



June 30, 2017

**Burlington Sustainable Development Committee's Review of
Burlington's Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)**

Introduction and Overview

To start with, the Burlington Sustainable Development Committee would like to thank the Planning Department and the Planners for working with us on this endeavour. They spoke to us on the phone and met with us in person on numerous occasions. They provided an overview and insight on many Chapters; willingly answered our numerous questions; openly discussed our ideas, concerns and issues; and provided their advice and some solutions on how to address some of our thoughts. SDC would not have been able to carry-out this review without this support and co-operation of the Planning Department and staff. It is greatly appreciated.

The Planning Department and staff are to be commended on putting together a well thought-out, structured and reasonably easy document to read. They outlined new concepts, approaches and complex ideas that will help the City to move forward in achieving the objectives of Burlington's Strategic Plan. They explained it in reasonably understandable fashion. This Plan was not easy to put together particularly with the change in direction and all the links among the Chapters. Their hard work made our job that much easier to accomplish.

Thank-you to all the Sustainable Development team who worked diligently to put this together, particularly, those having some trying times. Your new thoughts, comments and suggestions will help make this a better review.

The Burlington Sustainable Development Committee has carefully examined the Draft New Official Plan along with the Draft Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines as the basis for our comments.

Separate teams reviewed each chapter along with the associated Policy Directions, supporting materials and our comments on the relevant Policy Directions. With some chapters Staff were contacted by phone or met with the team directly to answer questions, explain the chapter, discuss ideas, etc. As well some teams had to discuss the interactions among their chapters with one another to ensure some consistency. Our comments on each chapter along with what we thought were the Key Positives, Issues and Proposed Changes can be found in the attached Chapter tables.

Although we may challenge some fundamental thoughts outlined in the draft and provide numerous thoughts, suggestions and improvements, our intention is to make this better New Official Plan and make easier for the City to achieve the objectives of the Strategic Plan.

Two final thoughts:

- 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.
- We are only part way through the Official Plan review with Area-Specific studies underway and work associated with the Halton Region Official Plan.

Summary

The purpose of the Summary is to outline our key positives, issues and proposed changes brought forward in the Chapter review.

Key Positives

The City of Burlington finally has an Official Plan that ties to the Strategic Plan including the priorities of for sustainable growth, complete communities, environment and sustainability. A City System is introduced with the purpose of incorporating major uses, and connecting services while providing a framework for future development. A coherent strategy for intensification is expressed to accommodate population growth and where it will be permitted. The range of services and facilities required for a Complete Community that satisfies health, education, social, religious and recreation needs are outlined.

New sections have been added for Environment and Sustainability covering Climate Change, Urban Forestry and Community Gardens. From an Economic Activity perspective, Area-Specific plans will be developed for Innovation Districts, a pilot Brownfield Community Plan to support re-development of employment land is being considered for new, more intensive employment uses, and Mixed Use Intensification will be promoted through re-development of traditional commercial areas.

More infrastructure, transportation and utilities details, and growth and development issues are being addressed than the previous plan. A multi-modal transportation system is being developed to support and complement the City's land use vision and provide a range of mode choices. Priority will be given to pedestrian, cycling, and transit over cars.

A strong message is being sent out we will strive for design excellence tying the built form to environment and cultural aspects with a strong emphasis on sustainable development and building through well-thought out guidelines.

Land Use Policies provide a good delineation of key City System areas, including permitted uses and expected development; and good treatment of natural heritage system, major parks and open spaces. A good strategy for conversion of single-storey retail plazas at nodes to mixed-use commercial with intensification has been developed. Commitment is given to the preservation of Rural Burlington while supporting agricultural growth/maintenance.

A separate chapter for Public Participation and Engagement identifies the critical importance of public involvement. The City will partner with the public and stakeholders in the decision making process.

New implementation processes have been added such as Community Permit Planning Systems and Area-Specific Planning as new tools that will be needed for the upcoming work. Other sections have been expanded to provide clarity and to strengthen them.

New Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines which are more specific and tangible have been introduced. This will better prepare for future changes to the Planning Act requiring an Official Plan to contain policies that identify goals, objectives and actions to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and to provide for adaptations to a changing climate, including through increasing resiliency.

Key Issues;

- Complete City vs. Complete Communities is not well explained. (Ch. 1)
- Economic and social aspects of sustainable development are not well introduced, particularly with respect to creating neighbourhoods. (Ch. 1)
- Adaptability and climate resilience are not addressed. (Ch. 1)
- Impact of built form on greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions and energy consumption are not addressed. (Ch. 2)
- Protection of existing employment lands from unwarranted conversion to other uses is not provided. (Ch. 5)
- Relevance of the speed of implementing growth infrastructure to population growth and resulting traffic loads is not given. (Ch. 6)
- Appropriate safety considerations for cycling are lacking. (Ch. 6)
- Ensuring design excellence acceptance and commitment from the building industry through education and acceptance is needed. (Ch. 7)
- Integrating intensification with green space is a major challenge. (Ch. 7)
- The SDC's continued position is that the proposed location of the Uptown is troublesome from the perspective of car traffic and the Region's intent to make Appleby Line an arterial road. (Ch. 8 and Appendix A)
- Protection of not only the land base necessary for a self-sustaining agricultural sector but also the businesses that provide unique and critical services/products to the sector.
- Intensification in established neighbourhoods requires tighter controls. (Ch. 2, 4 and 8)
- The circumstances under which the City would consider a higher level of public engagement to be required are very unclear and require more specific criteria. (Ch. 11)

Proposed Key Changes:

- Harmonize language on complete city vs. complete community. (Ch. 1)
- Incorporate the newly-approved Sustainable Development principles and objectives and provide broader context for Sustainable Development. (Ch. 1)
- Clarify City System as both an interconnected system of land use area, and a strategic framework. Current language is confusing. (Ch. 2)
- Strengthen “Sustainable Development” through additions outlined in Environment and Sustainability sections and 4.10.1. (Ch. 4)
- Address GHG and fuel emissions as part of Climate Change Objectives. (Ch. 4)
- 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 “place making”. (Ch. 5)
- Use Area-Specific Plans to better co-ordinate economic activity opportunities with required MTO approvals. (Ch. 5 and 6)
- Change “Public Transit/Transportation” definition to “Transit/Transportation” definition which should include bus (public and school) taxis, for hire, car/bike share/rental, autonomous cars, etc. (Ch. 6)
- Consider when should prioritize transit over cycling and cycling over transit. (Ch. 6)
- Need urban design brief guidelines (Ch. 7)
- Use Placemaking as a broad design concept, to ensure that the built environment creates places that are **accessible**; people are engaged in **activities** there; the space is comfortable and has a good image; and finally, is a **sociable** place; one where people meet each other and take people when they come to visit. They are well served by public transit and linked with attractive and well developed pedestrian environments. (Ch. 7 and Appendix A last two pages)
- Ensure the various references to sustainable growth (Ch. 2), sustainability (Ch. 4), sustainable design (Ch. 7), Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines (Appendix A 17 of new Official Plan) and Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives (Appendix D of new Official Plan) be made clear in terms of definition.
- Consider how development that supports social, cultural and entertainment aspects of neighbourhoods/communities can be ensured. (Ch. 8)
- Examine the location of Uptown to ensure planned mixed-use and a walkable urban core. (Ch. 8 and Appendix A)
- Protect the affordability of rural lands through making the creation of estate homes and rural housing development more difficult. (9.2.4 Prime Agricultural Areas) (Ch. 9)
- Use Audubon (or similar) standard for any expansion/change of golf operations. (Ch. 10)
- Turn Graphic 11-1. IAP2 Spectrum of Public Engagement into a 2 x 5 table giving examples of situations when the City would employ one type of engagement over another? (Ch. 11)
- Implement Environmental Awareness seminars or workshops for residents, inclusion in councillors’ newsletters, website posting area, and automated e-mail notifications. As part of

engaging the public community. We propose to add an item specifically for Environmental Awareness maybe into section 11.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES or section 11.3.1 PROCEDURES. (Ch. 11)

- Outline what citizens can do in terms of asking questions and providing opinion at each public meeting (Neighbourhood, Statutory, Recommendation to Committee and Council). (Ch. 11 Procedure)
- Provide Community Benefit Policy that ensures increased density and height conforms with Plan's intent and increases are compatible with adjacent existing or proposed development. (Ch. 12)

We would gladly meet with Planning staff to review and further discuss our comments.

Yours sincerely,

Guy Sheppard

Chair, Policy and Development Sub-Committee of Sustainable Development Committee

City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 1 Introduction

Name: Herb Sinnock, Guy Sheppard

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 1 Summary

Three Key Positives:

1. Introduction of the concept of complete communities that provide for all of the daily needs for residents.
2. Alignments to Strategic Plan, including priorities for sustainable growth, complete communities, environment and sustainability.
3. Signals commitment to preservation of Rural Burlington, including supports to growth/maintenance of the agricultural sector.

Three Key Issues:

1. Complete City vs. Complete Communities is not well explained.
2. Economic and social aspects of sustainable development are not well introduced, particularly with respect to create neighborhoods.
3. Adaptability and climate resilience are not addressed.

Proposed Key Changes:

1. Harmonize language on complete city vs. complete community
2. Seek to incorporate the newly-approved Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives, as these provide a broader context for sustainable development

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number) | Comment | Suggested Change/Action |
|---|---|--|
| Introduction, Paragraph 3 | 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” |
| Introduction, Paragraph 4 | The Official Plan sets out a clear vision and establishes strategic priorities for: <i>... add something about people?</i> | Maybe Complete Community definition covers daily needs. Nothing addresses the social side. |
| 1.4 Strategic Directions | As unable to change these Strategic Directions will need to incorporate our proposed Vision into either 1.5 Principles or 2.1 Land Use Vision | Do not see our proposed Vision anywhere. |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| 1.5 Principles, Introduction | <i>“sustainable development and complete community”</i> | |
| 1.5 Principles | | <p>Principles: <i>Sustainable Development</i> –do not see economic or social aspects, <i>Diversity and Adaptability</i> – see diversity related to Natural Heritage but nothing else. Adaptability is not addressed. <i>Community</i> – see it in bits and pieces but Neighbourhood re. interacting, supporting each other or identifying opportunities</p> <p><i>Invigorated Rural Areas</i> – Looks fairly well covered.</p> <p><i>Interconnectivity</i> – Looks fairly well covered . , <i>Accessibility and Equity</i> – Accessibility appears covered. See nothing on Equity. <i>Health and Vitality</i> – Looks fairly well covered.</p> |
| 1.5.1 b) | North Aldershot – why a distinct role? | Shouldn't that eventually either be urban or rural? |
| 1.5.1 g) | Provides for the efficient, effective , and financially responsible... | |
| 1.5.2 A City That Moves | The language is vague, referencing only active and sustainable transportation choices | Provide greater detail on how land use aligns to multi-modal transportation |
| 1.5.3 f) | Promotes health, safety and social well-being ... health care facilities, recreation facilities , parks ... | |
| 1.5.4 d) | Proposed new item d): “supports and encourages the community to identify opportunities to build active, creative neighbourhoods.” | |
| | | |

City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 2 Sustainable Growth

Name: Herbert Sinnock, Jim Fielders

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 2 Summary

Three Key Positives:

1. Good introduction of the City System, and its intended purpose to incorporate major uses, connecting services, and to provide a framework for future development.
2. Expresses a coherent strategy for intensification of the City to accommodate population growth
3. Properly signals where intensification will be permitted.

Three Key Issues:

1. Chapter fails to address the impact of built form on energy consumption and GHG emissions.
2. Land use in areas of North Aldershot and Aldershot are significantly affected by the very large areas of land owned and managed by RBG, including the expected Cootes to Escarpment park system. This is not mentioned.
3. Unique character of North Aldershot includes a very unique combination of Plains habitat and Carolinian Forest not just that built form lies adjacent to the natural habitat.

Proposed Key Changes:

1. Integrate messaging about the impact of built form on energy consumption and GHG emissions, including whether the definition of utilities includes district energy connections.
2. Clarify City System as both an interconnected system of land use areas, and a strategic framework. Current language is confusing.
3. Language around prioritizing active transportation/transit should be strengthened.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number) | Comment | Suggested Change/Action |
|---|--|--|
| Overall | The chapter doesn’t indicate the importance of reducing energy usage | Integrate messaging about the impact of built form on energy |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | / reducing GHG in the built form. This seems like a significant gap, and a missed opportunity. | consumption and GHG emissions, and the City’s goal of reducing both through better land use planning. |
| 2.1 Land Use Vision | | Do not see enough reference to people or connectivity. |
| 2.1 Land Use Vision | Paragraph 6, “A new sense of shared purpose ...” does not contribute to the overall message of the section. | Suggest deleting entire sentence. |
| 2.1 Land Use Vision | Paragraphs 7, 8 & 9 are confusing with respect to “city building” and key messages | <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p><i>The landscape of Burlington has changed remarkably over the last 50 years, and the evolution will continue. The combination of an economically strategic location, diversified economy and environmental and aesthetic factors, an extraordinary waterfront, its world-renowned Niagara Escarpment and other natural wonders has contributed to Burlington being a place where people and business want to locate.</i></p> <p><i>Community engagement, coordination and strategic thinking will be required to successfully manage the challenges and opportunities of growth through intensification and development and re-development. Residents, politicians, business owners, and others, using the Official Plan, must collaborate to shape the future of Burlington.</i></p> <p><i>The building of the City will never have a date of completion, but is a continuous process of targeting growth to the right areas of the City to make good use of existing infrastructure. The Plan’s long-term vision for the community will help ensure land use decisions made today contribute to the City’s ongoing goal of being a vibrant 21st century community.</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>2.2 The City System</p> | <p>Section jumbles messages on what the City System comprises, and its use as a framework</p> | <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p><i>The land use vision is described by the City System. The City System describes the physical make-up of the City over the long term and provides a comprehensive framework to guide growth and development over the horizon of this Plan and beyond.</i></p> <p><i>The City System comprises the Urban Area, the Rural Area, and North Aldershot. The City System also includes the Green System and Infrastructure and Transportation System that cross and connect the entire City.</i></p> <p><i>The City System recognizes that various areas of the City perform different functions. These distinct, and inter-connected areas, and the key boundaries that define them, establish the strategic framework within which more detailed policies are established. This framework provides direction on which areas must be protected and which areas should be expected to grow.</i></p> |
| <p>2.2.1 d) Areas</p> | <p>Last sentence, “Limited growth will be directed ...” is redundant</p> | <p>Suggest deleting the sentence</p> |
| <p>2.2.1 e) Areas</p> | <p>Edit for clarity</p> | <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p><i>North Aldershot represents a distinct area separate from both the Urban Area and Rural Area that contains protected areas of environmental significance co-located with human settlement areas. The Plan recognizes the distinct character of the area and that any development must be compatible with its special characteristics.</i></p> |
| <p>2.2.3 Provincial Plan Boundaries and concepts, d) (ii) Built boundary</p> | | <p>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</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | growth. |
| 2.2.3 e) Parkway Belt West Plan | 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. |
| 2.2.4 Population and Employment Distribution | | 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. |
| 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. |
| 2.3.2 c) Areas of Employment Overlay | Does this mean that every area in the city can be changed by a municipal comprehensive review or is it just employment lands? | Please clarify. |
| 2.3.4 Natural Heritage System and Major Parks and Open Space | 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. | Please clarify. |
| 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. |
| 2.4.1 e) | e) To limit the introduction of unplanned <i>intensification</i> in established neighbourhood areas” | This is objective is vitally important and needs to be supported in any fashion possible as we have lot of this. |
| 2.4.1 e) | This is a vague statement. Is the word unplanned necessary? | Suggested wording: <i>To limit the introduction of intensification in established neighbourhood areas.</i> |
| 2.4.2.1 e) (l) | | Could not find the Section 2.3 Urban Structure objectives. Do you mean 2.4 Growth Framework Objectives? |
| 2.4.2.1 c) | | Should we list tools similar to employment lands? |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 2.4.2.2 a) i) | Should be Schedule P-1 not B-1. | |
| 2.4.2.2 (b) (i) | (i) the increased height, and or density/intensity will not significantly increase the density beyond the existing permissions. | What does significantly mean? 5%, 25%, or 100%. This is unclear. |
| 2.4.2.2 b) (iii) | In the case of a property designated Residential-Low Density shall in no case exceed the provisions of the Residential-Medium Density designation (50 units/ha), and | 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. |
| 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. |
| 2.4.2.4 c) | c) Within Employment Growth Areas, all forms of employment intensification may be permitted. | 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. |
| 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. |
| 2.4.2.4 d) (viii) | (viii) development permit systems | Do we not want to use these in other areas particularly in recognized growth areas? |
| 2.5.2 Policies | Not sure if this addresses the concept of building better buildings. It may be covered in Chapter 7. | |
| 2.5.2 a) | | What are you to use for measuring TDM? What happened to grading as a compatibility criterion? It made |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>good sense.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| | | |

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number) | Suggested Change/Action |
|---|---|
| <p>Established Neighbourhoods</p> <p>2.4.2.3 ESTABLISHED NEIGHBOURHOOD AREAS</p> <p>b) Within Established Neighbourhood Areas, the following forms of <i>intensification</i> may be permitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <i>re-development</i> or infill in accordance with the maximum density permitted under the applicable land use designation contained in Chapter 8, Land Use Designations – Urban Area, of this Plan; (ii) consents, subject to policies in Chapter 12, Implementation and Interpretation, of this Plan; (iii) plans of subdivision, subject to the policies in Chapter 12, Implementation and Interpretation, of this Plan; (iv) <i>accessory dwelling units</i>, subject to Subsection 8.3.6 of this Plan; and/or (v) <i>garden suites</i>, subject to Subsection 8.3.7 of this Plan. | <p>2.4.2.3 ESTABLISHED NEIGHBOURHOOD AREAS</p> <p>b) Within Established Neighbourhood Areas, the following forms of <i>intensification shall not be permitted</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <i>re-zoning in accordance with the current definitions of Zoning Bylaw 2020;</i> (ii) <i>land assemblies;</i> (iii) <i>plans of subdivision</i> (iv) <i>removal of more trees than stipulated in 4.3.2.</i> <p><i>Within Established Neighbourhood Areas, the following forms of intensification may be permitted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) consents <i>to sever</i>, subject to policies in Chapter 12, Implementation and Interpretation, of this Plan; (ii) <i>accessory dwelling units</i>, subject to Subsection 8.3.6 of this Plan; and/or (v) <i>garden suites</i>, subject to Subsection 8.3.7 of this Plan. |
| <p>2.5.2 POLICIES</p> <p>b) The following additional criteria <i>shall</i> be satisfied when considering a Zoning By-law Amendment or an Official Plan Amendment related to height, and or density/<i>intensity</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the proposal maintains the land use vision of this plan and the intent of the Urban Structure element within | <p>2.5.2 POLICIES</p> <p>b) The following additional criteria <i>shall</i> be satisfied when considering a Zoning By-law Amendment or an Official Plan Amendment related to height, and or density/<i>intensity</i> but do not apply to Established Neighbourhoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the proposal maintains the land use vision of this plan and the intent |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>which the proposed <i>development</i> is located;</p> <p>(ii) adequate <i>infrastructure</i> and <i>public service facilities</i> are available to accommodate the increased demands, including, but not limited to such services as water, wastewater, stormwater, school accommodation and parklands;</p> <p>(iii) the proposal is in close proximity to existing or planned transit facilities including the justified <i>frequent transit network, higher order transit</i>, bus routes and/or transit shelters;</p> <p>(iv) the proposal complements and connects with the <i>public realm</i>;</p> | <p>of the Urban Structure element within which the proposed <i>development</i> is located;</p> <p>(ii) adequate <i>infrastructure</i> and <i>public service facilities</i> are available to accommodate the increased demands, including, but not limited to such services as water, wastewater, stormwater, school accommodation and parklands;</p> <p>(iii) the proposal is in close proximity to existing or planned transit facilities including the justified <i>frequent transit network, higher order transit</i>, bus routes and/or transit shelters;</p> <p>(iv) the proposal complements and connects with the <i>public realm</i>;</p> |
|---|---|

| Comment | | | |
|---|---|------------------------|------------------|
| <p>The policy does not put a “red light” on development in Established Neighbourhoods. It can permit up to 10 times the existing built form to occur. Zoning is not addressed in layman's language. Policy does not identify land assemblies (buying up a group of lots and developing them as one site with higher density). Permitting rezoning in low density residential areas will allow RM2 and RM3 housing which includes townhouses at 25 units per hectare.</p> <p>For example, developers can still buy up half a dozen R2 lots, say Rossmore area (6 UPH existing built form) near tall monster homes and build to 25 units per net hectare with townhouses. King Road north of North Shore Blvd. is another example. Even with as-of-right zoning, developments like 143 Blue Water Place could go from two houses to a dozen. The proposed average height of neighbouring buildings criterion would not prevent this.</p> <p>Other mechanisms to prevent undesired intensification should also be explored such as the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw and a Redevelopment Tree Preservation Bylaw.</p> | | | |
| Residential – Low Density Zoning | | | |
| Zoning | House Type Permitted | As of Right UPH | Built UPH |
| R1.1 | Detached, Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) | 5.4 | |
| R1.2 | Detached, ADU | 10.8 | 7 |
| R2.1 | Detached, ADU | 14.2 | 7 to 18 |
| R2.2 | Detached, ADU | 14.2 | 6 |
| R2.3 | Detached, ADU | 14.7 | 16 |
| R2.4 | Detached, ADU | 16.7 | 12 |
| R3.1 | Detached, ADU | 20.0 | 14 |
| R3.2 | Detached, ADU | 23.5 | 16 to 20 |
| R3.3 | Detached, ADU | 25.0 | 16 |

| | | | |
|------|---|------|------------------|
| R3.4 | Detached, ADU | 25.0 | 12 |
| R4 | Semi Detached | 25.0 | 8 |
| R5 | Cluster | | 11 |
| RM1 | Detached | 25.0 | Approx. 15 to 20 |
| | Semi-Det., | 37.0 | |
| | Duplex | 37.0 | |
| | Triplex | 50.0 | |
| | Retirement, Lodge, Institution. | | |
| RM2 | Det., Semi-Det., duplex, Triplex, Lodge, Institution. | 25.0 | 25 to 33 UPH |
| | Fourplex | | |
| | Townhouse | | |
| | Retirement | | |
| RM3 | Det., Semi-Det., Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, Townhouse, Street TH, | 25.0 | |

City of Burlington’s draft new Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 3 – Complete Communities

Name: Katie Rauscher, Katherine Miller

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 3 Summary

Key Positive Items

1. The range of services and facilities required for a Complete Community that satisfies health, education, social, religious and recreation needs are outlined.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1.1.2 f) The City shall | Additional options should be provided, beyond having to meet 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. |
| 3.3.2 e) update the existing Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan | Provide a timeline to complete this update. | SDC would like to see a timeline for accountability purposes. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

**City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 4 Environment and Sustainability**

Name: Guy Sheppard, Jim Fielders, All

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 4 Summary

Three Key Positive Items:

1. New sections have been added to cover Climate Change, Urban Forestry and Community Gardens.
2. Natural Heritage and Environment Assessment have been better clarified.
3. Stormwater Management, Waterfront and Mineral Aggregates sections have been strengthened.

Key Issues;

Proposed Key Changes:

1. Strengthen “Sustainable Development” through additions outlined in Environment and Sustainability sections and 4.10.1.
2. Address GHG and fuel emissions as part of Climate Change Objectives.
3. Include Schedules C and N in defining what makes up the Natural Heritage System.
4. Update Urban Forest Management Plan as more than five years old.
5. Control quantity of water running off building or site.
6. Consider adding back in section of Golf Courses as still allowed in North Aldershot and there could be redevelopment of golf courses.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|--|---|--|
| Page 4-5 Environment and Sustainability <i>Sustainable development</i> is about meeting the needs of today without compromising the needs of future generations. The goal of <i>sustainable development</i> is to create City systems and built | <i>“Sustainable development</i> 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 | Modifying so it matches with the new Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives write-up. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| form that support the kinds of communities and connections that provide social, economic and environment well-being now and in the future. | environmental factors must be jointly considered and harmonised. The goal of <i>sustainable development</i> is create the built form and systems that support the kinds of communities and connections that provide social, economic and environmental well-being now and in the future. | |
| Climate Change and Air Quality fifth line | Add “effective” after “sustainable”. | |
| Page 4-6 4.1.2 Policies | Address GHG and fuel emissions as part of Climate Change Objectives and Policies. | |
| 4.1.2 a) (ii) | Should have a definition for “transit” | |
| 4.1.2 a) (iii) | Or build intensification so existing or planned transit can be used. | |
| 4.1.2 a) (ix) | Could effective on-site non-fossil fuel energy generation not help? | |
| 4.1.2 a) (x) | | How will this help? |
| 4.1.2 a) (xi) & (xii) | Proposed additions: 1. Control air emissions from manufacturing operations. 2. Encourage energy conservation. | |
| Page 4-7 Natural Heritage System, third paragraph | | 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 |
| Page 4-7 4.2.1 Objectives a) , b) and f) | Change objectives to start “To maintain, enhance and restore” | |
| 4.2.1 g) | Consider adding “and away from NHS” | |
| 4.2.1 j) | Consider adding “and water quality” | |
| Page 4-8 4.2.2 General Policies, b) | What about Natural Heritage shown on Schedules C and N?? | |
| Page 4-9 4.2.2 c) (vi) | | Is Hamilton Conservation Authority not involved on east |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | side of Burlington? |
| Page 4-10 4.2.2 j) | | What are Major and Minor Changes? These should be spelt out. |
| Page 4-13 4.2.3 h (i), fourth line | Consider adding "and/" before "or". | |
| Page 4-14 4.2.3 k) | (i) "no alternative" – How often does this occur? (ii) "Impact ... minimized to the maximum extent possible" – how often does this occur? | These occurrences are bothersome. |
| 4.2.4 Environmental Impact Assessment a) (i) b. | | Should a smaller size than 1000 square metres be used? |
| Page 4-18 4.3 Urban Forest | | Should we not mention something about a Tree Bylaw? The Urban Forest Management Plan needs to be updated. It is more than five years old. |
| Page 4-19 4.3.2 Policies d) | What about replacing unhealthy trees with healthy trees? | |
| 4.3.2 Policies e) | | Great idea!! |
| Page 4-20 4.4.1.1 Watershed Management c) | | What about protection of species like fish etc.? |
| Page 4-21 4.4.1.2 l) | | What about controlling the quantity of water running off building or site? |
| Page 4-22 4.4.2 Policies | | What about a policy to encourage stewardship of watersheds by Local Land Owners? |
| Page 4.4.2.1 a) | | Is there not a partnership with Source Water Protection as well? |
| Page 4.4.2.1 c) | | What Schedule is used for Urban Watershed Plans? |
| Page 4-26 4.4.3 Water Resource and Stormwater Management p) | | Is Source Water Protection Committee not involved here? |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 4.4.3 q) (i) | | Why are we then reconstructing Waterdown Road? |
| Page 4-31 4.5.2.1 Objectives c) | “To improve access to the waterfront by all modes of transportation” | Can now drive dune buggies on the beach? |
| Page 4-33 4.5.3.2 Policies e) | | Is this fair to those who currently own land on the bay and lake and have access to boating? |
| Page 4-37 4.7.2 Policies k) | | Good to see. |
| Page 4-42 4.10.2.2 Mineral Resource Extraction Area Designation b) | | How much effort is being put into this? Settlement areas are almost on top of some of these deposits. |
| New – Golf Courses | | <p>Consider adding a section to cover the re-development of golf courses as well as ongoing maintenance around Natural Heritage.</p> <p>Also need as North Aldershot still allows Golf Courses although Rural area does not allow.</p> |
| <p>4.3.2 POLICIES d) In order of priority, all <i>development</i> proposals and <i>infrastructure</i> projects, including <i>City</i> projects, <i>should</i>: (i) <i>preserve</i> existing healthy <i>trees</i>. The location of existing healthy <i>trees</i> <i>should</i> be considered when establishing the location and building envelope of a proposed <i>development</i>; (ii) relocate healthy <i>trees</i> where feasible; (iii) plant replacement <i>trees</i> where healthy <i>trees</i> are removed. Replacement planting requirements <i>shall</i> be established using an</p> | <p>4.3.2 POLICIES d) In order of priority, all <i>development</i> proposals and <i>infrastructure</i> projects, including <i>City</i> projects, <i>should</i>: (i) <i>preserve</i> existing healthy <i>trees</i>. The location of existing healthy <i>trees</i> <i>shall</i> be considered when establishing the location and building envelope of a proposed <i>development</i>; (ii) relocate healthy <i>trees</i> where feasible; (iii) plant replacement <i>trees</i> where healthy <i>trees</i> are removed. Replacement planting requirements <i>shall</i> be established using an aggregate-caliper formula, to the satisfaction of the <i>City</i>. If replacement <i>trees</i> cannot be accommodated on-site, off-</p> | <p>See next row below.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| aggregate-caliper formula, to the satisfaction of the <i>City</i> . If replacement <i>trees</i> cannot be accommodated on-site, off-site compensation <i>may</i> be considered to maintain and enhance the neighbourhood canopy; and (iv) incorporate the planting of additional <i>trees</i> where appropriate. | site compensation <i>may</i> be considered to maintain and enhance the neighbourhood canopy; and (iv) incorporate the planting of additional <i>trees</i> where appropriate. | |
|--|--|--|

Comment

Comments:

The policy does not put a “red light” on development in Established Neighbourhoods. It can permit up to 10 times the existing built form to occur. Zoning is not addressed in layman's language. Policy does not identify land assemblies (buying up a group of lots and developing them as one site with higher density). Permitting rezoning in low density residential areas will allow RM2 and RM3 housing which includes townhouses at 25 units per hectare.

For example, developers can still buy up half a dozen R2 lots, say Rossmore area (6 UPH existing built form) near tall monster homes and build to 25 units per net hectare with townhouses. King Road north of North Shore Blvd. is another example. Even with as-of-right zoning, developments like 143 Blue Water Place could go from two houses to a dozen. The proposed average height of neighbouring buildings criterion would not prevent this.

Other mechanisms to prevent undesired intensification should also be explored such as the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw and a Redevelopment Tree Preservation Bylaw.

Residential – Low Density Zoning

| Zoning | House Type Permitted | As of Right UPH | Built UPH |
|--------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| R1.1 | Detached, Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) | 5.4 | |
| R1.2 | Detached, ADU | 10.8 | 7 |
| R2.1 | Detached, ADU | 14.2 | 7 to 18 |
| R2.2 | Detached, ADU | 14.2 | 6 |
| R2.3 | Detached, ADU | 14.7 | 16 |
| R2.4 | Detached, ADU | 16.7 | 12 |
| R3.1 | Detached, ADU | 20.0 | 14 |
| R3.2 | Detached, ADU | 23.5 | 16 to 20 |
| R3.3 | Detached, ADU | 25.0 | 16 |
| R3.4 | Detached, ADU | 25.0 | 12 |
| R4 | Semi Detached | 25.0 | 8 |
| R5 | Cluster | | 11 |
| RM1 | Detached | 25.0 | Approx. 15 to 20 |
| | Semi-Det., | 37.0 | |
| | Duplex | 37.0 | |
| | Triplex | 50.0 | |

City of Burlington's Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 5 Economic Activity

Name: Herb Lewington, Katherine Miller

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 5 Summary

Three Key Positive Items:

1. Area specific plans to be developed for Innovation Districts
2. Consideration for a pilot brownfield Community Improvement Plan to support the re-development of employment land for new, more intensive employment uses.
3. Promotion of Mixed Use Intensification Areas through re-development of traditional commercial areas.

Three Key Issues:

1. Existing employment lands must be protected from unwarranted conversion to other uses.
2. The re-development of existing employment lands must be encouraged and facilitated. The OP needs to be more specific about the kinds of tools that will be available and how they will be used to incentivize preferred outcomes.
3. Need to manage and coordinate the interests of all stakeholders, including various levels of government and environmental and MTO regulators, to ensure developments are not unduly discouraged or delayed.

Key Proposed Changes:

1. 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".
2. Consider sale of property currently used for recreational purposes be zoned for agriculture purposes on Class 1(+).
3. In 407 Corridor along Appleby Line, provide more diversity from just commercial retail business to include employment with advanced technology or professional business development
4. Provide timelines to complete area-specific plans and Employment intensification Study

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|---------|
|---|---|---------|

| Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | | |
|--|--|---|
| Economic Activity - Introduction | "Mixed Use" is not included in the definitions. | In conversations with BEDC, they mentioned it would be beneficial to define "Mixed Use" by degree or range of use. |
| 5.2.2 b) (vii) | "cross-jurisdictional issues have been considered" | This seems vague – not sure what it means. |
| 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? |
| 5.3.2 c) Provide area-specific plan for McMaster Innovation District 5.4.1 c) Provide Employment Intensification Study 5.4.2 b) Provide Bronte Creek Meadows area-specific plans | Provide a timeline to complete these plans or studies. | SDC would like to see a timeline for accountability purposes. |
| 5.4.1 c) | "support for re-development" | 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. |
| 5.5.2 a. | a) The City <i>shall</i> consider providing incentives and other forms of assistance to support the development of <i>agricultural, agriculture-related and on-farm businesses</i> through the preparation, adoption and implementation of a <i>Community Improvement Plan</i> under Subsection 12.1.3.5 of this Plan. | One Consideration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of property currently used for recreational purposes be zoned for agricultural purposes on Class 1(+) agricultural lands |
| 5.4.4 | This district is the newest <i>Area of Employment</i> in the City, located on the | On Appleby Line, the area has a high rate of commercial retail business. Need for |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>south side of Highway 407 between the Dundas Street and Appleby Line interchanges. This area is not fully built out and represents key opportunities for <i>prestige employment development</i> with visibility and access to Highway 407, along with close proximity to two interchanges at Dundas Street and Appleby Line.</p> | <p>increased diversity of employment with advanced technology or professional business development.</p> <p>Would like to see a target sector including office space and limit 'retail' commercial space, in comparison to 'prestige'.</p> <p>Where "prestige" employment, would like to see a minimum building height (2 stories).</p> |
| 6.2.1.2 j) | <p>"Any development located within the Provincial permit control area under The Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act is subject to Provincial review and approval prior to the issuance of entrance, building and land use permits. These permits must be obtained prior to any construction being undertaken within the permit control area."</p> | <p>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?</p> |
| | | |

City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 6 – Infrastructure, Transportation and Utilities

Name: Farzaneh Farahani, Tim Park, Guy Sheppard

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 6 Summary

Three Key Positive Items

- 1- In general this chapter considers many more details and more of the growth and development issues than the previous plan.
- 2- Considering a detailed transportation study to assess the impact of a propose development on current travel patterns and/or future multi-modal transportation requirements, before development applications are approved
- 3- Developing a transportation system that supports and complements the City's land use vision and provides a range of mode choices
- 4- Priority given to pedestrian, cycling, and transit over car in the future.

Three Key Issues

- 1- It should be considered that the speed of implementing growth infrastructures be relevant to the population growth and the resulting traffic loads in the city
- 2- Lack of appropriate safety considerations for biking and cycling
- 3- Lack of definite plans for car sharing or bike sharing options

Key Proposed Changes

1. 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. Also need to consider all these modes of transportation when developing plan.
2. In section 6.2 fourth paragraph, need to consider when 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.
3. 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?
4. 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.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|--|---|---------|
|--|---|---------|

| Number)/Original Text | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6.1 GENERAL 6.1.1 OBJECTIVES. b) | Please identify the “ areas in the Growth Framework” | Just a quick note, that what are those areas. Similar to 6.1.2 POLICIES (iv) |
| 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? | |
| 6.2 MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION – second paragraph & 6.2.1.1 OBJECTIVES i) <i>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</i> | “As the city grows up, if everyone continues to rely on their automobile to drive everywhere, it will become harder and harder for anyone to move.” 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 |
| 6.2 third paragraph | “It is a city that provides real and attractive choices outside the automobile. One of these choices is a convenient and reliable transit system which includes a frequency transit network (FTN) where trains users can expect easy-to-use services that are frequent enough that they do not need to refer to a schedule. | Hear, Hear!! |
| 6.2 fourth paragraph | <i>A successful, integrated and multi-modal transportation system will be achieved by prioritizing decision-making in this order: walking first, then biking, public transit ... automobile</i> | After reading this chapter completely 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. 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. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 6.2.1.1 g) | | Like the <i>context sensitive design concept</i> . <i>Design guidelines are definitely good to need to be flexible to make this work.</i> |
| 6.2.1.1 h) | | Will <i>complete streets</i> strategy truly work in all instances? A lot of streets are not wide enough. |
| 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. |
| 6.2.1.2 j) (also impacts Economic Activity) | “Any development located within the Provincial permit control area under The Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act is subject to Provincial review and approval prior to the issuance of entrance, building and land use permits. These permits must be obtained prior to any construction being undertaken within the permit control area.” | 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? |
| 6.2.2.2 POLICIES (a) | The City <i>shall</i> establish a <i>complete streets</i> strategy for all road and street projects, including those involving new construction, reconstruction, Resurfacing and <i>rehabilitation</i> . | Does this policy include the streets that new developments are applying for their permits at the moment in them? |
| 6.2.2.2 d) | | What are daylight triangles? Please define. |
| 6.2.2.2 m) and n) | | Need to outline what are the consequences of “LOS’E” or better or “LOS “F” shall” This means nothing to the general public. |
| 6.2.3.1 Transit Objectives | 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. | |
| 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. | |
| 6.2.3.1 e) | | How can you possibly carry this out under a <i>complete streets</i> strategy? |
| 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? |
| 6.2.3.2 POLICIES (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. | |
| 6.2.4 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION 6.2.4.1 OBJECTIVES (b) | It is recommended to consider about Health and safety of bike riders | |
| 6.2.4.2 | A policy should be incorporated such that barriers should be provided to protect cyclists wherever feasible. | |
| 6.2.4.2 b) and d) | Schedule Q and R changes should be approved as amendment to the Plan. | 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. |
| 6.2.5.2 POLICIES (b) | This item needs to be reviewed for safety matters | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 6.2.5.2 POLICIES (g) | What is the definition of “appropriate locations” | |
| 6.2.6 AIR 6.2.6.1 OBJECTIVES | Does this include an oversight on the possible contaminant emissions by transportation systems? | |
| 6.2.8.2 POLICIES (b) | Heavy truck traffic may be restricted to In what situations? And what kind of goods movement? | |
| 6.2.10 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT 6.2.10.1 b) | How the city does support sustainable transportation choices? And what are these choices? | |
| 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. |
| 6.2.10.2 POLICIES (e) | That’s a great idea, but it is recommended to add a more detailed plan or program in the policy | |
| 6.3.1 OBJECTIVES c) | c) To ensure.....facilities occur in a compatible..... Should be compatible? | |
| 6.3.1 f) | Where is the policy encouraging this? | |
| 6.3.2 POLICIES (a)/(b)/(c) | Long sentences in these paragraphs | |
| 6.3.2 POLICIES (j) | This will restrict the usage of electric vehicles and is a barrier | |
| 6.5.1 a) | | Totally agree with this objective. |
| | | |

City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 7 Design Excellence

Name: Jim Feilders

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 7 Summary

Three Key Positive Items:

1. Gives a strong message that we will strive for design excellence
2. Provides strong emphasis on sustainable development and buildings though well-presented guidelines that shows positive economic benefits.

Three Key Issues:

1. Ensuring design excellence requires acceptance and commitment from the building industry through education and incentives
2. Encouragement of adopting “voluntary” requirements must be constantly promoted by council, staff and the SDC. We should consider the changes to the Municipal Act that could allow us to enforce stricter standards within buildings and use the metrics that city of Toronto has adopted.
3. Integrating intensification with green space will be a major challenge.

Key Proposed Changes:

5. Make use of previous SDC members as a resource.
6. Need urban design brief guidelines.
7. Ensure the various references to sustainable growth (Ch 2), sustainability (Ch 4), sustainable design (Ch 7), Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines (App A 17.) and Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives (App D) be made clear in terms of definition.
8. Use Placemaking as a broad design concept, to ensure that the built environment creates places that are accessible; people are engaged in activities there; the space is comfortable and has a good image; and finally, is a sociable place; one where people meet each other and take people when they come to visit. They are well served by public transit and linked with attractive and well developed pedestrian environments.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 7.1.1 OBJECTIVES References to sustainability | Sustainable Development as a pattern of resource use that “meets the needs of the present without | Make clear what is being proposed. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | 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. | |
| d) To ensure that the design of the built environment contributes to creating places that are well served by public transit, and by attractive and well developed pedestrian environments. | Use Place Making approach previously sent to staff. | We do not feel this is planner jargon and should be emphasized. |
| 7.1.2 GENERAL POLICIES d) The preparation of <i>design guidelines</i> may be developed for certain types of building forms or specific areas in the City and <i>shall</i> be required | Delete “The preparation of” – not needed) | |
| f) An interdisciplinary staff committee, an outside advisory body of design professionals, or other means <i>shall</i> be established by the <i>City</i> to advise on issues of design that affect the <i>public realm</i> , architecture, context sensitivity and <i>sustainability</i> . | Draw from the current and past members of the SDC. | SDC members have a wealth of experience and knowledge. |
| h) Senior orders of government, <i>public authorities</i> and public <i>utilities shall implement</i> the design objectives contained in this Plan. | Clarify. | What does this mean? How? |
| 7.1.3 COMMUNITY DESIGN e) The <i>City shall</i> identify locations, particularly at entrances into established communities, through | Consider that the Heritage Committee look at it and prioritize. | 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 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| appropriate studies, as having landmark significance and <i>shall</i> ensure that these are retained and enhanced through design measures. | | identify whether a landmark significance exists then address how to retain and enhance it. |
| 7.1.2 c) | “municipal <i>development</i> engineering standards, design standards, ...” | Other standards will have to be used outside “municipal such as Ontario Building Code. |
| 7.1.2 e) | Need to develop urban design brief guidelines used in Development Applications. | Need to provide outline so developer understands what you want included in urban design brief.. |
| 7.1.2 f) | Need this tool in place to help ensure design excellence is achieved. | |
| 7.1.2 g) | | Urban design award is a good idea. What other tools are you going to consider? |
| 7.1.2 h) | | How are you going to get Senior orders of government to implement design objectives? |
| 7.1.4 c) | <i>Human scale</i> needs to be in italics. | Does not make sense when use only “ <i>scale</i> ” definition in Chapter 13 with human in front. |
| 7.1.4 e) | | Will also help tourism. |
| 7.1.4 i) | | Are there design standards for Public Safety regarding safe sidewalks, accessibility, etc. that needs to be considered? |
| 7.1.5 b) | | If a real issue do not allow it to be built. |
| 7.1.5 g) | | What are “terminus lots”? |
| 7.1.5 n) | | Not possible if no transit. |
| 7.1.5 q) | | How do you intend to avoid |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | acoustical walls? We have them all over the place. May need some guidelines. |
| 7.1.5 z) | Should provide guidelines how this should be done. | |
| 7.1.5.1 a) | Should provide guidelines fairly quickly in support of this. | Developers need to understand your expectations. |
| 7.1.5.1 f) | Stipulate in guidelines. | |
| 7.1.5.2 d) (i) | Put “human scale” in italics | |
| 7.2 Sustainable Design | Add “ and costs ” after “ <i>infrastructure demands</i> ”. | Beyond environmental, economic, and social considerations, should you consider cultural. |
| 7.2.1 a) | Add an additional objective to improved energy generation efficiency and reduce greenhouse gases. | |
| 7.2.2 f) | | If it is mandatory you may want to make an amendment to the plan. |
| 7.2.2 POLICIES a) . . . buildings <i>shall</i> address the following <i>sustainable</i> design measures: | (vi) <i>tree</i> protection measures Voluntary (ix) waste management facilities Voluntary in Appendix A17 but mandatory by Region (x) bird-friendly design measures Voluntary Missing 6.1 Waste Management Plan: Voluntary in Appendix A17 but mandatory by Region | These are out of order with Appendix A17 and some are voluntary. One mandatory is missing. |

**City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 8 Land Use Policies – Urban Area**

Name: Herb Sinnock, Jim Fielders, Guy Sheppard

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 8 Summary

Three Key Positives:

1. Good delineation of key City System areas, including permitted uses and expected development.
2. Good treatment of natural heritage system, major parks and open spaces
3. Good strategy for conversion of single-storey retail plazas at nodes to mixed-use commercial with intensification.

Three Key Issues:

1. SDC continues to feel that 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.
2. “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.
3. Intensification in established neighborhoods requires tighter controls, including rules that prevent developer-initiated OP amendments and zoning by-law changes.

Proposed Key Changes:

1. Re-examine anchor hub connection in north Burlington, particularly against those locations along the Dundas BRT and 407 Transitway.
2. Consider how development that supports social, cultural and entertainment aspects of neighborhoods/communities can be ensured.
3. Ensure that intensification in established neighborhoods has tighter controls, including rules that prevent developer-initiated OP amendments and zoning by-law changes

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|--|
| Page 8-8 8.1.1.1.2 l) (x) | | What about the impact of light on park, open spaces, and natural heritage? |
| Page 8-8 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. |
| Page 8-10 8.1.1.2 Downtown Urban Centre | | It is important to finish the Site Specific work in this area quickly so we do not lose control of it. |
| Page 8-11 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. |
| Page 8-18 8.1.1.3 Uptown Urban Centre | | 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. |
| . Page 8-18 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. |
| Page 8- 20 8.1.1.3.2 h) | | Great idea to link Dryden Avenue to Millcroft Park. |
| Page 8-26 8.1.1.3.7.2 a) (i) | | What is this? |
| Page 8-30 8.1.1.3.11 b) | | Is this feasible given the amount of traffic coming from the proposed CN container shipping terminal on Tremaine? |
| Page 8-42 8.1.3.2.2 f) | | 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 |
| Page 8-45 8.1.3.3.2 d) | Add "exception of single-detached, and semi-detached, and townhouses." | |
| Page 8-46 8.1.3.3.2 f) | | See 8.1.3.2.2 f) comments. |
| Page 8-54 8.1.3.6.2 g) | | See 8.1.3.2.2 f) comments. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Page 8-55 8.1.3.6.2 m) | Change from 30 to 50% | We need more affordable family units. |
| Page 8-58 8.1,3.6.3 c) | | Is this what current zoning for the ADI development? |
| Page 8-61 8.1.3.7.2 k) | | Why not quote exact heights here? |
| Page 8-61 8.1.3.7.2 m) | | Link to subsection 8.1.3.6.2 u) makes no sense |
| Page 8-62 8.2.1.1 j) | | Is there not a longer term strategy developed than 5 years? |
| Page 8-63 8.2 Employment Lands | | Saw nothing outlining how Bronte Meadows was going to be handled. Site specific study? |
| Page 8-66 8.2.2.2 a) (ii) Page 8-67 8.2.3.2 d) (iii) Page 8-68 8.2.3.2 f) (I) | Reference should be 8.2.3.2 e) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 e) (ii) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 e) (i) | |
| Page 8-70 8.2.3.2.a) (ii) Page 8-71 8.2.3.2.a) (iii) Page 8-71 8.2.3.2.a) (iv) Page 8-71 8.2.3.2.e) Page 8-72 8.2.3.2.f) Page 8-72 8.2.3.2.g) Page 8-72 8.2.3.2.g) (i) | Reference should be 8.2.3.2 e) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 f) and g) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 h) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 e) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 e) | |
| Page 8-74 8.2.2.3 a) (ix) Page 8-74 8.2.2.3 b) Page 8-74 8.2.2.3 c) Page 8-74 8.2.2.3 d) Page 8-74 8.2.2.3 e) Page 8-74 8.2.2.3 f) Page 8-74 8.2.2.3 f) (ii) | Reference should be 8.2.3.2 e) and g) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) and h) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) e) & f) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) Reference should be 8.2.3.2 a) | |
| Page 8-79 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 | This has the potential to intensify 3 fold. Two fold is bad enough. |

| | | |
|----------------------|--|---|
| | original brief. | |
| Page 8-79 8.3.3.2 c) | | Both addresses are west of William O’Connell Boulevard. |
| Page 8-80 8.3.4.1 c) | Any building going to be greater than 185 units/ha should be made through an official plan change. | 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. |
| | | |

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text |
|---|--|
| <p>Established Neighbourhoods</p> <p>8.3.2.1 POLICIES</p> <p>b) Notwithstanding Subsection 8.3.2.1 a) of this Plan, other forms of attached, <i>ground oriented dwellings</i> may be permitted on lands designated Residential – Low Density, provided that these forms meet the density as specified in Subsection 8.3.2.1 c) of this Plan, and provided that the <i>development</i> form is <i>compatible</i> with the <i>scale</i>, urban design and community features of the neighbourhood, including the provision of a functional common <i>amenity area</i> at grade.</p> <p>c) On lands designated Residential – Low Density, <i>development shall be</i> permitted to a maximum density of 25 units per <i>net</i> hectare.</p> | <p>8.3.2.1 POLICIES</p> <p>b) Notwithstanding Subsection 8.3.2.1 a) of this Plan, other forms of attached, <i>ground oriented dwellings</i> may be permitted on lands designated Residential – Low Density, except for townhouses and provided that these forms meet the density as specified in Subsection 8.3.2.1 c) of this Plan, and provided that the <i>development</i> form is <i>compatible</i> with the <i>scale</i>, urban design and community features of the neighbourhood, including the provision of a functional common <i>amenity area</i> at grade.</p> <p>c) On lands designated Residential – Low Density, <i>development shall be</i> permitted to a maximum density of 25 units per <i>net</i> hectare or the existing zoning, whichever is less.</p> |

Comments

The policy does not put a “red light” on development in Established Neighbourhoods. It can permit up to 10 times the existing built form to occur. Zoning is not addressed in layman's language. Policy does not identify land assemblies (buying up a group of lots and developing them as one site with higher density). Permitting rezoning in low density residential areas will allow RM2 and RM3 housing which includes townhouses at 25 units per hectare.

For example, developers can still buy up half a dozen R2 lots, say Rossmore area (6 UPH existing built form) near tall monster homes and build to 25 units per net hectare with townhouses. King Road north of North Shore Blvd. is another example. Even with as-of-right zoning, developments like 143 Blue Water Place could go from two houses to a dozen. The proposed average height of neighbouring buildings criterion would not prevent this.

Other mechanisms to prevent undesired intensification should also be explored such as the Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw and a Redevelopment Tree Preservation Bylaw.

Residential – Low Density Zoning

| Zoning | House Type Permitted | As of Right UPH | Built UPH |
|--------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| R1.1 | Detached, Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) | 5.4 | |
| R1.2 | Detached, ADU | 10.8 | 7 |
| R2.1 | Detached, ADU | 14.2 | 7 to 18 |
| R2.2 | Detached, ADU | 14.2 | 6 |
| R2.3 | Detached, ADU | 14.7 | 16 |
| R2.4 | Detached, ADU | 16.7 | 12 |
| R3.1 | Detached, ADU | 20.0 | 14 |
| R3.2 | Detached, ADU | 23.5 | 16 to 20 |
| R3.3 | Detached, ADU | 25.0 | 16 |
| R3.4 | Detached, ADU | 25.0 | 12 |
| R4 | Semi Detached | 25.0 | 8 |
| R5 | Cluster | | 11 |
| RM1 | Detached | 25.0 | Approx. 15 to 20 |
| | Semi-Det., | 37.0 | |
| | Duplex | 37.0 | |
| | Triplex | 50.0 | |
| | Retirement, Lodge, Institution. | | |
| RM2 | Det., Semi-Det., duplex, Triplex, Lodge, Institution. | 25.0 | 25 to 33 UPH |
| | Fourplex | | |
| | Townhouse | | |
| | Retirement | | |
| RM3 | Det., Semi-Det., Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, Townhouse, Street TH, | 25.0 | |

**City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 9 Land Use Policies – Rural Area**

Name: Bob Burchett, Kelly Cook, Jim Feilders, Gareth Williams

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 4 Summary

Key Positive Items:

1. Committed to the preservation of Rural Burlington while supporting agricultural growth/maintenance.
2. Support of the strong protections put in place to preserve agricultural lands and support the long-term viability of the farming industry.

Key Issues:

1. Protection not only the land base necessary for a self-sustaining agricultural sector but also the businesses that provide unique and critical services/products to the sector.

Key Proposed Changes:

1. Protect the affordability of rural lands through making the creation of estate homes and rural housing development more difficult. (9.2.4 Prime Agricultural Areas).
2. Clarify term on-farm ‘events’ and consider a less restrictive approach regarding types of events allowed.
3. Should there be restrictions on aggregate extraction in the designated area as it all seems to be prime land and just requiring a swap at time of rehabilitation seems unwise.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|--|
| 9.2.3 (b) On a commercial farm a limited number of special events may be held each year on lands located outside Key Natural Features and the Escarpment Natural Area if the events have been approved by the City through an amendment to the Zoning By-law, a Temporary Use By-law or a permit issued by the City and provided that: (i) | | Definition of types of events seems rather vague, but also overly restrictive; should include events which raise awareness of local agriculture (Gareth) Types of events allowed is very restrictive- allowing only events directly related to the farm operation or related to on-farm |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>the events are directly related to the farm operation, to an agriculture-related use or to an on-farm diversified use producing value-added agricultural products on the property; (ii) sufficient and appropriate traffic management and on-site parking are available; (iii) adequate and appropriate on-site water and sanitary services are available; (iv) the events will be compatible with, and not adversely impact on surrounding land uses; and (v) the events will be in compliance with other municipal requirements.</p> | | <p>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 agrotourism 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 (Kelly).</p> |
| <p>9.2.4 c) Within the Greenbelt Plan Area, the re-designation of land within Prime Agricultural Areas to permit non-agricultural uses shall be prohibited, except where permitted by the Greenbelt Plan. d) Outside the Greenbelt Plan Area, the re-designation of land within Prime Agricultural Areas to permit non-agricultural uses shall only be permitted where the following have been demonstrated through appropriate studies to the satisfaction of the City and the Region:</p> | | <p>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 of control of the municipality and could be impacted by changes in Provincial government.</p> |
| <p>9.2.4 PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS a) Prime Agricultural Areas are identified on Schedule K, The Agricultural System- Rural Area, of this Plan. The purpose of Schedule O is to assist in interpreting the policies of this Plan. b) The Prime Agricultural Areas shown on Schedule K, The Agricultural System</p> | <p>9.2.4 PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS a) Prime Agricultural Areas are identified on Schedule K, The Agricultural System- Rural Area, of this Plan. The purpose of Schedule O is to assist in interpreting the policies of this Plan. b) The Prime Agricultural Areas shown on Schedule K, The Agricultural System – Rural Area, of this Plan, include lands in</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>– Rural Area, of this Plan, include lands in the Agricultural Area and Natural Heritage System designations. Together these lands support and advance the goal to maintain a permanently secure, economically viable agricultural industry and to preserve the open space character and landscape of the Rural Area.</p> <p>c) Within the Greenbelt Plan Area, the re-designation of land within Prime Agricultural Areas to permit non-agricultural uses shall be prohibited, except where permitted by the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>d) Outside the Greenbelt Plan Area, the re-designation of land within Prime Agricultural Areas to permit non-agricultural uses shall only be permitted where the following have been demonstrated through appropriate studies to the satisfaction of the City and the Region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the necessity for such uses within the planning horizon for additional land to be designated to accommodate the proposed uses; (ii) the amount of land area needed for such uses; (iii) the reasons for the choice of location; (iv) no unacceptable impacts to the Agricultural System or to adjacent agricultural operations, or negative impacts to the natural environment; (v) alternative locations have been evaluated; and (vi) there are no reasonable alternatives that avoid Prime Agricultural Areas as shown on Schedule K, The Agricultural System – Rural Area, of this Plan; (vii) there are no reasonable alternate locations of lower capability agricultural lands; and (viii) the land does not comprise a specialty crop area. | <p>the Agricultural Area and Natural Heritage System designations. Together these lands support and advance the goal to maintain a permanently secure, economically viable agricultural industry and to preserve the open space character and landscape of the Rural Area.</p> <p>c) Within the Greenbelt Plan Area, the re-designation of land within Prime Agricultural Areas to permit non-agricultural uses shall be prohibited, except where permitted by the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>d) Outside the Greenbelt Plan Area, the re-designation of land within Prime Agricultural Areas to permit non-agricultural uses shall be discouraged and only be permitted where the following have been demonstrated through appropriate studies to the satisfaction of the City and the Region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the strong necessity for such uses within the planning horizon for additional land to be designated to accommodate the proposed uses; (ii) the minimal amount of land area needed for such uses; (iii) the reasons for the choice of location; (iv) no unacceptable impacts to the Agricultural System or to adjacent agricultural operations, or negative impacts to the natural environment; (v) demonstration why alternative locations outside of the prime agricultural area are unsuitable; and (vi) there are no reasonable alternatives that avoid Prime Agricultural Areas as shown on Schedule K, The Agricultural System – Rural Area, of this Plan; (vii) there are no reasonable alternate locations of lower capability agricultural lands; and (viii) the land does not comprise a specialty crop area. | |
| <p>9.1.2 GENERAL POLICIES</p> <p>a) Non-farm development in the Rural Area shall be directed to the Rural Settlement Areas of Kilbride, Lowville</p> | <p>9.1.2 GENERAL POLICIES</p> <p>a) Non-farm development in the Rural Area shall be directed to the Rural Settlement Areas of Kilbride, Lowville</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>and Mount Nemo, as shown on Schedule J, Land Use-Rural Area, of this Plan, unless specifically permitted by the policies of this Plan.</p> <p>b) Where home occupations, cottage industries, bed and breakfast homes, animal kennels, veterinary clinics, agriculture-related uses or on-farm diversified uses are permitted in Subsections 9.2.3 a) or 9.3.2 c) of this Plan, those uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) shall not have unacceptable impacts on adjacent agricultural operations or other surrounding land uses, the rural character of the area, or on public infrastructure; or negative impacts on the natural environment; (ii) shall be located within or adjacent to the existing building cluster; (iii) shall be serviced by private on-site water and wastewater systems; (iv) shall have adequate on-site parking located and designed to be compatible with surrounding land uses and the rural character of the area; and (v) shall adequately screen outdoor storage, parking areas, and loading/unloading zones from neighbouring properties and public roads. <p>c) Subject to the other policies of this Plan, and the policies of the applicable Provincial Plans, outside the Rural Settlement Areas new lots may be only created:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) for the purpose of acquisition by a public authority; (ii) for the purpose of consolidating lots; (iii) for adjusting lot lines | <p>and Mount Nemo, as shown on Schedule J, Land Use-Rural Area, of this Plan, unless specifically permitted by the policies of this Plan.</p> <p>b) Where home occupations, cottage industries, bed and breakfast homes, animal kennels, veterinary clinics, agriculture-related uses or on-farm diversified uses are permitted in Subsections 9.2.3 a) or 9.3.2 c) of this Plan, those uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) shall not have unacceptable impacts on adjacent agricultural operations or other surrounding land uses, the rural character of the area, or on public infrastructure; or negative impacts on the natural environment; (ii) shall be located within or adjacent to the existing building cluster; (iii) shall be serviced by private on-site water and wastewater systems; (iv) shall have adequate on-site parking located and designed to be compatible with surrounding land uses and the rural character of the area; and (v) shall adequately screen outdoor storage, parking areas, and loading/unloading zones from neighbouring properties and public roads. <p>c) Subject to the other policies of this Plan, and the policies of the applicable Provincial Plans, outside the Rural Settlement Areas new lots may be only created:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) for the purpose of acquisition by a public authority; (ii) for the purpose of consolidating lots; (iii) for adjusting lot lines provided that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the adjustment is | |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the adjustment is minor and for legal or technical reasons such as easements, corrections of deeds and quit claims; and b. the proposal does not result in additional building lots. <p>(iv) for the purpose of creating a new lot for conservation purposes in accordance with Subsection 4.2.5 e) of this Plan.</p> <p>d) Where a single detached dwelling is permitted on an existing lot outside the Rural Settlement Areas, the development envelope shall be located within 120 m of a municipal road and shall not exceed one hectare in area. The development envelope shall be located so as to minimize impacts on the viability of the current and future agricultural use of the lot.</p> <p>e) Development and site alteration in or near sensitive surface water features</p> | <p>minor and for legal or technical reasons such as easements, corrections of deeds and quit claims; and</p> <p>b. the proposal does not result in additional building lots.</p> <p>(iv) for the purpose of creating a new lot for conservation purposes in accordance with Subsection 4.2.5 e) of this Plan.</p> <p>d) Where a single detached dwelling is permitted on an existing lot outside the Rural Settlement Areas,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <p>e) Development and site alteration in or near sensitive surface water features</p> | |
| <p>The definition of Prime Agricultural Area – Areas where prime agricultural lands predominate. This includes: areas of prime agricultural lands and associated Canada Land Inventory Class 4–7 soils; and additional areas where there is a local concentration of farms which exhibit characteristics of ongoing agriculture. Prime agricultural areas may be identified by the Province using guidelines developed by the Province as amended from time to time, or may also be identified through an alternative agricultural land evaluation system approved by the Province.</p> | | <p>Should there be restrictions on aggregate extraction in the designated area as it all seems to be prime land and just requiring a swap at time of rehabilitation seems unwise.</p> |

City of Burlington's Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
 Feedback Form – Chapter 10 – Land Use Policies – North Aldershot Area

Name: Bob Burchett, Gareth Williams

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 10 Summary

Key Positive Items:

1. Area plans are generally consistent and specific
2. Plan balances need for an increase in density with trying to preserve unique North Aldershot's aspects of rural/urban mix

Three Key Issues:

1. Any expansion of golf facilities should only be done if the facilities meet the Audubon or similar standard
2. Maintain rural/urban mix
3. Need to develop a balanced transportation system with ensured transit access to new employment lands development

Key Proposed Changes:

9. Use Audubon (or similar) standard for any expansion/change of golf operations

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| 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. . |
| 10.3.6 (g) Each landowner in | | Seems to glaze over the transit |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>North Aldershot who develops an office use of greater than 3000 sq. m. shall be required, prior to the occupancy and use of land, to establish with the City a Transportation Demand Management Plan and implementation strategy for each development. Priority shall be given to measures that are not capital intensive (e.g. flexible working hours, priority parking spaces for car pool vehicles) and which are feasible given the scale, ultimate ownership and location of the development.</p> | | <p>part of TDM; i.e. work with city to ensure site is accessible by transit, and that transit vehicles have priority. Also not strictly related to TDM but should this section discuss provision of EV charging as a method to reduce local air pollution and GHGs? Both of these are far more likely to be utilized than carpool parking, and provisions for flexible working hours is something very much left up to the tenant / operator that the developer and city have no real control over.</p> |
| <p>10.4.4 (c) Building design shall provide a gateway appearance into North Aldershot that conveys an open space, lower density appearance.</p> | | <p>Need to be careful that lower density appearance is not confused with sprawl...</p> |
| <p>5.4.7 f) (ii)draft site plans including cross sections;</p> | <p>5.4.7 f) (ii)draft site plans including cross sections built to an Audubon or equivalent environmental standard</p> | |
| | | |

City of Burlington's Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)

Feedback Form Chapter 11 – Public Participation and Engagement

Name: Farzaneh Farahani, Colleen Lowe & Carolyn Barnes

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee - Awareness Sub-committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 11 Summary:

Three Key Positive Items:

- 1- The City has identified the critical importance of public involvement.
- 2- The City will partner with the public and stakeholders in the decision making process, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.
- 3- When development applications for amendments to both the City and Regional Official Plans are made to permit development on the same property, City Council may hold a joint public meeting with the Region of Halton to consider both applications concurrently, in order to eliminate duplication of processing and to streamline and simplify public consultation.

Three Key Issues:

- 1- The circumstances under which the City would consider a higher level of public engagement to be required are very unclear and require more specific criteria. 11.3.1 a) (xi).
- 2- 11.1.1 OBJECTIVES - Objectives are general - It would be better to explain more about "how" the City is going to implement these.
- 3- 11.3.1 PROCEDURES a) (ix). Does the fact that it is a statutory public meeting imply that staff should analyze all public comments?

Key Proposed Changes:

- 1- Turn Graphic 11-1. IAP2 Spectrum of Public Engagement into a 2 x 5 table giving examples of situations when the City would employ one type of engagement over another? Graphic 11-1.
- 2- Section 11.1.1 "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...).
- 3- Environmental awareness is a key factor in engaging the public community. Implement Environmental Awareness seminars or workshops for residents, inclusion in councillors' newsletters, website posting area, and automated e-mail notifications. As part of engaging the public community. We propose to add an item specifically for Environmental Awareness maybe into section 11.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES or section 11.3.1 PROCEDURES.
- 4- 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).

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| PAGE 11-5 | | |
| “The goal of community engagement...” | The sentence could be changed to “One of the goals of community engagement...”if this is not the only goal | |
| “over arching objective” | “over-arching objective” | |
| The Strategic Plan identified as one of its four strategic directions that the... | “One of the four strategic directions identified in Burlington’s Strategic Plan 2015-2040 is that the City will be an Engaging City” | I would also suggest identifying which strategic plan you are referencing i.e. 2015-2040 |
| ‘decision making’ | “Decision-making” | Throughout this chapter, decision making is sometimes hyphenated, and sometimes not. It is recommended to make it consistent throughout. CP Style suggests it be hyphenated. |
| Page 11-6 | | |
| Graphic 11-1. IAP2 Spectrum of Public Engagement | 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? | In what circumstances does the City consider a high level of public engagement to be required? An example seems to be given in 11.3.1 a) (xi). Provide reference to document that fully spells out this process or better describe in Official Plan. |
| “engagement charter” | “Engagement Charter” | Capitalize |
| Section 11.1.1 | | |
| 11.1.1 OBJECTIVES | Objectives are general - It would be better to explain more about “how” the City is going to implement these, | |
| “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...). |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Page 11-7 | | |
| 11.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES | 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 | |
| Page 11-8 | | |
| Section i “The locations shall be consistent with the standards of The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act and will include places which are accessible...” | “...and will include places that are accessible...” | |
| Section j The City will employ appropriate tools and techniques which are consistent...” | “...techniques that are consistent...” | |
| Section j, part i websites – one word not two | | |
| Section j, part ii “Tools and techniques suitable include...” | “Suitable tools and techniques include...” | |
| Page 11-9 | | |
| 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 | |
| | | Outline what citizens can do in terms of asking questions and providing opinion at each public meeting (Neighbourhood, Statutory, Recommendation to Committee and Council). |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | Some times appear to appear to be missing. |
| | | Provide recommendations four weeks in advance of Planning and Development Recommendation meeting. Allow time to properly analyze. |
| 11.3.1 PROCEDURES a) (iv) | Please consider adding more advisory committees and persons who have expressed interest to the circulation list. | |
| Page 11-10 | | |
| 11.3.1 PROCEDURES 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? |
| Page 11-11, part xi “When a development application is deemed to have a potentially significant impact, the City may require an expanded public consultation process, including neighbourhood meetings” | | How is this defined? What is considered to be a ‘potentially significant impact’? Who makes this decision? |
| | | |

**City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 12 - Implementation and Interpretation**

Name: Ramsha Ahmed, Farzeneh Farahani

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

Chapter 12 Summary

Key Positives:

1. New sections have been added like for Community Permit Planning Systems and Area-Specific (to some extent replaces Secondary and Tertiary/Neighbourhood Planning Policies) providing new tools for our use.
2. Many sections have been expanded to clarify how the process works.

Key Issues:

1. Will the processes described meet our needs?
2. Are all the appropriate tools in place?

Proposed Key Changes:

1. Provide Community Benefit Policy that ensures increased density and height conforms with Plan’s intent and increases are *compatible* with adjacent exiting or proposed development.
2. For Legal Non-Conforming Uses, ensure safety matters are addressed.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|--|---|---|
| 12.1.2.1. Official Plan c) “Notwithstanding Subsection 12.1.2.1 b) minor modifications to the Urban Structure, may be considered outside of a <i>municipal comprehensive review</i> where permitted by the policies of this Plan. | Define “minor”. | |
| LAND USE CONTROLS AND IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS 12.1.3.1.2 POLICIES | e) Some areas designated for urban uses shall remain undeveloped until municipal infrastructure becomes | What municipal requirements does that include? |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>available and other municipal requirements are met.</p> <p>During this interim period, these undeveloped areas shall be zoned for agriculture or open space uses to preserve them for their designated urban uses. These zones shall be referred to as Development Zones.</p> | <p>Agricultural zones will be re-developed as “urban zone” after interim period. Can this be explained a little more clearly?</p> |
| 12.1.3.5.1 Objectives | Should be an objective that addresses Employment Lands. | |
| 12.1.3.1.5.2 Policies Proposed Additional Subsection g) | g) Community benefits provision <i>shall</i> be considered where the increased density and height conforms with the intent of the e Plan and the increase in height and density is <i>compatible</i> with adjacent existing or proposed <i>development</i> . | |
| 12.1.3.1.7.2 POLICIES | a) Items (i) to (v) Not clear enough regarding timing | |
| 12.1.3.1.8.2 POLICIES b) (vii) – proposed addition | Safety matters should also be addressed. | |
| 12.1.3.3.2 POLICIES d) | Energy conservation could be added to the items | |
| MOBILITY HUB AREA-SPECIFIC GUIDING POLICIES 12.1.4.2.2 POLICIES | <p>d)</p> <p>f) The Area-Specific Plan shall include a transportation analysis and establish policy that supports the achievement of the Region of Halton’s targeted modal split of 28 percent within each mobility hub.</p> | <p>Why such a high density of 300 people and jobs per ha?</p> <p>What is the make-up of the 28 percent?</p> |
| 12.1.3.5.1 OBJECTIVES | Should employment lands not also be addressed here? | |
| 12.1.3.6 PARKLAND DEDICATION | OBJECTIVE a) To acquire lands for park purposes that are beneficial to the entire community. | Instead of saying “acquire land” perhaps suggest that new developments will need to develop parkland when a new development takes place. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>POLICIES a) The payment of money equal to the value of the land otherwise required to be conveyed for parks may be required at the discretion of the City.</p> | <p>Instead of may which gives developers a loop hole, suggest using the words “will be required” to ensure compensation if parkland is not developed.</p> |
| <p>12.1.3.7.2 POLICIES a)</p> | <p>More info about the program would be great</p> | |
| <p>12.2.2 g)</p> | <p>Where the intent of this Plan is maintained, minor boundary adjustments ...</p> | <p>What is “minor”? Provide examples.</p> |
| | | |

City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
 Feedback Form – Chapter 13 Definitions

Name: Chris Maynard

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|--|---|--|
| Page 13-1 | What is the definition for appropriate locations? | As associated with 6.2.5.2 Policies (g) |
| Page 13-4 Ancillary Employment Use and Area of Employment Page 13-12 Employment | | Provide detailed definitions of employment uses with examples. |
| Page 13-10 Development | | The definition appears to be very limiting. |
| Page 13-22 | Add definition for – 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. | 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". - Chapter 5 comment. |
| Page 13-25 | Add definition for “Placemaking” 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 | (Chapter 7 Comment) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | that reflect shared value and support healthy communities. | |
| Page 13- 28 Service Commercial | <i>Service Commercial</i> – provide an example or two with definition. | Hard to know what included. |
| Page 13-31 Sustainable and Sustainability and Sustainable Development | Sustainable and Sustainability and Sustainable Development – Meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. | 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 harmonised. (Chapter 2 Comment) Ensure the various references to sustainable growth (Ch. 2), sustainability (Ch. 4), sustainable design (Ch. 7), Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines (App A 17.) and Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives (App D) be made clear in terms of definition. (Chapter 7 Comment) |
| Page 13-32 | Add definition for Transit - local transportation of people in public vehicles. | 1. 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. Also need to consider all these modes of transportation when developing plan. (Chapter 6 Comment) |

City of Burlington's Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form – Chapter 14 Schedules and Maps

Name: Katie Rauscher

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|---------|
| 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 | |
| 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. | |
| Schedule A | Parkway Belt West Plan hard to understand in the east end | |
| Schedule A-1 | The line types for North Aldershot Policy Area and Designated Greenfield Area are extremely similar and causes minor confusion when reading. | |
| Schedule B | Urban Growth Centre Boundary is shown on map, but not labeled. | |
| Schedule B-1 | Urban Growth Centre is noted at 'UGC' - use full name as there is space | |
| Schedule B-2 | 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. | |

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| Schedule B-2 | Primary Mobility Hub Connector, make line type have a smaller dash, for legibility. | |
| Schedule C | Northeast corner of Walkers Line and Upper Middle Road is not Open Space and Park Area. It is a hockey arena. | |
| Schedule C | From roughly Kerns Road to Hendon Road south of Dundas to Lake why is there no Natural Heritage shown | |
| Schedule D-1 | Watercourse is not labeled | |
| 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. | |
| Schedule Q | Shows 'Highway Interchange Crossing' along Harvester Rd, likely a mistake? | |
| 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' | |

**City of Burlington’s Draft New Official Plan (April – June 2017)
Feedback Form –Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines**

Name: Guy Sheppard, Jim Fielders

Company/Organization: Sustainable Development Committee

Contact Information (address/email): On file with BSDAC

SBDG Summary

Three Key Positives

1. We finally have specific tangible guidelines to use rather a list of potential areas to be addressed.
2. Will enable us to better prepared with a process for to accommodate changes proposed to Section 16 of the Planning Act.be It is proposed to amend the *Planning Act* by adding a subsection requiring an official plan to *contain policies that identify goals, objectives and actions to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and to provide for adaptations to a changing climate, including through increasing resiliency.* We will also have to accommodate changes to the Municipal Act to require stricter building standards than the Ontario Building Code.

Key Issues:

1. The right approach to implementing these guidelines is critical. We need the applicants to willing buy-in. We need to get it right the first time. Particularly staff in contact with developers and homeowners need buy into its importance, and be properly trained in its use to sell it. Change Management approaches should be used.
2. Determining the appropriate incentives and how to use them to ensure the key guidelines get implemented. Tie in with CEP goals and IESO incentives.

Key Proposed Changes:

1. Develop a priority scheme so the most important and effective guidelines are addressed first such as net zero carbon, energy generation and conservation, water conservation and waste reduction.
2. Develop guidelines for single family homes and low rise buildings.
3. Set-up guidelines
4. Consider the use of proposed Energy Performance and Water Efficiency criteria to help ensure success of achieving energy and water efficiency goals.

| Official Plan Topic Area (Policy Number, Schedule/Appendix Number)/Original Text | Suggest Change/Action/Proposed Next Text | Comment |
|---|---|------------------------|
| General | Should stress the importance of: | May want to consider a |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouse gas emission reduction • Energy generation and conservation • Water Conservation, and • Waste Reduction | priority scheme similar to Toronto. |
| Page 2, Top paragraph | Should develop guidelines for single family homes. | |
| Page 2, <u>After Construction</u> | After “Compliance for additional voluntary building measures ...award”, add “if received community benefits, non-monetary benefits or monetary benefits”. | |
| Page 5, Second bullet under 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. |
| Table page 3, section 2, item 1. Site Connections | | How handle cycling or walking paths that going through the site? |
| Table page 4, Section 2, Item 8 – Electrical Vehicles | | Is there not an incentive of reduced parking spots if put one in. |
| Table Page 7, Section 4, Item 1 – Stormwater Quality | | Can we not go pass level one for requirements? |
| Add new Item Water Consumption | Add water consumption reporting | 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). |
| New – Water Efficiency | Consider using following LEED criteria: | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Efficient Landscaping, Reduce by 50% • Water Reduction, 30% Reduction | |
| Section 5 Energy | Rename to Energy and Emissions | <p>Follow Strategic Plan focus on net zero carbon and new SDC Principles and Objectives</p> <p>Principle 2: Recognize the urgency of climate change and take measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt.</p> <p>Objective 12. Energy Conservation, Efficiency and Generation: Promote net zero carbon energy generation and usage.</p> |
| Table Page 8, Section 5, Items 1, 2, & 3 | | Heat Island Items normally fall under Sustainable Sites. |
| Table Page 8, Section 5, Item 4 - Energy Performance | <p>Provide a metric similar to Toronto in kWh/m² or LEED criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum Energy Performance • Optimize Energy Performance | |
| Table Page 10, Section 5, Item 7 - Net Zero | Add metric similar to Toronto in kgCO ₂ /m ² | New LEED Net Zero can provide some background. |
| Table Page 10, Section 5, Item 8 – Continuous Monitoring | Add energy consumption reporting | 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). |
| | | |

Appendix A



Comments Regarding Uptown Policy Brief

May 2015

Based on a review of the “Uptown Policy Brief” (dated December 16, 2014) and other associated documents, the Burlington Sustainable Development Committee (SDC) generally supports the proposed Policy Directions. The committee offers the following comments and recommendations as they pertain to SDC Principles and Objectives:

1. Achieving the vision for Uptown:

The vision for Uptown is to be an urban centre and key destination for residents in north-east area. Given the existing built form of the area, substantial width of Appleby Line and traffic congestion, the City must work diligently to overcome many barriers to implementation.

- Vibrant urban centres require safe pedestrian infrastructure. Any further widening of Appleby Road or Upper Middle Road will make it virtually impossible to achieve the stated vision for Uptown. Accordingly, SDC endorses the Policy Brief’s proposed objective of discouraging the future widening of Appleby Line and Upper Middle Road, and would encourage the City to aggressively oppose further attempts to increase the throughput of vehicular traffic.
- Given the traffic congestion during most daylight hours on Appleby Line, the City needs to develop a comprehensive plan showing how it would like to see City and Region collaborate to achieve a transition from the current configuration and traffic patterns to a new configuration that engages public transit, priority lanes, traffic demand management and other mechanisms to reduce the number of automobiles traversing the Uptown area. To validate and monitor its approach, the City might consider conducting a traffic congestion study for Walkers Line, Appleby Line, Upper Middle Road and some of parallel routes (e.g. New Street and Dundas Street) to establish the baseline condition, then repeat these assessments regularly to determine the effectiveness of the traffic transition plan.

- Development of effective, interconnected transit routes through the area will be essential to reducing automobile traffic, and must be a priority.
 - If the Region insists that the road be widened, or if improved public does not lessen congestion, then additional lanes should be designated as public transit priority to encourage the use of shared transportation.
2. Location of transit hub:
- Appleby Line and Dundas Street should also be considered as a possible location for a transportation hub as it is an area where the 407 commuter buses, Dundas express bus, potential express bus route up Appleby Line, and connections to Milton can readily meet.
3. Section 2.0 Policy Review:
- The SDC would like to see the addition of two more goals:
 - To continuously monitor and evaluate intensification and development projects to determine if there are any adverse effects on the community.
 - To integrate natural features into proposed new development/redevelopment and to protect current natural features in the Uptown.
 - The SDC would like to see greater detail on the plan as it relates to building heights and how they will transition from area to area.
4. The SDC supports the summary of recommendations and the proposed modifications in Section 3.0 “Review of Commercial Strategy Study Proposals for Uptown”. The SDC recommends that the comments made in this document are read in conjunction with the previously submitted comments on the Commercial Lands Policy – April 2015.
5. The SDC believes that there are risks in mixed use development (e.g. allowing designs or uses not intended, permitting too much of one use over another).
- If it has not already been done, the SDC recommends that the City undertake a risk management study and develop mitigation strategies. The SDC recommends the use of the Project Management Institute methodology (see PMBOK Guide pages 127-144).
 - An assessment of recent mixed used development in the City should be undertaken to determine where practices can be corrected or improved.
 - It would be helpful for the City to create a mixed use “pilot” area, or identify an area where the City feels mixed use development has been particularly successful. This would provide developers with an example of what the City is aiming to achieve.
6. The idea of Placemaking is supported by the SDC.
- The concept of ‘Placemaking’ will be important to achieve the ‘active, engaging public realm’ envisioned for Uptown. Cultural and entertainment uses will need to increase.

- The definition provided by “Project for Public Spaces” (Appendix B), and in particular the circular image included in this reference, provides a really helpful description of Placemaking.
 - The SDC supports the development of cohesive Neighbourhood Plans in addition to the general philosophy of Placemaking.
7. It is not always clear how the City’s different plans and guidelines connect. For example, how will the development ensure sufficient natural features and green space, energy conservation in land use planning and design, as well as water conservation and stormwater management? It would be helpful for the City to include links in reports to related guidelines or plans.

Sincerely,

Members of the Burlington Sustainable Development Committee

Detailed Comments on Policy Directions

Note: The policy brief interchanges ‘*mixed-use centre*’ and ‘*urban centre*’ in the document. It would be helpful to have clear definitions of both of these terms.

Policy Direction A – Modify Uptown’s principals and objectives to promote standard of urban design and community development.

- Given the current status of the area, it may not be feasible for Uptown to become a truly “urban centre”. If it is considered feasible, then the seven proposed modifications make good sense.
- There is little in the way of entertainment or cultural uses (e.g. churches) within the area. How will these uses be encouraged?
- The SDC recommends adding an additional objective: “transition to more friendly pedestrian, cycling and transit oriented environment”.

Policy Direction B – Modify the existing Uptown land use structure to introduce a node and corridor land use in order to promote intensification and provide opportunities to support Uptown’s long-term growth

- SDC generally supports switching to a node and corridor approach for Uptown but would like to get a better understanding of the mechanisms through which this will occur.
- It will be important to apply the concepts of ‘Placemaking’ near the intersection of Upper Middle Road and Appleby Line as it is the central area of Uptown.

Policy Direction C – Modify and consolidate existing Uptown Official Plan Designations based on a node and corridor use structure

- The consolidation of Existing Designations into a smaller set for Residential and Commercial uses makes good sense.
- Uptown Central – North West Quadrant – Two of three existing designations in this area are Commercial/Residential. Should there also be an area with a residential designation as this is an urban centre?
- For the Commercial/Residential areas it will be important to implement the concept of Placemaking.
- Employment lands – The SDC will defer commenting until the results of the Municipal Comprehensive Review of Employment Lands are available.

Policy Direction D - Modify existing commercial and mixed-use policies to provide new retail and commercial use opportunities and further the development of Uptown into an active and urban environment

- The SDC supports the three policy directions proposed.

Policy Direction E – Add policies to further Uptown’s evolution into a pedestrian and transit-oriented urban centre

The SDC agrees with the objectives proposed except where noted below:

- *ii. discourage the future widening of Appleby Line and Upper Middle Road*
 - There is currently significant traffic congestion on Appleby Line. This is the major north/south route in east Burlington. How will public transit be improved so that this can be mitigated, particularly as the area intensifies?
 - The City should consider conducting a traffic congestion study across Walker’s Line and Appleby Line, first to establish a baseline and then repeated later to assess the impact of enhancements to the transit system.
 - Widening the road to allow more car traffic would conflict with the objective to “Promote the establishment of pedestrian, transit and cycling facilities and effective route connections to surrounding neighbourhoods”.
 - If the Halton Region decides to widen the road, the City should advocate for public a transit lane to encourage the use of shared transportation.
- *iv. establish parking maximums for mixed-use developments*
 - The SDC supports this concept in general but the implementation will be critical as alternate means of transportation need to be in place first to avoid worsening transportation issues.
 - How will parking maximums be set? How will the transition be made to lower levels of parking? There is a risk if there is inadequate parking that this may drive commercial uses away.
- *vi. promote the establishment of pedestrian, transit, and cycling facilities and effective route connections to surrounding neighbourhoods*
 - This is very important to the entire area.

- *vii. recognize Uptown's close proximity to the Appleby Go station and build upon the centre's potential as a significant source of ridership on local and regional transit systems*
 - Appleby Line and Dundas Street could be considered a transportation hub as it is an area where the 407 commuter buses, Dundas express bus, potential express bus route up Appleby Line, and connections to Milton can readily meet.
- *ix. promote the incorporation of complete street principles in new and existing roads*
 - This is a good idea but will be difficult to fully near the intersection of Appleby Line and Upper Middle Road given the current width of the streets.
 - This needs to be more clearly defined.

SDC Comments on Design Guidelines:

The following "Guiding Principles" are provided on pg. 6 of the Design Guidelines:

- "Provide mobility through compact forms, diversity of uses and pedestrian-oriented development;
- Promote the greening of the community and enhance the urban canopy;
- Encourage active transportation choices;
- Encourage redevelopment of underutilized sites;
- Promote energy efficiency, water conservation and management; and,
- Incorporate energy efficiency and waste reduction strategies in the design, construction and maintenance of buildings."

SDC Comments:

- Energy efficiency, waste reduction and water conservation are not addressed any further in this document. There is no discussion concerning larger open spaces/parks or stormwater management. In which other documents are these issues addressed? It would be helpful for the City to include links to related references in reports.
- Ensure incorporation of measures that achieve a sustainable development including low carbon/renewable energy sources, energy and water efficiency/conservation, low carbon /renewable energy production/distribution, storm water & wastewater treatment/reuse, reuse of older buildings and recycle/reduce/reuse solid waste materials.
- Is there any benchmark data on the success of this type of design in increasing active transportation and use of public transit?

The Design Guideline should be used along with Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines.

Appendix A

The following represent a subset of SDC Principles and Objectives are the most relevant to the proposed Uptown Policy Brief.

Sustainable Development Committee Principles:

Support Responsible Development that promotes efficiency and enhances the quality of life.

Promote Sustainable Resource Use and conservation practices

Have Regard for Environmental, Economic and Social Costs and Benefits in the development and use of resources, products and services.

Promote Responsible Stewardship to ensure equitable use of natural and environmental resources in order to meet essential needs and both present and future generations.

Sustainable Development Committee - Objectives:

| |
|--|
| <p>Full Public Participation in Development Decisions. The public should be part of all planning decisions. Economic, environmental and social impacts of proposed developments should be considered.</p> |
| <p>Best Use of Land. Promote the best use of land based upon an ecosystem approach to ensure environment integrity and diversity. To include but not limited to promoting environmentally sensitive lands and fertile soil for agriculture throughout the municipality.</p> |
| <p>Balanced Development. Provide a community plan and an economic strategy aimed at creating sustainable and appropriate forms of development that reflect human scale and a sense of community as well as representing a balance between urban development and natural surroundings.</p> |
| <p>Efficient Urban Design. To increase the efficiency of land use in the urban community in terms of energy and time, promote intensification and diversification policies that generate urban sprawl.</p> |
| <p>Accessible Community Development. A new form of community development should be promoted whereby local community components such as commerce, shopping, employment, education, and recreation are readily available, preferably within walking distance of all residents.</p> |
| <p>Integration of Natural Features and Green Space. Integrate natural features and green spaces in all new developments and intensification projects.</p> |
| <p>Energy Conservation. Promote energy conservation through efficient land use planning and building design.</p> |
| <p>Balanced Transportation System. Develop a balanced transportation system including transit, pedestrian, and cycling amenities and the best use of the road and people, with the existing facilities used to their fullest capacity.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation of Development. Continuous monitoring and evaluation of development should take place to ensure that it does not have adverse impacts on the City's finances and the environment.</p> |

Appendix B

Placemaking Definition Provided by “Project for Public Places”

Placemaking is a quiet movement that reimagines public spaces as the heart of every community, in every city. It’s a transformative approach that inspires people to create and improve their public places. Placemaking strengthens the connection between people and the places they share.

Placemaking is how we collectively shape our public realm to maximize shared value. Rooted in community-based participation, Placemaking involves the planning, design, management and programming of public spaces. More than just creating better urban design of public spaces, Placemaking facilitates creative patterns of activities and connections (cultural, economic, social, and ecological) that define a place and support its ongoing evolution. Placemaking is how people are more collectively and intentionally shaping our world, and our future on this planet.

With the increasing awareness that our human environment is shaping us, Placemaking is how we shape humanity’s future. While environmentalism has challenged human impact on our planet, it is not the planet that is threatened but humanity’s ability to live viably here. Placemaking is building both the settlement patterns, and [the communal capacity, for people to thrive with each other and our natural world.](#)

WHAT MAKES A SUCCESSFUL PLACE?

Great public spaces are where celebrations are held, social and economic exchanges take place, friends run into each other, and cultures mix. They are the “front porches” of our public institutions – libraries, field houses, neighborhood schools – where we interact with each other and government. When the spaces work well, they serve as a stage for our public lives.

What makes some places succeed while others fail?

In evaluating thousands of public spaces around the world, PPS has found that successful ones have four key qualities: they are **accessible**; people are engaged in **activities** there; the space is **comfortable** and has a good image; and finally, it is a **social** place: one where people meet each other and take people when they come to visit. PPS developed **The Place Diagram** as a tool to help people in judging any place, good or bad:

WHAT MAKES A GREAT PLACE?



Imagine that the center circle on the diagram is a specific place that you know: a street corner, a playground, a plaza outside a building. You can evaluate that place according to four criteria in the orange ring. In the ring outside these main criteria are a number of **intuitive or qualitative** aspects by which to judge a place; the next outer ring shows the **quantitative aspects** that can be measured by statistics or research.

<http://www.pps.org/reference/reference-categories/placemaking-tools/>