriculture: at a minimum it should include aquaponics, garden chickens, and bees.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	Urban Agriculture	Include access to food in the definition of a complete community and create a section in Chapter 3 to address it, or at minimum, a cross-reference to section 4.9.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	Schedule/Table	Comments
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule A	This mapping is nearly impossible to read at this scale when looking at specific properties (i.e.. Eagle Heights).
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule A	Bronte Creek Meadows and 1200 King Road are shown outside of the built boundary, which is incorrect. Similarly, the "Greenfield" designation needs to be corrected to "Urban Area".
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule A	Green System is not shown accurately on Bronte Creek Meadows or 1200 King Road.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule A	e) Properties at 3075 and 3095 Dundas Street are incorrectly shown as "Green System".
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule A	Label for Major Transit System easily gets lost on the map. A brighter colour or image i.e. star, diamond, etc. would be better
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule A	Green Belt Plan Area and Built Boundary are too similar in colour/style when looking in the Aldershot area – change colour or line type on one of them for ease of reading.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule A	Parkway Belt West Plan hard to understand in the east end
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule A1	The line types for North Aldershot Policy Area and Designated Greenfield Area are extremely similar and causes minor confusion when reading.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule A-1	Bronte Creek Meadows, 1200 King Road and the Alton commercial plaza are incorrectly shown as "Greenfield" and outside of the built boundary.
29-Jun-17	PERL	Schedule A-1	The map does not show the MNRF 2010 designation, and 2017 NEP 'escarpment natural' designation which is the Grindstone Creek Headwaters Wetland Complex Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW)

29-Jun-17	PERL	Schedule A-1	The map does not show the MNRF designation areas for the Jefferson Salamander habitats on and adjacent to the Nelson Aggregate lands, which was substantive in the Joint Board's application 'denial' decision of October 2012.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule B	Bronte Creek Meadows - The NHS designation covers way too much area, and does not accurately reflect what's actually on the property.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule B	1200 King Road - The NHS designation covers way too much area, and does not accurately reflect what's actually on the property.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule B	The Natural Heritage System and Major Parks and Open Space area do not reflect the appropriate NHS (see comments below for Schedule C and N). Mapping of the NHS then needs to be updated to reflect the appropriate NHS set out in the revised Schedule N.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule B1	Urban Growth Centre is noted at 'UGC' - use full name as there is space
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule B-1	Bronte Creek Meadows is incorrectly shown outside of the built boundary, has far too much NHS shown, and is shown not subject to Intensification Framework, which makes no sense given that it is one of very few properties that has potential to help the City meet its intensification targets and bring significant income to the City, if planned properly.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule B-1	1200 King Road is incorrectly shown outside of the built boundary, has far too much NHS shown, and is shown not subject to Intensification Framework, which makes no sense especially since part of this property is within the planned Mobility Hub area.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule B-1	Alton commercial plaza is incorrectly shown outside of the built boundary.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule B-1	Evergreen is identified as Undeveloped Area Outside Built Boundary (not subject to Intensification Framework). How will the Evergreen Lands be identified in the future? Mapping of the NHS then needs to be updated to reflect the appropriate NHS set out in the revised Schedule N.
10-Mar-17	Mark McConnville (Humphries Planning Group Inc.)	Schedule B-1	5230 Harvester Road should form part of the Primary Intensification Area.

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule B2	This schedule should also show external linkages to Oakville, BRT, Hamilton, and 403 & 407 Bus Routes. A separate map showing all non-car/truck linkages to Mobility Hubs should be developed for walking, cycling and public transit routes along with external links.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule B2	Primary Mobility Hub Connector, make line type have a smaller dash, for legibility.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule B-2	Bronte Creek Meadows is not shown as an Employment Growth area, is not shown having Justified Frequent Transit Network access, and is not shown having even Candidate Frequent Transit Network access, supporting our position that this property is not desirable for employment uses, as evidenced by years of marketing it for such use, unsuccessfully. It's time to consider other uses on this property.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule C	From roughly Kerns Road to Hendon Road – south of Dundas to Lake – why is no Natural Heritage shown.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule C	Way too much NHS shown on the mapping for Bronte Creek Meadows and 1200 King Road, not reflective of actual conditions.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule C	Mapping of the NHS then needs to be updated to reflect the appropriate NHS set out in the revised Schedule N.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule C	Northeast corner of Walkers Line and Upper Middle Road is not Open Space and Park Area. It is a hockey arena.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule C	From roughly Kerns Road to Hendon Road south of Dundas to Lake why is there no Natural Heritage shown
28-Jun-17	Ed Forthergill	Schedule C	These lands are designated Mixed Use Nodes and Intensification Corridors in Schedule B, however are designated General Employment in Schedule C. Recommends that these lands be designated Urban Corridor in Schedule C.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule D1	Watercourse is not labeled
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule F	'Rail Line' is very difficult to identify on the plan, and the rail line does not continue south past Grahams Line, unlike what the schedule shows.

29-Jun-17	Dana Anderson, MHBC	Schedule G	901 Guelph Line: It is also our opinion that the proposed Mobility Hub boundary for the Burlington GO station should be extended to include the subject lands, and other parcels, as identified on our proposed mapping . Similar to our comment above, we would hope that these boundaries are not fixed and are open to ongoing review and refinements through the public process. We note that the other mobility hub boundaries extend far further beyond a 500 metre suggested radius and believe this mobility hub should be no different. In fact, given its activity and context, the boundary should be greater than originally recommended.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule H	Should include all of the 1200 King Road property, not just the western portion. This property offers a great opportunity to do something special. Why limit that potential?
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule I	Consideration should be given to including 4450 Paletta Court as part of the Mobility Hub as well, given that it is under the same ownership of neighbouring land that is included in the Mobility Hub.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule J3	The NHS mapping for the residential lots on the east side of Escarpment Drive is inaccurate, as it shows far too much NHS. Also worth noting are the areas behind that section of NHS identified as "Agricultural Area", as these are the areas referred to earlier that we are not allowed to actually farm. There are also agricultural areas not shown correctly in this vicinity, which have instead been shown as NHS.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule K	As identified above, there are agricultural lands in the vicinity of The Bluffs that are incorrectly shown as NHS.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule K	As identified above, there are agricultural lands in the vicinity of The Bluffs that are incorrectly shown as NHS.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule L	How was the mapping in and around Eagle Heights determined? Does this accurately reflect the existing OMB approval and future development plans? Again, it's difficult to tell how accurate this mapping is given the scale, but it appears that there are errors.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule M-2b	This map incorrectly shows a large green Environmental Protection Area running right down the middle, which doesn't exist, at least not to this extent. This needs to be revised.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule N	As stated previously, the NHS mapping on Bronte Creek Meadows, 1200 King Road and at The Bluffs is incorrect, and at least near The Bluffs is missing sections of Prime Agricultural Land.

30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule N	The Key Natural Heritage Features mapped on Schedule N are incorrect and actually include Key Features, Buffers and Linkages.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule N	The extent of Key Features and Linkages has been revised based on further study and agreed to with the Region at the OMB (as per the decision PL111358 dated April 6, 2016)
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule N	The extent of Buffers is still to be confirmed through the area-specific planning process but it has been agreed by the Region and City that at this stage it is appropriate to show (precautionary) 30 m buffers to all Key Features except the wetland at the corner of Highway 407 and Tremaine Road where 15 m is to be applied. This is consistent with the OMB decision (PL111358 dated April 6, 2016).
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule N	The NHS as mapped is inconsistent with the site-specific OMB decision (PL111358 dated April 6, 2016) as well as the Draft Secondary Plan for this area. The reference to in the legend to Prime Agricultural Lands in Enhancements, Linkages, and Buffers should be corrected to refer to Enhancement Areas.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	Schedule N	Therefore, Schedule N of the Draft New OP needs to be updated to reflect the Key Natural Heritage Features that were agreed to with the Region (see survey attached to this letter), included in the OMB decision and subsequently staked, as well as the Linkages that were agreed to with the Region through the OMB. Buffers should be applied to the revised Key Features and illustrated separately on Schedule N in accordance with the OMB decision. This is important because policy 4.2.2 j) requires an OPA for major changes to boundaries or the removal or addition of Key Natural Features. This would mean in the case of Evergreen an OPA would be triggered to make changes that have already been approved by the OMB for the Evergreen lands.
29-Jun-17	PERL	Schedule N	Schedule N Map: Why are the agricultural lands on the Mount Nemo Plateau not identified as 'prime agricultural lands'? Schedule K map shows that most of these agricultural lands as "prime agricultural area".
29-Jun-17	Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee	Schedule Q	Recommend that the city replace the Long-Term Cycling Master Plan map in Schedule Q with a AAA Cycling Network map.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule Q	Shows 'Highway Interchange Crossing' along Harvester Rd, likely a mistake?

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Schedule Q	Add carpool parking lot at QEW & Guelph line and at Appleby & 407; change label on map to be 'Car Pool Lot' rather than 'Go Transit Car Pool Lot'
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Schedule R	It's interesting that 6 different Future Trail Connections are shown at Bronte Creek Meadows, a block of land that the City will not allow to be developed with anything but employment uses, in an area not desirable for employment uses, with no transit to speak of, in a part of the City that is really only accessible by car.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN - APPENDICES			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	Appendices	Comments
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	B	Update upon the adoption of the Secondary Plan and associated Official Plan amendment.
30-Jun-17	Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP)	C	The Tremaine and Dundas Secondary Plan Subwatershed Study (AECOM, 2009) should be listed as an approved Subwatershed Study.

General Comments		
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	Comments
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	Strengthen the Official Plan by including a clear outline of accountability measures. Include more information about the timing and specific relationship between other City planning documents and the OP.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	With all the plans, studies, guidelines, area-specific work, new processes, etc. proposed in this new Official Plan, it is important to put together an overall Work Plan outlining the scope of work, timeline, and resources. This Work Plan should be monitored and controlled to ensure the Work Plan is carried out successfully in a timely fashion and those responsible are held accountable.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	a) There is considerable wording and thinking in this draft Official Plan that appears to be from the past, when greenfield development was the norm. That isn't the case in Burlington anymore. Consideration should be given to updating the general policy concepts to reflect the current and future reality of where and how Burlington will grow. Generally speaking, this Official Plan does not appear to accept or acknowledge the challenges resulting from the fact that this city is essentially already built out.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	b) With the Provincial government's decision to essentially abolish the Ontario Municipal Board and remove all checks and balances in the municipal planning system, it is critical to get this Official Plan right. This is the primary planning tool that will be relied upon, therefore there must be enough flexibility to allow for greater densities that meet Provincial intensification goals, even if those densities are beyond what may be popular with residents. Failure to put policies in place that will allow the development community reasonable opportunities for success will only result in reduced development, under-
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Burlington is at a turning point and it knows the services it needs to offer residents to improve transportation and promote economic success, yet remains reluctant with the concept of intensification and increased residential densities that will provide both the finances and population justification to provide those services. In other words, not enough people live here yet to achieve many of the City's objectives.
20-Jun-17	Penta Properties	Based on this draft Official Plan, the "Grow Bold" tagline does not seem appropriate. This Official Plan does little to promote bold growth, and instead offers a very tentative and old fashioned approach to growth, one that will lead to continued conflict between City Hall, developers, and residents. This Official Plan seemingly handcuffs this City's potential for growth and economic success.

29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	The level of detail in many sections is not appropriate for an OP. This was a unanimous concern of the various stakeholders in our membership, including planners, consultant, and builders alike).
29-Jun-17	Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	There is insufficient direction provided to consider the Official Plan complete.
30-Jun-17	Jeff Kelly, Emshih	Provide adequate treatment for all future developments across the City as they relate to the provision of public space resulting from development.

Addressed by Other Projects, Initiatives and Agencies		
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	Comments
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	Supports the development of a robust public transit system as a key strategy in reducing Burlington's carbon emissions.
30-Jun-17	Gloria Reid, Burlington Green	We will be looking for a viable level of investment in public transit in the Transportation Plan to improve service and increase ridership and a more concrete strategy to develop/gauge walkability.

Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines Comments			
Date	Name/Company/ Organization	Section	Comment
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Should stress the importance of: Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, Water Conservation, Energy Generation and Conservation, Waste Reduction. May want to consider a priority scheme similar to Toronto.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	General	Should develop guidelines for single family homes.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Intro, Page 2	After "Compliance for additional voluntary building measures ...award", add "if received community benefits, non-monetary benefits or monetary benefits".
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Intro, Page 5, Next Steps	May have a difficult time trying to carry out this training for everyone who needs it. If inspectors are going to do this, you have a lot of work in front of you.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Transportation, Item 1	How handle cycling or walking paths that going through the site?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Water Conservation and Quality, Item 1	Can we not go pass level one for requirements?
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Water Conservation and Quality	Add New: Do not forget, in February 2017 Ontario Regulation 20/17, Reporting of Energy Consumption and Water Use was filed and published. The regulation outlines what building owners must do to comply with Ontario's Large Building Energy and Water Reporting and Benchmarking (EWRB).
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Water Conservation and Quality	Consider LEED criteria for Water Efficient Landscaping, Reduce by 50%
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Water Conservation and Quality	Consider LEED criteria for Water Reduction, 30% Reduction

30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Energy	Rename to Energy and Emissions
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Energy	Follow Strategic Plan focus on net zero carbon and new SDC Principles and Objectives
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Energy	Heat Island Items normally fall under Sustainable Sites.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Energy, item 4	Provide a metric similar to Toronto in kWh/m ² or LEED criteria: Minimum Energy Performance and Optimize Energy Performance
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Energy, item 7	Add metric similar to Toronto in kgCO ₂ /m ² . New LEED Net Zero can provide some background.
30-Jun-17	Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee	Energy, item 8	Do not forget, in February 2017 Ontario Regulation 20/17, Reporting of Energy Consumption and Water Use was filed and published. The regulation outlines what building owners must do to comply with Ontario's Large Building Energy and Water Reporting and Benchmarking (EWRB).