

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 1. 1 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 1.1 | Missing key direction for the Mobility Hubs. | Comment noted. The Mobility Hubs Area Specific Plans are underway. |
| S. 1. 2 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 1.1 | Without the specific details that will be developed through the Mobility Hub Area Specific Plans it is unclear how the policy will accomplish the goals of the Plan. That is, how much growth will be directed to each Mobility Hub Area. | Comment noted. This Official Plan has a planning horizon to 2031. The Mobility Hubs Area Specific Plans will include growth to full build out (2041 and beyond). An update to the Region of Halton Best Planning Estimates will serve as an additional planning tool. |
| S. 1. 3 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 1.4 | Without filling the gaps in Section 8 of the Plan the Plan is not in alignment with the Strategic Plan. | Comment noted. The Downtown Mobility Hub Area Specific Plan has been advanced to a point to provide high level policies for inclusion in the Official Plan. As the Area Specific Planning process continues these policies will be subject to modification and refinement. |
| S. 1. 4 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 1.4 | Do not see our proposed Vision anywhere. | Comment noted. Elements of the vision proposed by Sustainable Development Committee can be found in the guiding principles, community vision and throughout the Plan. |
| S. 1. 5 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 1.5 | Principles: Sustainable Development –do not see economic or social aspects, Diversity and Adaptability – see diversity related to Natural Heritage but nothing else. Adaptability is not addressed. Community – see it in bits and pieces but Neighbourhood re. interacting, supporting each other or identifying opportunities. Invigorated Rural Areas – Looks fairly well covered. Interconnectivity – Looks fairly well covered. Accessibility and Equity – Accessibility appears covered. See nothing on Equity. Health and Vitality – Looks fairly well covered. | Policy modified. Economic aspects addressed in 1.5.1 a) c) f) g) h) i), Social aspects addressed in 1.5.1 a) e) g), 1.5.3 f), 1.5.4 a) b) c). 1.5.1 e) to modified to reflect social aspects. "Diverse" "Adaptable" now reflected in 1.5.1 a) and "Equitable" in 1.5.3 f). |
| S. 1. 6 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 1.5.1 b) | North Aldershot – why a distinct role? Shouldn't that eventually either be urban or rural? | Policy maintained. The next Regional Official Plan Amendment will update the land use vision for North Aldershot. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 1. 7 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 1.5.1 c) | The Plan is intended to accommodate minimum population and employment growth yet it fails to indicate the amount of growth that is targeted for each of the intensification areas – this additional information is required. | Comment noted. The Official Plan establishes Population and Employment forecast to 2031, among a wide range of other targets. The proposed Official Plan conforms to the Regional Official Plan policy numbers. Also please refer to PB-50-17, Key Issues 1 and 5. |
| S. 1. 8 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 1.5.1 g) | Provides for the efficient, effective, and financially responsible... | Policy modified. |
| S. 1. 9 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 1.5.2 | The language is vague, referencing only active and sustainable transportation choices. Provide greater detail on how land use aligns to multi-modal transportation | Policy modified. |
| S. 1. 10 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 1.5.3 f) | Promotes health, safety and social well-being ... health care facilities, recreation facilities, parks ... | Policy modified. |
| S. 1. 11 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 1.5.4 d) | Proposed new item d): “supports and encourages the community to identify opportunities to build active creative neighbourhoods | Policy maintained. 1.5.4 a) b) and c) enable this direction. |
| S. 1. 12 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | General | Concerned that there is not sufficient detail to understand where and how much growth will be directed to achieve Provincial growth targets. | Comment noted. The Mobility Hubs Area Specific Plans are underway. |
| S. 1. 13 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | General | Explanation of the differing titles and roles that the Downtown area of the City holds. | Policy modified. Please refer to Chapter 2 and Chapter 8. |
| S. 1. 14 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | General | Significant gaps in Section 8 of the Plan (specifically the Downtown Land Use policies) challenge the plan's ability to achieve the objectives set out in this section. | Policy modified. Refer to new proposed Downtown policies. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/ Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 1. 15 | 30-Jun-17 | Shane Cooney, ADI Development | General | Premature to comment on the Plan being an effective tool to guide growth in the future. We are looking forward to receiving additional information requested by the HHHBA. | Comment noted. Staff trust that the memo's included in the Council Information Packages on September 8 and September 15, 2017 along with the responses contained in this document and discussion on October 13, 2017 has been of assistance. It is important to note that growth targets are one of many considerations in city-building. Provincial, Regional and Local planning policies should be read comprehensively. Also please refer to PB-50-17, Key Issues 1 and 5. |
| S. 1. 16 | 30-Jun-17 | Robert Molinaro, Molinaro Group | General | Premature to comment on the Plan being an effective tool to guide growth in the future. We are looking forward to receiving additional information requested by the HHHBA. | Comment noted. Refer to response to comment S.1.15 |
| S. 1. 17 | 30-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | General | The overall success of the Official Plan will be greatly contingent on the mobility hubs, the Urban Growth Centre and transportation corridors to accommodate growth within the planning horizon (2031). | Comment noted. Refer to response to comment S.1.15 |
| S. 1. 18 | 30-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | General | Premature to comment on the Plan being an effective tool to guide growth in the future. We are looking forward to receiving additional information requested by the HHHBA. | Comment noted. Refer to response to comment S.1.15 |
| S. 1. 19 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | General | All growth will occur in an intensified form- directed to primary growth areas. Agree. The Plan lacks detail on how those areas will function. | Comment noted. The Mobility Hubs Area Specific Plans are underway. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/ Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 1. 20 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | General | What population growth has been achieved to date (relative to the targets set in the Regional OP and the densities set for urban growth centres and mobility hubs in the original and updated Growth Plan) what remains to achieve these targets and where will that growth occur. We understand this information is being developed but believe the information is absolutely critical before finalizing the mobility hub Area Specific Plans or the Official Plan. At this time we are unable to support the Official Plan as it does not provide our industry with the information it requires to understand if the City is meeting our requirements to accommodate growth nor does it allow our industry to submit a development application and have an understanding as to whether or not it meets the intent of the plan. | Comment noted. See response to comment S.1.15. |
| S. 1. 21 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | General | Grow Bold the Plan must be unapologetic and guide future development applicant to successfully providing economically feasible, quality developments that are in keeping with big picture City goals that marry the City's vision with the growth targets mandated by higher order government. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/ Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 1. 22 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | General | In the absence of population and employment distribution numbers and significant revisions to the failed precinct planning framework to adequately accommodate the required future growth within the mobility hubs and the connecting corridors, City Council, the public and the development industry is being misled. Significant and “bold” planning framework and policy changes are required to enable the City to accommodate the minimum population and employment targets that have been established. The current draft of the New Official Plan fails to indicate how the City of Burlington is planning to accommodate the minimum Provincial requirements outlined in Places to Grow and the Growth Plan. The overall success of the New Official Plan will be greatly contingent upon the success of the Urban Growth Centre to accommodate required growth within the planning horizon of 2031. | Comment noted. Refer to Chapter 8, Section 8.1.1 (3). |
| S. 1. 23 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | Introduction | The plan does not set out development ready provisions as they are absent clear intensification targets. | Policy maintained. The policies have been written to balance flexibility and prescriptiveness. The policies use a blend of targets, density and/or intensity measures to guide development. |
| S. 1. 24 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Introduction | City is evolving into a “complete city” or “complete City”, but definition is only provided for a “complete community”. Suggest harmonizing the language, e.g. “a city of complete communities”, using only “a complete community” | Policy modified. |
| S. 1. 25 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Introduction | Economic and social aspects of sustainable development are not well introduced, particularly with respect to create neighborhoods. Maybe Complete Community definition covers daily needs. Nothing addresses the social side. | Policy modified. |
| S. 1. 26 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Introduction | Adaptability and climate resilience are not addressed. | Policy modified. These themes are also being considered as part of the Regional Official Plan Review. Updates to the City's Official Plan will be required in the future to expand upon these themes. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------|---|------------------|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 1. 27 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Introduction | The focus on intensification areas with little mention of direction to the few remaining greenfield areas. The OP could benefit from an introductory statement like: "Development of the remaining greenfield areas will be consistent with the strategic directions in this Plan and integrate sustainability as appropriate." | Policy modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 1 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.1 general | Do not see enough reference to people or connectivity. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 2 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.1 general | Suggest deleting Paragraph 6, "A new sense of shared purpose ..." does not contribute to the overall message of the section. | Policy modified by deletion. |
| S. 2. 3 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.1 general | Paragraphs 7, 8 & 9 are confusing with respect to "city building" and key messages. Specific wording recommended in comments. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 4 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.2.1 d) | Last sentence, "Limited growth will be directed ..." is redundant | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 5 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.2.1 e) | Specific edits for clarity recommended in comments | Policy maintained. Only minimal modifications to the existing North Aldershot policies were undertaken through the development of the Official Plan. The Regional Official Plan Review will consider this area and modifications may be required to the City's Official Plan in the future. |
| S. 2. 6 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 2.2.2 d) | How does the Green System differ from the Natural Heritage System? | Policy modified to clarify that the Green System is simply a combined layer that includes the Natural Heritage System, Major Parks and Open Space and other parks in the Urban Area. |
| S. 2. 7 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.2.3 | The plans referred to are outdated. While it is recognized that the implication of changes to the plan is not simple, references elsewhere in the document point to future plans (i.e. Walkers Cumberland future GO). Updated mapping should be included in the document. | Policy modified to remove dates related to policy document references. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 8 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.2.3 | Built Boundary. Reference is made to 8300 units to be added between 2015 and 2031. We have on two occasions requested a status report on where the City is at with respect to the above and the general status of achieving overall population targets. Please provide as soon as possible. | Refer to response to comment S.1.15. |
| S. 2. 9 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.2.3 | We have requested a status report as to the gross density target to date of the urban growth centre to understand if densities being proposed through the OP and Mobility Hubs studies will bring us close to or achieving this target. Please provide as soon as possible. | Refer to response to comment S.1.15. |
| S. 2. 10 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.2.3 | For the Designated Greenfield Area, please clarify where the development density target of 45 people and jobs per ha came from. | Comment noted. ROPA #38 established a Designated Greenfield Area target of 45 people and jobs per ha for Burlington. |
| S. 2. 11 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.2.3 | For the Designated Greenfield Area, the plan should make reference to the fact that the Growth Plan will require these targets to increase considerably (currently 50 p+j/ha and ultimately 80 p+j/ha) in the near future, and certainly within the horizon of this OP. | Comment noted. The 2017 Growth Plan does set up a graduated density increase from 50 p+j/ha. Until the next Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review (RMCR) the density target remains the same. Through the next RMCR these lands will be planned to achieve within the horizon of this plan not less than 60 p+j combined per ha. For the sake of clarity, the 80 p+j/ha target would not apply to lands that are designated greenfield lands identified in official plans that are approved and in effect as of July 1, 2017. |
| S. 2. 12 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.2.3 | While there are other maps including locations of the other provincial plans there does not appear to be information on the Parkway Belt West Plan within appendices. | Policy modified to indicate that the boundaries of the Parkway Belt West Plan area are shown on Schedule A-1. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 13 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.2.3 d iii) | A minimum density of 200 people and jobs is required by 2031. We would like to obtain an understanding of how the City is planning to satisfy this minimum growth requirement. We are of the opinion that unless significant changes are made to the City's land use policy framework, it may be impossible for the City to achieve the minimum density target by 2031. While we note that the "Downtown Mobility Hub" is significantly larger than the "Urban Growth Centre", we also recognize that the majority of this additional area is comprised of what may be considered as existing residential neighbourhoods that are to be protected. Therefore, as the residential neighbourhoods are intended to be protected and will not change to accommodate significant redevelopment and intensification, redevelopment and intensification policies are most appropriately focused on the "Urban Growth Centre" as defined on Schedule "F". | Comment noted. Refer to response to comment S.1.15. In addition, the Downtown Mobility Hub ASP will present population and employment numbers to full build out. |
| S. 2. 14 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.2.3 d) ii) | Could the yearly number be included, as in 519 units per year from 2015 to 2031? This may help some with a better perspective on growth. | Policy maintained. While that figure (519) represents the average annual number of units that would be required over the time period this target is established in the Regional Official Plan and the achievement of the policy is not measured on an annual basis, rather from the year 2015 to 2031. |
| S. 2. 15 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.2.3 e) | Land use in this area in North Aldershot is significantly influenced by the large land-areas owned and controlled by RBG, and by the planned Cootes to Escarpment Park. | Policy maintained. The next Regional Official Plan Amendment will update the land use vision for North Aldershot. |
| S. 2. 16 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 2.2.4 | At minimum provide a rationale for how the 55% ratio of employment to general population was determined. In absence of that, conduct a comparison with other cities aiming to grow economically to determine whether a more ambitious target than this is feasible. | Comment noted. This distribution of population and employment was established collaboratively among partner municipalities at the time of the last Regional Official Plan Review. A balance of jobs and residents is important to achieving a more complete community. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 17 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.2.4 | Could a percentage increase per year be included to help readers gain a better perspective on growth? This would show growth of less than 1% per year over 25 years. | Policy maintained. This is an item that is outside of the scope of the Official Plan. |
| S. 2. 18 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.3 general | Unless significant changes are made the City cannot achieve the target of 200 people and jobs per ha by 2031 in the Downtown Urban Growth Centre. | Please refer to memo dated September 8, 2017. |
| S. 2. 19 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.3 general | Intensification within the Downtown Mobility Hub will be focused within the UGC. | Policy maintained. Yes. |
| S. 2. 20 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 2.3 general | To the previous comment (2.2.2 d) Is the Green System redundant? | Refer to response to comment S.2.6. |
| S. 2. 21 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.3 general | Paragraph one does not read well. It should be reworked. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 22 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.3 h) | It is appropriate to specify the densities expected through the Growth Plan for these mobility hubs. Please include. | Policy maintained. For Mobility Hubs planned to be served by Metrolinx's Regional Express Rail shall consider an overall target of 300 residents and jobs combined per hectare. See Policy 12.1.4.2.2 |
| S. 2. 23 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.3 m) | This should be reworded to say "Mixed Use Nodes and Intensification Corridors will be a focus for re-urbanization. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 24 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 2.3.1 g) | Mobility Hubs are being planned as major intensification areas. Consideration must be given to prioritizing the City's needs within the urban area over potential environmental constraints. | Policy maintained. Planning processes require a balancing of considerations. The foundation for this is set by the Provincial Policy Statement. Some areas of Mobility Hubs contain environmental constraints that will be evaluated and confirmed through the Area Specific Planning Process. |
| S. 2. 25 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.3.1 j) | Since City is indicating it will designate a new Walkers/Cumberland GO station as a mobility hub, consider mentioning Appleby/Dundas as potential future mobility hub location once Dundas Street BRT is underway. | Policy maintained. The Walker's Cumberland station is under review by Metrolinx as a potential future GO station, while Appleby/Dundas is not under consideration. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 26 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.3.2 c) | Does this mean that every area in the city can be changed by a municipal comprehensive review or is it just employment lands? | Policy modified. Policy 12.1.2.1 outlines the issues that can only be assessed at the time of an Official Plan Review. Since the release of the Draft Official Plan the Province released the revised Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) which redefined the term municipal comprehensive review. A municipal comprehensive review may now only be conducted by an upper or single-tier municipality. Modifications have been made to reflect that change. |
| S. 2. 27 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 2.3.3. b) | This policy is rigid and limited. Limiting growth to infill and ADU is short sighted. There are many opportunities for redevelopment such as closed school sites which pose an excellent opportunity for redevelopment. So long as redevelopment is thoughtful and provides for compatibility it should not be discouraged. | Policy modified to clarify intent. In general the Established Neighbourhood Areas are expected to accommodate only limited intensification. The Growth Framework policies, and specifically the Established Neighbourhood policies discourage intensification have been modified to rely on appropriate processes, policies and criteria to assess potential development, rather than to limit the ability to assess an individual application on its own merit. Please refer to Chapter 2 (2.4). |
| S. 2. 28 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.3.4 | a) and b) only state what they are. Are these areas to be protected or can they be developed or intensified? This may not be clear to the public. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 29 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 2.3.4 b) | Again, how does the Green System differ from the Natural Heritage System? | Refer to response to comment S.2.6. |
| S. 2. 30 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.4 general | Pleased to see that the Downtown will be the recipient of the majority of the City's forecast growth, height and density. Effective new planning policies are required to achieve these goals and objectives - these policies are not provided. | All Primary Growth Areas (Downtown, Uptown, Aldershot GO, Burlington GO and Appleby GO) together will be the recipients of the majority of the City's forecasted growth. Heights and densities will be determined through the area-specific planning, or through development applications. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 31 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 2.4 general | Add a clause to address the transportation needs in the employment lands, such as “development in employment growth areas shall include implementation of appropriate transit services and design principles to promote walkable and bikeable options”. | Detailed objectives and policies to improve transit and active transportation options in employment areas are found in Sections 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4 and 6.2.10. |
| S. 2. 32 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 2.4 general | 5353 Lakeshore Rd. (Lakeside Plaza): The Growth Framework inappropriately constraints the subject lands' potential and will preclude significant opportunities for a mix of uses and height variation - a variation that is highly appropriate given the subject lands' size, location and the local context. | Land Use Designation modified to acknowledge opportunities to consider comprehensive development of large sites within the Neighbourhood Commercial Designation. Refer to Chapter 8 , section 8.1.3.(4). |
| S. 2. 33 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.4.1 b) | There is no reference to low rise which seems odd, given that some of the development and redevelopment that occurs will be low rise. | Policy modified. Added, please refer to 2.4.1 d) |
| S. 2. 34 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.4.1 c) | The term public expenditure needs clarification, a definition, etc. It is unclear that this infers investment by the City to facilitate/ensure successful private development. | Policy modified to clarify that investments in transit as well as other types of infrastructure and public service facilities will be prioritized in the primary growth framework area. |
| S. 2. 35 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.1 d) | Language around mobility choices is weak. We need to prioritize & support active transportation/transit not just provide choice. Suggest that language be strengthened to indicate prioritizing active transportation/transit. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 36 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.1 e) | e) To limit the introduction of unplanned <i>intensification</i> in established neighbourhood areas”. This is objective is vitally important and needs to be supported in any fashion possible as we have lot of this. | Refer to response to comment S.2.27. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 37 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 2.4.2 b) | Why would the growth framework not apply to greenfield areas such as Bronte Creek Meadows and 1200 King Road? Specifically, the western portion of 1200 King Road is part of the Aldershot Mobility Hub Study Area and identified as Primary Growth Area, yet this policy states the Growth Framework shall not apply. | The growth framework was intended to apply only to locations within the Urban Area that were developed at the time of the preparation of the plan. This is because it is a framework intended to guide intensification, which requires there to be an existing built context or located within a previously developed area. Bronte Creek Meadows and 1200 King Road are for the most part not within the Delineated Built Up Area and are considered Designated Greenfield Area and would be subject to current or future area-specific planning processes. |
| S. 2. 38 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.4.2 d) | The term "justified" in front of the frequent transit network appear throughout the document. In our meeting we indicated this doesn't read well, nor does the reader understand the use of this term. It is recommended that the "justified" be removed, and some reference to current and potentially expanded "frequent transit network" be included. Please note there is a lack of consistency with the inclusion of justified or not throughout the document. | Policy modified throughout the Official Plan to replace justified frequent transit network with "Frequent Transit Corridor". See Section 6.2.3. |
| S. 2. 39 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.1 c) | Should we list tools similar to employment lands? | Policy modified - moved. Strategic Investment Area policies are located in the Implementation and Interpretation Chapter of the Plan (12.1.20). |
| S. 2. 40 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.1 e) i) | Could not find the Section 2.3 Urban Structure objectives. Do you mean 2.4 Growth Framework Objectives? | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 41 | 5-Apr-17 | David McKay, MHBC | 2.4.2.2 | 1450 Headon Road: Draft Secondary Growth Area policies discourages Official Plan Amendments for increased height and or density/intensity. | Policy deleted. |
| S. 2. 42 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.2 (b) (i) | What does significantly mean? 5%, 25%, or 100%. This is unclear. | Policy deleted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 43 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.2 a) i) | Should be Schedule P-1 not B-1. | Policy maintained. The listing of street types in this instance is to provide context for the residential lands included in the Secondary Growth Framework, but the policy relies on Schedule B-1. |
| S. 2. 44 | 30-Jun-17 | Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT | 2.4.2.2 a) ii) | Supports this policy. | Comment noted. |
| S. 2. 45 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.2 b) (iii) | Add 50 units/ha so do not greatly exceed 25 units/ha as have the capability to go up to 75 units/ha which could lead to over intensification. | Policy deleted. |
| S. 2. 46 | 30-Jun-17 | Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates | 2.4.2.2 c) | 2095 Prospect Street: This policy is too onerous and would preclude redevelopment of the site in question. It is not clear how this policy supports or encourages intensification and additional rental housing within the City. Please consider modifying the policies to permit this kind of redevelopment. | Policy modified to establish a growth management strategy that differentiates areas within the urban area for the purposes of communicating clear choices about where the city will and will not be planning to accommodate intensification and higher density mixed uses in a more compact built form. Please refer to revised Growth Framework policies in Chapter 2 (2.4). Also refer to PB-50-17, Key Issue 3. |
| S. 2. 47 | 30-Jun-17 | Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates | 2.4.2.3 | 619 and 625 Maple Ave: This policy would preclude any OPA on these lands for additional density. It is not clear how these policies encourage or support intensification and the creation of a broader range and mix of housing. It is requested that modifications be made to permit the higher density stacked townhouse form. | See response to comment S.2.46. |
| S. 2. 48 | 28-Jun-17 | Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates | 2.4.2.3 | 431, 425, 419, 415 Burlington Avenue and 1421, 1415 and 1407 Lakeshore Road: The existing St.Lukes Neighbourhood policy permits only existing uses and single detached dwellings (Burlington Ave) and the ENA policies prohibit privately initiated. Together that means a significant portion of these lands cannot redevelop. This is contrary to the direction that Urban Centres should provide for a broad range of uses at a density higher than the surrounding area. | See response to comment S.2.46. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 49 | 28-Jun-17 | Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates | 2.4.2.3 | 352, 348, 344 Guelph Line and 353 and 359 St. Paul Street: The draft Official Plan should contain policies which allow for intensification at the edges of neighbourhoods such as along Guelph Line to provide an opportunity for a range of housing types in these neighbourhoods. | See response to comment S.2.46. |
| S. 2. 50 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 2.4.2.3 | Too limited. Fails to acknowledge that change and transition can happen in an area. Further it does not permit a proponent to make an application that does not meet those criteria but may still be appropriate, compatible and meet the needs of a segment of the population. | See response to comment S.2.46. |
| S. 2. 51 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.3 | Specific edits for established neighbourhoods provided in comments | See response to comment S.2.27. |
| S. 2. 52 | 30-Aug-17 | Ruth Victor & Assoc on behalf of Halton Interfaith Council | 2.4.2.3 a), b), c), d), & m) | These policies prohibit any opportunity for a privately initiated application to reuse an existing place of worship site. Where a municipality initiates an amendment, restricting the majority of uses to assisted or special needs housing is an undue and inappropriate level of planning restriction on places of worship sites. | Policy deleted. |
| S. 2. 53 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 2.4.2.3 b) | Suggest the following revision: Within Established Neighbourhood Areas, the following forms of intensification shall not be permitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • re-zoning in accordance with the current definitions of Zoning Bylaw 2020; • land assemblies; • plans of subdivision • removal of more trees than stipulated in 4.3.2. Within Established Neighbourhood Areas, the following forms of intensification may be permitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consents to sever, subject to policies in Chapter 12, Implementation and Interpretation, of this Plan; | Policy maintained. The policy proposes to frame the permitted forms of intensification. In accordance with the Planning Act, Zoning By-law amendments, plans of subdivisions cannot be prohibited. The removal of trees would be a consideration in any development application per the development criteria in Chapter 12. A number of revisions have been made to the Growth Framework including the Established Neighbourhood Area policies. Please refer to Chapter 2 (2.4) and the staff report for discussion. See also response to comment S.2.27. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 54 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.3 b) | We like the idea of introducing policies that prohibit privately initiated Official Plan amendments for increased density beyond that permitted through the underlying use designation. Strong language is needed that prevents any Official Plan Amendments beyond existing maximum density. | Refer to response to comment S.2.27. |
| S. 2. 55 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 2.4.2.3 c) | 5166 - 5170 Lakeshore Road: The language "shall not be supported" is inappropriate and removes the decision making ability of Council and presupposes that any application for increased density cannot be supported. Remove this policy language from subsequent drafts. | Refer to response to comment S.2.27. |
| S. 2. 56 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 2.4.2.3 c) | Stating this (Official Plan Amendments for increased height and or density/intensity beyond that which is currently permitted in the underlying land use designation shall not be supported) outright is shortsighted and does not acknowledge the need to evaluate a development application based on its own merits. | Refer to response to comment S.2.27. |
| S. 2. 57 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 2.4.2.3 d) | A proponent should be permitted to bring forward an OPA, the assessment of which should be based on its merits. It should not be left to the City. | Refer to response to comment S.2.27. |
| S. 2. 58 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 2.4.2.4 | Re-assess major gateways to the City and areas where mixed development is being encouraged to see if there is language that can be added to encourage innovative developers to invest in model community building without jeopardizing the retention of adequate employment lands | Comment noted. The City, through the new Official Plan project, has confirmed its urban structure, including areas appropriate for mixed use development. |
| S. 2. 59 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.4 | Does this go as far as saying the city will go out and recruit business to come to our city? As we have limited experience in implementing incentives, we should learn from other municipalities who have been successful and replicate their practices. | Comment noted. The role of the Official Plan is to ensure there are adequate opportunities provided for a mix of employment and economic activities throughout the City. The City in partnership with BEDC and the Region of Halton can develop additional strategies to facilitate growth of jobs throughout the City, and within the City's Area of Employment. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 60 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.4 c) | Do you really want this? You could be leaving yourself open to investing in whole lot of infrastructure when you do not have the resources? You intend to prioritize everything the same? Should consider Employment Secondary areas. | Policy maintained. The policies are supportive of employment growth within all Employment Growth Areas, however priorities for development may be further refined by identifying certain areas as Strategic Investment Areas. BEDC through its Economic Strategy will develop various programs and initiatives to support employment growth and employment development. |
| S. 2. 61 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.4.2.4 d) (viii) | Do we not want to use DPS in other areas particularly in recognized growth areas? | Refer to response to comment S.2.39. |
| S. 2. 62 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.5 general | The use of the phrase "reflecting the existing character of adjacent development" is unsuitable. The policy should strive for new development in harmony with existing development. Similarly the use of the term "compatible" is problematic as this term has been deferred in the existing Official Plan and has never been approved. We would like to discuss different wording with the City that is not only acceptable to the development industry but also approvable. | Policy has been modified. The Official Plan contains a definition of compatible that is different than the existing Official Plan, albeit deferred, definition. Please refer to the definitions section. |
| S. 2. 63 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 2.5 general | Strengthen the commitment to environmental stewardship by including specific strategies for green space and tree canopy development/ conservation in all development and redevelopment policies and objectives. | The development criteria (now found in subsection 12.1.2.(2) require the implementation of the Urban Forestry policies in Section 4.3 and the protection of the Natural Heritage System in accordance with Section 4.2. Further, Parkland Dedication policies would also be used to obtain land or cash in lieu for parks. The policies in these sections outline the specific strategies. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 64 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.5 general | General - In this section, it is important that "fit" be understood. In this light, there needs to be an improved understanding of the definition of compatibility, as this is very subjective in nature. Further, a definition of "land use vision" is required. While we recognize this was discussed in one of the meetings, and industry was referred to Chapter 8, this discusses priorities, and the term land use vision is not included in the chapter. | Refer to response to comment S.2.62. |
| S. 2. 65 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 2.5.1 a) vi) | Flexibility should be added. Within the build boundary and the urban area it can't always be zero impact to NHS or the development does not proceed. Allow for creative solutions. | Comment noted. The test for NHS protection is "no negative impact" in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement. This allows for various approaches to be considered as part of the development approval process, including mitigation. |
| S. 2. 66 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.5.2 | Not sure if this addresses the concept of building better buildings. It may be covered in Chapter 7. | Comment noted. Yes, Chapter 7 Design Excellence covers this concept. |
| S. 2. 67 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.5.2 a) | What are you to use for measuring TDM? | Policy modified to clarify that TDM is provided in accordance with subsection 6.2.10. |
| S. 2. 68 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.5.2 a) | What happened to grading as a compatibility criterion? It made good sense. | Policy maintained. Staff are not aware of a previous grading criterion, however the development criteria require review of stormwater management and grading and drainage plans are a requirement of a complete application (see subsection 12.1.2). |
| S. 2. 69 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 2.5.2 a) | Consider the following as potential intensification criteria: Section 4 criteria, Sustainability Building and Development Guidelines, District Energy Evaluation, Carbon Analysis of proposed fuels, and triple bottom line assessment. | The criteria includes all policies in Chapter 7 which includes Sustainable Design and a link to the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines. The guidelines provide guidance on low carbon buildings and district energy. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 70 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.5.2 a) (v) b) | This section needs further discussion to understand implementation and its effect on developments. It suggests working arrangements between private developers. | Policy maintained. This policy highlights a key consideration that ensures that development does not compromise the ability to develop adjacent parcels. This would only be discussed at the time of assessment of a development application and would be lead by the City. |
| S. 2. 71 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.5.2 a)(vii) | Public service facilities and specific uses, and their proximity to transit is more a function of City transit planning and site location, vs. a requirement to be satisfied through a development proposal. It is listed as a "shall be evaluated", however is outside of the control of private development. | Comment noted. |
| S. 2. 72 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.5.2 a)iv) | This policy is confusing and should be reworded to focus on fit and the mitigation of adverse impacts. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 73 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.5.2 b) i) | what is land use vision? Staff will address in section 2.3 | Policy modified. Refer to Chapter 12, Development Criteria 12.1.2.(1.2). |
| S. 2. 74 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.5.2 b)& c) | This section is problematic since all neighbourhoods in the city are now existing. This takes all mid and high rise buildings and moves them to the periphery of a neighbourhood, because the requirement uses the word shall. There are areas within the mobility hubs, and potential throughout the City, that can accommodate mid and high rise and are not on the periphery of a neighbourhood (i.e.. The draft concepts based on public input from the mobility hubs shows a number of locations where mid and high rise are proposed and NOT on the periphery of a neighbourhood. This needs to be rectified. | Policy modified by moving this consideration in to the Medium Density Residential designation within the Residential Neighbourhood Areas. Refer to Chapter 8, Section 8.3.4. |
| S. 2. 75 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | 2.5.2 b)i) | What does "land use vision of this plan" mean? | Policy modified. Refer to Chapter 12, Development Criteria 12.1.2.(1.2). |
| S. 2. 76 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 2.5.2 e) | The industry needs a better understanding of what criteria will be used to determine if an area-specific plan is required in conjunction with a development. Further, the OP needs to be careful that area-specific plan and financial analysis, as referred to in 6.5.2 Policies are not interchanged. | Policy modified. Refer to Chapter 12, Development Criteria 12.1.2.(1.2). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 77 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Where relevant, include brief cross-references to Chapter 4: Environment & Sustainability to give more weight to the 'sustainable' part of the chapter title and connect to the Strategic Plan: A Healthy and Greener City, as well as cross references to Chapter 6: Infrastructure and Transportation where appropriate. In fact, cross-referencing like this throughout the OP document would demonstrate how the Strategic Plan themes are woven into the OP, and how the various chapters are interconnected and support the four SP directions. | Policy modified. Community Vision and Urban Structure modified to place more emphasis on these elements. Cross references are now described in Section 1.8 and have been improved throughout the plan, however we also note that cross referencing is not exhaustive and all policies of the OP must be read in conjunction with each other. |
| S. 2. 78 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Insert brief cross-references to Chapter 8 to tie together the principles outlined in Chapter 2 to the more detailed implementation of these principles. In particular, a discussion of building footprint vs. height would offer more concrete planning guidelines to ensure that intensification meets the goals of pedestrian and cycling connections and affords sufficient room for green spaces in redevelopment projects. | Policy modified. Chapter 1 now contains a general guide to the plan that explains how Chapter 2 and 8 need to be read together to implement the plan. Cross references are now described in Section 1.8 and have been improved throughout the plan, however we also note that cross referencing is not exhaustive and all policies of the OP must be read in conjunction with each other. |
| S. 2. 79 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Add clearly stated objectives and solid policies to support the inclusion/preservation of green space, both in the downtown core and other high intensity development nodes. | Area Specific Plans are being completed for the Primary Growth Areas, including the downtown and three mobility hubs. These plans will identify natural heritage system areas to be protected, and the identification of existing and new greenspace/parks to be incorporated. Parkland dedication will continue to be a routine component of development applications in all areas of the city. |
| S. 2. 80 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | At minimum, a cross reference to the section on Agricultural System in Chapter 9 would strengthen the plan for sustainable growth in Chapter 2. The production of food locally is a key pillar in the overall sustainability of a community. | Policy modified to recognize the importance of a healthy Agricultural System, and of local food. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWO - SUSTAINABLE GROWTH | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 2. 81 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | The chapter doesn't indicate the importance of reducing energy usage / reducing GHG in the built form. This seems like a significant gap, and a missed opportunity. Integrate messaging about the impact of built form on energy consumption and GHG emissions, and the City's goal of reducing both through better land use planning. | Policy modified. Community vision has been modified. |
| S. 2. 82 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Clarify City System as both an interconnected system of land use areas, and a strategic framework. Current language is confusing. | Policy modified. |
| S. 2. 83 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Language around prioritizing active transportation/transit should be strengthened. | Section 2.3.1 modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 1 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 3.1 c) | We encourage the City to commit to using surplus lands for affordable housing, as a priority over other development. | Policy modified. See proposed new Official Plan policy 3.1.1.2 e). |
| S. 3. 2 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1 general | There is no definition provided in Tab 13 – Definitions for affordable in this context. We note that in this context affordable is not the same as affordable housing – a social housing product. Definition is required. | Policy maintained. There are definitions for affordable housing, assisted housing and special needs housing. The unitalicized term affordable is now used in select policies and the intent is described in each policy. |
| S. 3. 3 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.1.1.1 a) | The policy objective sets out that sufficient supply of suitably designated and serviced residential lands is maintained to meet existing and future housing needs. Burlington is already in non compliance with this policy. Old thinking. | Policy modified. Revised to acknowledge the ability of the city to accommodate residential growth through intensification in mixed use intensification areas as well as residential areas. See proposed new Official Plan policy 3.1.1.1 a). |
| S. 3. 4 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.1.1 b) | While we believe we understand the intention of this paragraph, it may be appropriate to provide some verbiage that recognizes that is it not necessarily the actual existing stock that is required to be maintained, rather the quantity and approximate location of. | Policy modified. |
| S. 3. 5 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.1.1 f) i) | Recognizing that our municipal OPs address rental housing, we submit that Burlington is not in the same category as Toronto for the provision of rental housing. We would recommend the following alternative standards for rental housing provision in this circumstances: “the rental vacancy rate..... has been at or above two percent...” – this is similar to the provision of rental housing in Hamilton, which is far closer in size and makeup to Burlington than is Toronto. | Policy maintained. Policy 86(19) of the Regional Official Plan requires that Local Municipalities use a rental housing vacancy rate of three percent as a minimum threshold to permit the conversion of existing rental housing to ownership tenure or other uses, or the demolition of such housing. See 3.1.2.2 a) |
| S. 3. 6 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.1.1 f) iv) | (f)(iv) The intent of protecting rental rates is generally understood, however the wording here is subjective and needs further clarification. | Policy modified. The policy speaks to impacts being minimized to an acceptable level. |
| S. 3. 7 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.1.1 h) | It may be appropriate to discuss some of the financial tools, noted elsewhere in the document, that the City may use/have at its disposal for the provision of rental housing. | Policy modified by deletion. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 8 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 3.1.1.2 f) | 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. | Refer to comment S.3.5 |
| S. 3. 9 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.2 a) | We note that the PPS requires a municipality to establish targets and policies to meet the current and future needs for housing affordability. Recognizing that a subsequent section commits to working with the Region to update its Municipal Housing Statement, there appears to be a lack of current information to substantiate the targets and rationale for them. Our review could only find a Regional strategy document dated March 2010. It would seem that a more current and frequent review is appropriate. | Policies modified. The Regional Official Plan establishes affordable housing targets and monitoring requirements. Policies promote and encourage the development of affordable housing in the City. See policies within 3.1.1 and 12.3. Annually, the Region prepares a State of Housing Report which includes such information as income and housing cost threshold for affordable housing as well as the achievement of Regional targets related to affordability. |
| S. 3. 10 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.2 b) | This section suggests that affordable housing provisions may be mandated as part of every day developments. This needs to be discussed with our industry on how such determinations will be made, at what stage in the process, etc., as it has a significant implication on the built form, the economic viability of projects. We request that further discussion take place at this time to understand the intent of this section, or wording provided for clarification. | Policy modified. Deleted, however several other policies speak to mechanisms and support for affordable housing. See policies within 3.1.3.(2). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 11 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.2 c) | In various locations within the document, there is discussion about community benefit provisions. We note there is no definition for this term, and for the uninformed reader, it may not be apparent that community benefits are typically provided by a private developer as a result of a Section 37 agreement for which they have received something in return. This, and other section in which community benefits are referred, require clarification to ensure the end user that this is not a standard provision by a developer in applications that meet as of right zoning, densities, etc. Further, we would suggest that a Section 37 bonusing policy be publicly consulted on and updated, given the changing face of the City. | Policy maintained. Policy for Community Benefits are located in Chapter 12. |
| S. 3. 12 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.1.2.1 b) | How do you plan to encourage affordable housing? With land values skyrocketing, construction costs increasing, development application and development charges increasing and supply/demand forces inflating housing prices throughout the GTA how exactly does one build "affordable" housing anymore? Builders will not build if it means losing money doing so. Even if reduced price housing is somehow offered it is sold out immediately and resold at market value for a significant profit. | Policy Modified. Several new objectives for housing affordability have been established in 3.1.3. Affordable housing is a consideration as part of development applications and may also be a consideration of Official Plan Amendments in Secondary Growth Areas and the Established Neighbourhood Areas, as well as part of a Community Benefits process. |
| S. 3. 13 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.1.2.2 b) | How does the designation of land for affordable housing happen when development in Burlington is now limited to reuse of existing lands (*size restrictions and great cost)? Notifying a landowner at the time of development approval is way too late as costs have already been incurred. What exactly does "made available" mean? | Policy modified. Deleted, however several other policies speak to mechanisms and support for affordable housing. See policies within 3.1.3.2. |
| S. 3. 14 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 3.1.2.2 d) | The commitment to processing priority for affordable housing should be as clear as stipulated in 3.1.3.2 g). | Policy modified. See policy 3.1.4(2) e) |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 15 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.1.2.2 d) | Not fair practice. At least when the OMB existed developers could appeal non-decisions after 180 days. Will the municipality be able to accept applications fees and then sit on applications as long as they want with no recourse? | Policy modified to recognize the importance of development applications that would provide assisted and special needs housing and direct priority for those receiving funding from senior levels of government. This policy is not intended to relieve the City from meeting the non-decision time frame as established in the Planning Act. Refer to 3.1.4.(2). |
| S. 3. 16 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 3.1.2.2d) | Revise wording to "The City may give processing priority to development applications which will provide the type, size and tenure of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being needs of City residents" | Policy modified to recognize the importance of development applications that would provide assisted and special needs housing and direct priority for those receiving funding from senior levels of government. Refer to 3.1.4.(2). |
| S. 3. 17 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.1.3.2 b) | Notifying a landowner at the time of development approval is way too late as costs have already been incurred. What exactly does "made available" mean? If the City wants land for this type of housing, then they need to buy it. | Policy modified. See policy 3.1.3.2 j) which identifies Area Specific Planning process as having detailed housing policies which, among other things, may require the designation of land for <i>affordable housing</i> . |
| S. 3. 18 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.1.3.2 b) | Our comments here are the same as those stated for 3.1.2 (b) above - We request that further discussion take place at this time to understand the intent of this section, or wording provided for clarification. | Policy modified. Deleted, however several other policies speak to mechanisms and support for assisted and special needs housing. See policies within 3.1.4.2. |
| S. 3. 19 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.1.3.2 g) | Not fair practice. At least when the OMB existed developers could appeal non-decisions after 180 days. Will the municipality be able to accept applications fees and then sit on applications as long as they want with no recourse? | Refer to comment S.3.15. |
| S. 3. 20 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.2.1 d) | How long will the City-wide Post Secondary Institution Strategy take? When will it begin? In meetings with City staff we've been told they want to undertake this study before determining appropriate uses at Bronte Creek Meadows. What if no institutions want to come to Burlington? Will lands be designated and placed on hold indefinitely just like the employment lands that remain vacant for decades? How is this fair to landowners who may have a different vision for their private property? | This level of detail would not be provided in the Official Plan, however prioritization of various initiatives such as a City-Wide Post Secondary Institution Strategy are considered on an annual basis to determine timing, budget and resources. All lands will have permitted uses in this plan and landowners have development rights in accordance with this Plan and its designations. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 21 | 16-Oct-17 | Rev. Michael Brooks, Port Nelson United Church | 3.2.2 | Policies for surplus institutional lands are too inflexible and overly restrictive. Other uses than affordable or special needs housing should be considered, and the Plan should recognize that not every parcel needs to include a majority of units with assisted or special needs housing. | See response to comment S.2.46 and S.2.27. |
| S. 3. 22 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.2.2 c) | This contradicts discussions we've had with City planning staff regarding Bronte Creek Meadows. | Policy modified. The policy permits public service facilities that are ancillary employment uses and directs that other public service facilities should (a convincing planning reason is required in order not to fully comply with an Official Plan Policy) be discouraged in the area of employment. The City-Wide Post Secondary Institution Strategy identified in the Strategic Plan, and in this Plan will assess various sites within the City, which may identify lands within Area of Employment and could serve as planning rationale for permitting a public service facility within the employment lands designations, or clarify that a given public service facility is an ancillary employment use. |
| S. 3. 23 | 30-Aug-17 | Ruth Victor & Assoc, on behalf of Halton Interfaith Council | 3.2.2 d) and e) | Proposed restrictions on places of worship in Employment Areas will impair ability of smaller and newly established congregations to locate in the City, and these policies need to be reviewed and revised. | Policy modified to simplify and reduce duplication was prepared to achieve conformity with the Regional Official Plan and to generally continue the City's approach. |
| S. 3. 24 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.2.2 i) and ii) | If Bronte Creek Meadows, a designated greenfield area, is not considered a desirable location for a post secondary institution, which is fine, why are we being forced to wait until after this study is completed. | Refer to response S.3.22 |
| S. 3. 25 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.2.2 q) | As outlined in previous submissions/sections of the draft OP, the criteria here are more appropriate for a zoning bylaw than an OP. Public service facilities and specific uses, and their proximity to transit is more a function of City transit planning and site location, vs. a requirement to be satisfied through a development proposal. It is listed as a "shall be evaluated", however is outside of the control of private development. | Policy modified. Refer to Chapter 8, section 8.3.10. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 26 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 3.3 general | Please clarify does the Special Resource Area/Linkages include NHS Linkages, as defined in the Draft New OP. In particular, can Linkages be provided for the purposes of parkland dedication (as set out in section 12.1.3.6)? | The Special Resource Area/Linkages function referred to in this policy is identified by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan and may not reflect the same linkage areas identified by the Natural Heritage System. Parkland dedication of these areas would be evaluated according to the Parkland Dedication policies of the plan, unless they are determined to be a part of the Natural Heritage System. |
| S. 3. 27 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 3.3 general | Current Parkland Dedication rates do not address changing needs in intensification areas. Update the City's Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan to reflect the new needs of the City. | Policy maintained. We agree that parkland dedication needs are changing in intensification areas. The city will complete an updated Parks Master Plan that examines the need for parkland in the City prior to amending Official Plan policies related to parkland dedication rates. Parks and Open Space staff forecast the delivery of a new Parks Master Plan by the end of 2018/early 2019, at which time OP policies will be amended accordingly. |
| S. 3. 28 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 3.3 general | The OP addresses green space in general terms. Prepare a Green space Inventory and Acquisition Plan. | Policy maintained. In the context of a land use plan, green space is achieved and acquired through a number of different policies and programs E.g. Parkland dedication, Natural Heritage System Securement Policies, Urban Forestry Policies, Water Resource Policies, etc. Staff would be happy to discuss any additional green space acquisition suggestions that Burlington Green may have. A green space inventory and acquisition plan for the Cootes to Escarpment Park system is already in place in collaboration with partners at Conservation Halton, Halton Region, RBG and Hamilton. |
| S. 3. 29 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.3.2 d) | Land for new parks doesn't exist anymore; therefore the entire parkland dedication idea needs to be revamped or removed. | See response S.3.27. |
| S. 3. 30 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 3.3.2 e) | Provide a timeline for the update the existing Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan for accountability purposes | Policy maintained as this process is outside the scope of the new OP project. Parks and Open Space staff forecast the delivery of a new Parks Master Plan by the end of 2018/early 2019. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 31 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.3.2 f) | If those trails or connections don't exist already there's likely not going to be much of an opportunity to create them now. | Policy maintained. At the time of development approval opportunities to connect to the larger trail system, proposed or existing will be examined. |
| S. 3. 32 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.3.2 g) | There is no land for development of new parks. | Policy maintained. New parks will be developed through area specific plans, both in existing urban areas and in greenfield areas, and through parkland dedication. Also, the city may use new parkland approaches in the future following the Parks Master Plan update (e.g. Strata Parks). |
| S. 3. 33 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.3.2 i) | There is no opportunity for more "neighbourhood" type developments like we've seen in the past. If the park doesn't already exist there's likely not going to be much of an opportunity to create them now. | Refer to response S.3.32. |
| S. 3. 34 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.3.2 j) | On what land? Does the City have significant undeveloped land holdings, or will efforts be made to purchase such land? | Policy maintained. New parks will be developed through area specific plans, both in existing urban areas and in greenfield areas, and through parkland dedication, of either land or cash in lieu which can be used by the city to secure property. |
| S. 3. 35 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.4.3 | This section needs to establish that generally, the provision of public art on the part of private development is done as a community benefit (see above) and is done as part of a Section 37 agreement. It needs to be clear that this is not a requirement of site plan or development, but rather is "over and above". We would suggest that wording be included that for public art in capital projects, etc. that funding be addressed. | Policy maintained. The policy speaks to the use of "applicable planning tools and processes" to encourage public art (e.g. Section 37). |
| S. 3. 36 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 3.4.3 d) | So in other words the provision for public art will be a condition of approval? What if the developer doesn't want to spend money unnecessarily for the sake of public art? What does public art have to do with planning approvals and development? Where in the Planning Act does it state public art is a requirement? If the City wants public art, then pay for public art. | Refer to response S.3.35 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 37 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Goulet, PERL | 3.5 general | Appendix G 'Cultural Heritage Landscape Study Area' map encompasses the Mount Nemo Plateau and slopes. Since the Province did not accept the NEC Escarpment Protection designations for the Mount Nemo Plateau, the City needs to strengthen its rural protective policies for this unique Plateau. | Comment noted. Policy 3.5.2.5.1 provides the strengthening requested. |
| S. 3. 38 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5 preamble | Suggest adding the wording "... archaeological resources, many of which are privately owned and are located..." and also, replace irreplaceable with important. | Preamble modified to acknowledge private ownership. The word "irreplaceable" has been maintained to acknowledge that cultural heritage resources are lost forever if the City permits them to be removed. |
| S. 3. 39 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.1 b) | Like the idea of the objectives but less heavy handed...HB is not in favour of stewardship or custodial language which deems people are not "owners". | Objective modified. The word stewardship is maintained for consistency with natural heritage policies. |
| S. 3. 40 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.1 d) | Reject the sentiment that this could be done at all costs to the Burlington taxpayer or worse the home owner. Recommend adding language such as "...To minimize, wherever economically feasible, the demolition, destruction....". | Objective maintained. The policy is worded to allow flexibility by using the word "minimize" rather than "prohibit". |
| S. 3. 41 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.1 f) | Character areas are not clearly defined and therefore do not fall under the OHA, so this should be modified to Heritage Conservation District or omitted completely. | Objective modified. Wording revised to reflect that the heritage character of an area must be defined through study. |
| S. 3. 42 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.1 h) | Recommend continuing to emphasize significance. We appreciate the "valued" language as it assumes a monetary value and we endorse this thinking. | Objective modified. (1) Definition of "cultural heritage resources" in Ch. 13 has been modified to match the definition in the Growth Plan. This definition resolves the question of significance. (2) Objective simplified by removing redundant language that already appears in definition of cultural heritage landscapes. (3) Use of the word "valued" in policy refers to a range of values including cultural, historical, design, social, and economic. |
| S. 3. 43 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.1 k) | Need to be clear that not all cultural heritage resources are City owned...there is a distinction that needs to continue to be appreciated. | Objective modified to provide the requested clarity. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 44 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Goulet, PERL | 3.5.2.1 | Does this OP policy include the possibility of reviving the 'Rural Cultural Landscape Conservation Designation' for the Mount Nemo Plateau? If not, why not? | Comment noted. Policies do not preclude designation of the Mount Nemo Plateau. Section 3.5.2.5.1 provides guidance. |
| S. 3. 45 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.1 | Heritage Burlington, Council and Staff have dialed back the rhetoric that once characterized heritage exchanges, demonstrated clear respect for property owners and expanded our incentive program. The policies related to Cultural Heritage Resources must continue to build on the positive and constructive relationship that we have established over the past few years. Going forward, it will be imperative that the policies in the OP provide direction to Council and Staff to ensure we maintain our “carrot not stick approach” and a development “tool kit” comprised of both financial and non-financial options that would permit designation, where necessary and at the same time, not penalize the owner(s) of the property. | Comment noted. |
| S. 3. 46 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.1 | Suggest adding: a) The City shall recognize the word and spirit of the Council approved 2012 report” NEW APPROACH TO CONSERVING BURLINGTON’S HERITAGE”. | Policy maintained. Reference to this document is not required in the Official Plan. |
| S. 3. 47 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.1 | Suggest adding: b) The City shall acknowledge and adhere to the principle that the conservation of privately-owned cultural resources may be accomplished with the assistance of the community at large, not solely at the cost of the individual property owner. | Policy maintained. Section 3.5.2.1 refers to programs that are available to support owners. |
| S. 3. 48 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.1 a) | As mentioned above, it is important to distinguish between what is City owned what is not. Specific wording recommended in comments. | Policy modified to provide the requested clarity. |
| S. 3. 49 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.1 c) | Omission of cemeteries. Historic cemeteries are equally valuable. Specific wording recommended in comments. | Policy modified to use "should" instead of "shall" and to reflect that a cemetery is a type of cultural heritage landscape, as defined in Chapter 13. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/ Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 50 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.1 d) | What context would the City have non-government funding? Also, important to emphasize the use of both financial and non-financial tools. | Policy modified to refer to a wide range of tools available to the municipality. Official Plan does not need to identify possible future sources of funding. The policy as proposed constitutes a strategy. |
| S. 3. 51 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.1 e) | Standards are already mentioned and limit us. For example, our tax rebate program is an initiative but not a standard per say. Specific wording changes recommended in comments. | Policy maintained. The Standards and Guidelines guide the conservation of cultural heritage resources. Policy 3.5.2.1 (d) refers to the tax rebate and other funding initiatives. |
| S. 3. 52 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.2 a) & b) | Wherever possible it is important to emphasize the significance. This ties back to the OHA as well. Also, emphasize the new approach and our collaboration with property owners and other groups alike. Specific wording recommended in comments. | Policy modified to list Heritage Burlington and property owners first. "Co-operation" not added as it is not required by the Heritage Act. |
| S. 3. 53 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.3 & 3.5.2.4 | Again, we'd like to see significant cultural and not just cultural referenced throughout these sections and not limit the City to certain options. | Policy maintained. Definition of "cultural heritage resources" has been defined to conform to provincial plans and address the question of "significance". |
| S. 3. 54 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.5 c) & v) | Again, we are looking to have options and not limiting...options may be outside our borders e.g. across Derry Rd to Milton or to Hamilton | Policy modified to allow for "other conservation solutions as appropriate". |
| S. 3. 55 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.5.2.5 d) | It is recognized through the OP that the Heritage Impact Study is required prior to any approvals being received, versus the potential practice of being required as part of a complete application. | Policy modified. Wording revised to clarify that studies are required to recognize complete application, to be consistent with 12.1.5.1.2.1. The policy acknowledges the potential that study will not be required where no impact is foreseen. |
| S. 3. 56 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 3.5.2.5 i) | A definition is missing for landmark trees. | Policy modified to provide the requested clarity. |
| S. 3. 57 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.5.1 | The word "major" needs to be defined and best financial so this does not include taking down a tree but more about a development over \$100Ketc...Might this be something included in the NEC or other provincial legislation? | Policy maintained. The Plan does not define major or minor in order to allow for interpretation subject to context, scale, and potential impacts. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 58 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.5.2 | Some Archaeological companies do not respect the cultural sensitivity of the peoples they are excavating or perceive the project as being more important than heritage they are excavating. These archaeological excavations result in the discarding archaeological objects from an excavation to hasten an excavation and reduce the likelihood that further research into the site will continue. The purpose of requiring monitors on an excavation, while not always required in a Stage 2 excavation under the Ontario Heritage Act, will ensure that Burlington actively respects the heritage of the people and culture they are excavating, while taking a leading role in encouraging other Municipalities to preserve their archaeological heritage. This guideline presently does not exist in the Burlington Heritage By-Laws, but it is recommended that the City enact. | Comment noted. |
| S. 3. 59 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.5.2 | Suggest adding: The City of Burlington shall under archaeology excavations have monitors on site from the beginning of any stage 2 excavation until the research on the site concludes in adherence to the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport legislation of the Ontario Heritage Act. | Policy modified. This comment as stated cannot be addressed in the Official Plan. Policy 3.5.2.5.2 (e) added to address the intent of this comment. Policy 11.2.1(c) may further address the intent of this comment. |
| S. 3. 60 | 16-Jul-17 | Heritage Burlington | 3.5.2.5.2 | Suggest adding: Monitors shall be on the excavation site to register objects found and control the sensitivity of actions taken by the archaeologists ensuring relevant objects found are recorded, and preserved in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act. | Policy modified. This comment as stated cannot be addressed in the Official Plan. Policy 3.5.2.5.2 (e) added to address the intent of this comment. Policy 11.2.1(c) may further address the intent of this comment. |
| S. 3. 61 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Include access to food in the definition of a complete community and create a section in Chapter 3 to address it, or at minimum, a cross-reference to section 4.9. | Policy modified. Preamble now highlights how the elements of a complete community are delivered by all sections of the plan, not just Chapter 3. Existing definition of a complete community is maintained to conform to provincial plans. |
| S. 3. 62 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Provide more clarity on the strategy for the transition period from our communities today to complete communities | Comment noted. It is intended that transition, directed by the policies of this plan, will produce incremental change that moves closer to the Community Vision. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THREE - COMPLETE COMMUNITIES | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 3. 63 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Add appropriate policies to the OP in the “Complete Communities” and “Transportation” sections to achieve the goal of walkability, and include the adoption of a walkability score tool to measure results. | Policies throughout the plan have been modified and improved to promote walkability. The walkability score tool has been identified in the Strategic Plan and would be implemented outside of the Official Plan. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 1 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.1 general | Climate Change and Air Quality fifth line, add “effective” after “sustainable”. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 2 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.1.2 | Address GHG and fuel emissions as part of Climate Change Objectives and Policies. | Policy modified. Preamble and policy updated to refer to greenhouse gas and fuel emissions. |
| S. 4. 3 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.1.2 a) (iii) | Or build intensification so existing or planned transit can be used. | Policy maintained. The policy as written achieves this effect. |
| S. 4. 4 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.1.2 a) (ix) | Could effective on-site non-fossil fuel energy generation not help? | Policy modified. Existing policy 4.1.2 vii) addresses this consideration, and policy 4.1.2 xi) was added to reflect a broader scope of energy considerations. |
| S. 4. 5 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.1.2 a) (x) | How will this help? | Policy maintained. This helps by ensuring sensitive land uses (e.g. residential) are not impacted by air quality impacts like dust and odour. |
| S. 4. 6 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.1.2 a) (xi) & (xii) | Proposed additions: 1. Control air emissions from manufacturing operations AND encourage energy conservation | 1. Policy maintained. Air emissions from manufacturing operations are controlled by the provincial government. 2. Policy modified. policy 4.1.2 xi) was added to reflect a broader scope of energy considerations, such as energy conservation. |
| S. 4. 7 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.2 general | Include the urban tree canopy as part of the natural features on the City’s Natural Heritage System. | Policy maintained. Section 4.3 recognizes the protection and enhancement of the urban forest, both in and out of the natural heritage system. |
| S. 4. 8 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.2 general | Make a stronger commitment to the Cootes to Escarpment Ecopark System and how the City plans to support its expansion. | Policy maintained. The development of the EcoPark is supported through the Natural Heritage Securement policies in Section 4.2.5, and Parks policies in Section 3.3. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 9 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.2 general | Emphasize tree protection in the Natural Heritage System sub-chapter. | Policy maintained. Tree protection is addressed in Section 4.3, and includes protection of trees in the Natural Heritage System. Policies in 4.2.4 require an EIA study that includes an evaluation, impact assessment and recommendations related to woodlands and other vegetation. |
| S. 4. 10 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.2 general | Add a section regarding the protection of spawning areas, dens and nests from human disturbance, if they are located within the natural heritage system and don't interfere with existing human activities. The goal should be to protect, preserve, restore and enhance the productivity and biodiversity within the city's natural heritage system. | Policy maintained. Spawning areas, dens and nests are protected as wildlife habitat through the policies in Section 4.2. Significant wildlife habitat is identified as a component of the Natural Heritage System in Section 4.2.2 c). |
| S. 4. 11 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.2 general | Encourage habitat protection for endangered species in all land uses, including urban parks, and areas zoned for residential, commercial and industrial use. | Policies 4.2.2 b) and c) as modified indicate that the habitat of endangered and threatened species is included in the NHS, including habitat that is not within the NHS designated on Schedule C or Schedule J. Thus the NHS policies would apply to habitat that is not within the NHS designation as shown on those Schedules. |
| S. 4. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.2 general | Include natural corridor improvements and enhancements such as wildlife bridges and tunnels to cross major roads and railways to reduce collision risk and level of human disturbance. | Policy maintained. Detailed policies regarding mitigation measures such as this are not dealt with in the Official Plan but are addressed through the Environmental Impact Assessment and/or Subwatershed Study process. |
| S. 4. 13 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2 general | Why would you ever want to strike a “balance between protection and enhancement of the Natural Heritage System and community growth and development” - Dangerous statement to put in here | Policy modified by removing this sentence. |
| S. 4. 14 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2 general | How is this different from the Green System? | Policy modified. Section 2.2.2 d) revised to indicate that the Green System is made up of three components: the NHS; Major Parks and Open Space and other city parks. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 15 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.1 e) | It should be the other way around. Not enough importance is placed on the role of agriculture and the challenges it faces because of competing NHS policies. At the pace which NHS policies are getting more and more restrictive to farming activity, agriculture is being strangled out of the Prime Agricultural Area. NHS is important, but without agriculture, we don't eat. | Comment noted. The OP only regulates lot creation and building. It does not regulate farming activity such as the growing of crops. |
| S. 4. 16 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.1 g) | Consider adding "and away from NHS". | Policy maintained. The policies place restrictions on development to maintain and enhance the Natural Heritage System but do not direct all development away from the NHS. |
| S. 4. 17 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.2.1 g) | The City should ensure that mapping is available for hazard lands. | Comment noted. Appendix E contains Conservation Halton Approximate Regulated Limit Mapping which includes hazardous lands. |
| S. 4. 18 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.1 j) | Consider adding "and water quality" | Policy modified. Objective added respecting water quality and quantity. |
| S. 4. 19 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.1 l) | This encourages illegal trespass onto private property and farmland. Rural property owner rights are infringed upon every day because of policies like this one. | Comment noted. Section 4.2.2 o) makes it clear that designation of lands as NHS does not indicate that those lands are open to the public. |
| S. 4. 20 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.2.1 m) iii) | The application of natural heritage system policies to lands adjacent to the system needs to be defined and clarified. Policies applicable to the system itself is not necessarily appropriate for lands adjacent. | Policy modified. Clarifies that the policy applies to lands within 120 m of NHS or a Key Natural Feature in an adjacent municipality. |
| S. 4. 21 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.1 Objectives a) , b) and f) | Change objectives to start "To maintain, enhance and restore" | Policy modified. Objectives a) and b) revised to be consistent with Provincial policy. |
| S. 4. 22 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.2 c) (vi) | Is Hamilton Conservation Authority not involved on west side of Burlington? | Comment noted. Burlington is entirely under the jurisdiction of Conservation Halton. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 23 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.2.2 f) | Further refinements that occur at a draft plan of subdivision stage through a study accepted by the City and Region as set out in policy 4.2.2.f), could further trigger a requirement for an additional OPA, shortly after the completion of the above OPA. Greater flexibility should be provided in the language of policy 4.2.2.f) of the Draft New OP to allow for City discretion regarding requirement for multiple OPAs related to the refinement of the NHS. | Policy modified and now conforms to the Region's Official Plan. Please see 4.2.2 f). |
| S. 4. 24 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.2.2 f) | It is unclear if the "other components within it" refers to components within the Natural Heritage System or within the Key Natural Heritage Features. We believe it is the former. Revise reference to "other components within it the Natural Heritage System" | Policy modified. Reference to "other components" deleted. |
| S. 4. 25 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.2 General Policies, b) | What about Natural Heritage shown on Schedules C and N?? | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 26 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.2 j) | What are Major and Minor Changes? These should be spelt out. | Policy deleted. Please refer to policy 4.2.2 f). |
| S. 4. 27 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.2.2 j) | There may be some ambiguity between what is a minor refinement and a major refinement requiring an OPA. Policy 4.2.2.j) should allow for City discretion regarding when an amendment is required in circumstances of major refinements. Suggest revising policy to remove reference to "minor" and modify from shall to may require an amendment. | See response S.4.26. |
| S. 4. 28 | 29-Jun-17 | PERL | 4.2.2 j) | "Major changes...or removal or addition of Key Natural Features on Schedule N..., shall require an amendment to this Plan." This Policy should also require public meeting(s). | Policy deleted. Please now refer to 4.2.2 f). The Planning Act requires that the City hold a public meeting when considering Official Plan Amendment. Policies on public participation are detailed in Chapter 11. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 29 | 29-Jun-17 | PERL | 4.2.2 k) | "...the review of a development application, it is found that there are natural heritage feature(s) or function that have not been adequately identified or evaluated, or new information has become available, the applicant shall be required to have an Environmental Impact Assessment prepared..." This Policy should add {or potential for species at risk}. This became determinative in the denial of the Nelson Aggregate new quarry application on Mount Nemo. The applicant, Nelson Aggregate, did not identify the presence of endangered Jefferson Salamanders. | Policy maintained. Key Natural Features, as defined in the new OP, include the habitat of threatened and endangered species. Thus this policy would apply to potential habitat of such species. |
| S. 4. 30 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.2 l) | We lost 40 acres of designated Prime Agricultural Area, all because we let the property go fallow as part of normal farm practices, and have been fighting the Provincial Government for the past 5 years unsuccessfully to farm our land. The word "existing" should be deleted. | Policy maintained. As the objective of the OP is to protect and maintain Key Natural Features new agricultural development is not permitted. This policy conforms to the Halton OP and to the Niagara Escarpment Plan policies respecting Escarpment Natural Areas. |
| S. 4. 31 | 29-Jun-17 | PERL | 4.2.2 m) (i) | "...prohibited development and site alteration within: a. b. c. d. This Policy should add e. {significant woodlands designated within the Natural Heritage System}. | Policy maintained. Further studies and site visits required to confirm woodland significance and boundaries and determine whether development should be prohibited. |
| S. 4. 32 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.2 m) ii) | The "no negative impact" test is no longer appropriate given its subjective nature. Any development or site alteration could be argued to have a negative impact depending on a person's point of view. It should be a matter of identifying the impact and then determine if/how compensation can be provided to mitigate that impact. | Policy maintained. The 2014 PPS and the Halton Region OP specify that development is not permitted unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impact. |
| S. 4. 33 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.2 m)i)c) | Placing a prohibition on development and site alteration over the entire rural area (Natural Heritage System) will end agriculture as we know it. Ploughing a farm field has been interpreted by Provincial authorities, as evidenced by the example given related to policy 4.2.2 l), where ploughing our designated Prime Agricultural Area would result in fines and possible imprisonment. | Policy maintained. The policies permit all types, sizes and intensities of agricultural use outside Rural Settlement Areas and Key Natural Heritage Features. The OP does not prohibit agricultural activities such as ploughing. Agricultural buildings may be permitted if it is demonstrated that there will be no negative impact on natural features. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 34 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.2 n) | Again this is the old way of thinking. Subdivision applications where blocks of land can be dedicated to the City won't be happening like they used to. | Comment noted. |
| S. 4. 35 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.2 p) i) | Good. This needs to be emphasized to the public, not just hidden in the Official Plan which most residents don't ever read. | Comment noted. |
| S. 4. 36 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.2 p)ii) | Arguably, by designating private lands as NHS and enforcing what can and cannot be done on that property the City does have an interest in those lands. If property owners are left with no opportunity to use their property the way they want the City should be forced into a position of either purchasing the property, or at least waiving any and all property taxes. This is expropriation without compensation. | Policy modified. Reference to assuming an interest in those lands deleted. |
| S. 4. 37 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.2.2.b) | Missing a reference to Schedule C | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 38 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 4.2.2; Schedule J | Key Natural Features have been broadly expanded upon. They should only reflect what is clearly defined so as not to remove agricultural land from agricultural use or fragment the agricultural land base. | Policy maintained. The Key Natural Features correspond to the Key Features identified and mapped in the Region's OP and are in conformity with the Region's Plan. |
| S. 4. 39 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.2.3 | We recognize that this section and the policies is separate from, and is not intended to address or enhance issues associated with the Provincial Greenbelt Plan. However, a clarification statement to this effect should be included, given the document uses the term Greenbelt frequently in this section, which in current times is generally known to mean the green areas between urban development and rural areas around the Greater Holden Horseshoe. | Policy modified. Section 4.2.3 a) revised to clarify that the policies in this Section of the OP implement the policies of the Provincial Greenbelt Plan. |
| S. 4. 40 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.3 c) | Why do there have to be this many different sets of policies essentially enforcing the same thing, and this many different sets of approvals, applications, fees etc. This causes confusion for landowners trying to cut through the red tape when trying to submit a development application. | Policy maintained. This Section is included to clarify the relationship between the Greenbelt NHS policies and the City's NHS policies and conforms with the Region's OP. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 41 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 4.2.3 d) | Changes to the Greenbelt NHS boundaries...add must be approved by the Province. | Policy modified. The boundaries of the Greenbelt NHS are identified in the Provincial Greenbelt Plan and once incorporated into the City's OP can only be modified by the Province through amendment to that Plan. Key Natural Heritage features within the Greenbelt NHS have been identified by the Region and may be refined by the municipalities when dealing with development applications or via a municipal zoning by-law update. |
| S. 4. 42 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.3 h (i) | Fourth Line, Consider adding "and/" before "or". | Policy maintained. The policy conforms with the Greenbelt Plan. |
| S. 4. 43 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 4.2.3 h) | Requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. Add: that EIA must comply with Greenbelt development policies; and must be approved by the City, Region and where appropriate Conservation Authority. | Policy modified to clarify that the EIA must be to the satisfaction of the Region, the City and The Conservation Authority. The policy indicates the Greenbelt development policies that the EIA must address. |
| S. 4. 44 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.3 j) | Policy 4.2.3 h) identifies the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for any development proposed within 120m of a Key Natural Feature for the purpose of identifying a vegetation protection zone. Why then is a 30m minimum dictated without the benefit of an EIA? If 30m is needed why make the proponent spend thousands of dollars on a report which, even if it recommends 15m is still going to be enforced at 30m. Either eliminate the need for an EIA or let the EIA dictate what zone is appropriate under the site specific circumstances. | Comment noted. The policy is in conformity with the Region's OP, which is in conformity with the policy in the 2005 Greenbelt Plan. |
| S. 4. 45 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.3 k) | (i) "no alternative" – How often does this occur? | Comment noted. This wording is required for conformity with the Greenbelt Plan and the Region's OP. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 46 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.3 k) | (ii) "Impact ... minimized to the maximum extent possible" – how often does this occur? | Comment noted. |
| S. 4. 47 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 4.2.4 | OP should clearly state that EIA requirements do not apply where a building or structure requires only a building permit. | Comment noted. Under the OP an EIA is only required for development requiring approval under the Planning Act (see the definition of development). An EIA is not required where only a building permit is required. The City will work with the Region to update the Region's EIA Guidelines. |
| S. 4. 48 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.2.4 a) (i) b. | Should a smaller size than 1000 square metres be used? | Policy maintained. This question could be considered through the Region's OP review. |
| S. 4. 49 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 4.2.4 f) | Add that, through the EIA process the boundaries of Key Natural Features must also be corroborated by the Niagara Escarpment Commission where appropriate. | Policy maintained. While the Niagara Escarpment Plan designates Escarpment Natural Areas and Escarpment Protection Areas it does not delineate and map Key Natural Features. |
| S. 4. 50 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 4.2.5 | Natural Heritage Securement. Language could be altered from MAY to SHALL and should only apply in the case of development requiring an Official Plan Amendment and only in the case of Key Features and/or Escarpment Natural Area to prevent agricultural land from being removed from agricultural use. | Policy modified to clarify that in the Rural Area, outside Settlement Areas, the policy respecting dedication of natural heritage lands will only apply to Official Plan Amendments. |
| S. 4. 51 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.2.5 c) | What if a landowner does not want to dedicate their land free of charge? Development land is at a premium, and isn't cheap, so what gives the City the right to just take it? The comment above with respect to the 30m minimum zone in combination with this policy ensures the City will acquire valuable land at no cost, which is not fair to the landowner. At minimum, this land should at least count towards parkland dedication, which it currently doesn't. It's one thing to require dedication of roads, but this policy allows for the possibility of taking otherwise useable property. | Policy maintained. The policy indicates that the City shall seek the dedication of NHS lands through the planning approval process, not that it shall require the dedication of these lands. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 52 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 4.2; Schedule J | The Natural Heritage System (NHS) should be an overlay on the Rural Land Use Map, not a designation. | Policy maintained. Schedule 1: Land Use- Rural Area combines the Agricultural Land Base and Natural Heritage System mapping, showing the full extent of the Agricultural Land Base. |
| S. 4. 53 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.3 general | Need more solution focused mechanisms in place to protect the tree canopy. All development proposals and infrastructure projects, including City projects, should be required to preserve existing healthy trees and require the integration of trees into parking lots and other impervious areas. | Policy maintained. This suggestion is addressed in policies 4.3.2 d) and h). |
| S. 4. 54 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.3 general | Assess the results from the implementation of the Urban Forest Management Plan and a review of any new related policy based on experience to date (e.g. violation of tree protection agreements during construction). | Comment noted. All policies were written in conjunction with staff who have experience implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan to benefit from experience to date. |
| S. 4. 55 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.3 general | Should we not mention something about a Tree Bylaw? | Council did not approve a city wide by-law. A pilot tree bylaw for the Roseland Character Area is being developed, however it does not require OP policy to be implemented. |
| S. 4. 56 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.3 general | The Urban Forest Management Plan needs to be updated. It is more than five years old. | Comment noted and referred to Roads and Parks Maintenance, the lead department on the Urban Forest Management Plan. |
| S. 4. 57 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.3.2 d) i) | Replace "should" with "shall": the location of existing healthy trees shall be considered when establishing the location and building envelope of a proposed development | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 58 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.3.2 e) | Replace "should" with "shall": Replacement and compensation planting requirements shall consider onsite tree removals that occurred prior to and after the submission of a development application. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 59 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.3.2 g) | Add: "that are fed from surface drainage into lower elevation ground without curbs (to reduce the need to water the trees)" in the Zoning By-law. | Policy maintained. However, this concept is encouraged through the Low Impact Development policy in section 4.4.2.(2) j). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 60 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.3.2 Policies d) | What about replacing unhealthy trees with healthy trees? | Policy 4.3.2 d) iii) modified. Trees of varying levels of health are all currently considered in tree replacement requirements. |
| S. 4. 61 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.3.2 Policies e) | Great idea!! | Comment noted. Thanks. |
| S. 4. 62 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.3.2.(d).(iii) | Good policy. Why can't this same concept apply to the Natural Heritage System in cases where development is desirable, but with it comes the need to remove trees. Given the significant challenges with development nowadays, this sort of flexibility and openness to creative solutions which can result in a win-win scenario should be encouraged. | Policy maintained. Provincial and Regional plans and policies do not permit development that will have a significant negative impact on key natural features. While individual trees can be replanted, this is very different from replacing a woodland, which is a complex ecosystem made up of a large number of interdependent species in a specific physical setting. |
| S. 4. 63 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.4.1.1 and 4.4.1.2 | Section 4.4.1.1 and 4.4.1.2 appear to be two separate lists of different objectives for Watershed Management. We presume that Section 4.4.1.2 was intended to be titled "Water Resource and Stormwater Management Objectives" based on subsequent section titles. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 64 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.4.1.1 c) | What about protection of species like fish etc.? | Policy maintained. This is covered by Natural Heritage System policies which includes wildlife habitat and fish habitat. |
| S. 4. 65 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.4.1.2 l) | What about controlling the quantity of water running off building or site? | New objective added. |
| S. 4. 66 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.4.1.2 l) | The word Stormwater at the beginning of this sentence should be removed (typo). | Policy modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 67 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.4.2 | What about a policy to encourage stewardship of watersheds by Local Land Owners? | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 68 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.4.2.1 a) | Is there not a partnership with Source Water Protection as well? | Source Protection is implemented by the Region of Halton in conjunction with Conservation Halton |
| S. 4. 69 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.4.2.1 a) | While the City acknowledges that watershed and subwatershed studies may be reviewed from time to time “and update every five years”, we note that many of the studies listed in Appendix C are decades old with no current review. We are aware of instances where this is hindering development potential (i.e. Rambo Creek subwatershed study), and urge the City to commit to the review of these studies especially in areas where redevelopment is expected. | Comment noted. A SWS update will be undertaken as part of the Area Specific Plan process for areas where the level of natural heritage/water resource issues warrant a SWS and redevelopment is expected (e.g. Mobility Hubs). |
| S. 4. 70 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.4.2.1 c) | What Schedule is used for Urban Watershed Plans? | Policy modified to reference Schedule C - Land Use Urban Area. |
| S. 4. 71 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 4.4.2.1 e) (i) | Add endangered and threatened species to the inventory of items included in the inventory of environmental data to be included in sub-watershed studies | Policy modified. Now references key natural features which includes endangered and threatened species, fish habitat and other features noted in Section 4.2.2 c). |
| S. 4. 72 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.4.2.1 f) | Should reference subsection (e) not (d) | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 73 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.4.2.1(d)(xi) | This policy should allow for recommended ranges for buffers and setbacks. Modify the text to “criteria <u>and/or</u> <u>recommended ranges</u> for buffers or setbacks from development” | Policy modified. This has also been moved to Section 4.4.2.(1) e) as buffers are more appropriately addressed through Subwatershed Studies, instead of Watershed Studies. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 74 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.4.3 | Many of these policies reflect the old way of thinking, when there were opportunities for the construction of stormwater management ponds in new subdivisions. Now that development will be restricted to infill intensification, some of these policies may warrant a second look to ensure they reflect the new reality of what development in Burlington will look like. New systems are now available to manage storm water. | Comment noted. Policy 4.4.2(2) j) references best practices and low impact development measures in order to encourage new and innovative ways of managing stormwater. |
| S. 4. 75 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.4.3 p) | Is Source Water Protection Committee not involved here? | Source Protection is implemented by the Region of Halton in conjunction with Conservation Halton. The primary responsibility of the committee is to create the source protection plan, oversee any technical updates and review annual progress reports. |
| S. 4. 76 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.4.3 j) | Policies for the use of Low Impact Development should be created by the City to support this initiative. | Comment noted. The City's Stormwater Management Standards will be updated over the coming year and will address Low Impact Development measures. |
| S. 4. 77 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.4.3 m) | This section should conclude with the addition of “, where appropriate.”, given that all of these may or may not be applicable to a given development or site alteration. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 78 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.4.3 n) | Wording needs to be clarified to explain that this does not include conveyance systems, such as outlet piping. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 79 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.4.3 o) | Question: is the City required to carry out such reporting on its own activities listed here? I.e. snow removal/ salting? | Yes, the city has a salt management plan (addresses monitoring and reporting), prepared in conjunction with the Region and other local municipalities. |
| S. 4. 80 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.4.3 q) (i) | Why are we then reconstructing Waterdown Road? | This policy is subject to a "may" test which allows discretion. Therefore it may be applied in some parts of South Aldershot as conditions warrant, but not all parts of South Aldershot (e.g. Waterdown Road). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 81 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 4.4.3(a)(iv) | This policy says that planning for stormwater management shall maximize the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces. This is not always possible given that development necessarily reduces the amount of pervious surface on an existing site, especially in greenfield situations. Add the qualifier "to the extent possible". | Policy maintained to conform to the wording in the Provincial Policy Statement. |
| S. 4. 82 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.4.4.(f) | Why not? Any land for preservation purposes that the City takes from the landowner (excluding roads) should count towards the parkland dedication requirement. | Hazard lands are generally not safe for public access and the constraint associated with the hazard limits the development of park facilities. |
| S. 4. 83 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5 general | Do not need to strengthen OP policies, but rather to act upon it. Note issues with implementation of waterfront policies as currently written, including the sale of publicly owned waterfront land. | Comment noted. |
| S. 4. 84 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5 general | Section 4.5 talks about the waterfront and shoreline, its uses, and development along it but does not reference expanding public ownership and use along the shoreline and waterfront. Want to see it explicitly stated. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 85 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.2.1 b) | Entertains more areas of public accessibility, but only key access points and parks. There is nothing to suggest the city wants to own its shoreline and open it up for the use and enjoyment of its residents and the public at large. | Policy modified to reflect the waterfront trail. |
| S. 4. 86 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.5.2.1 c) | Can now drive dune buggies on the beach? | This objective speaks generally to multimodal access to the waterfront. The enabling policies are intended to facilitate a range of transportation options to support connection to waterfront lands. |
| S. 4. 87 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.2.2 | Add a policy stating that COB cannot sell any publicly owned waterfront, shoreline lands | Policy added to address city ownership, maintenance and liability. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 88 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.2.2 b) | Expand this to cover acquisition of land with the intent to eventually create new public access everywhere along the waterfront or shoreline, not just Windows to the Lake or Bay. Establish a shoreline fund or accept land donations and trusts, or easements. | While the city supports increasing public access to the waterfront, the majority of the waterfront is divided into smaller residential lots, making access everywhere difficult to achieve. Objectives and policies in this section support increasing access through windows to the lake, adding segments of the waterfront trail and through waterfront parks. |
| S. 4. 89 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.2.2 f) | Provide more clear direction in this policy, such as: This trail should be a shoreline trail immediately abutting the lake or bay; if this cannot be achieved, a near shoreline trail located in the general vicinity of the lake or bay – with the expectation that efforts will be made to attempt to obtain sufficient lands abutting the lake or bay to eventually place the trail adjacent to the water. | Policy modified to establish that the priority is to first consider a trail adjacent to the lake or bay. |
| S. 4. 90 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.5.2.2 f) | This section reads: “A continuous Waterfront Trail shall be implemented through development and/or redevelopment....” This needs clarification to read “where possible” or “as appropriate” given that there are large sections of the waterfront where a trail may never occur, and certainly may not be carried out by private development. | Policy maintained. Policy notes that there must be sufficient land between the water and a public or private street to provide guidance and be more specific than "where possible". |
| S. 4. 91 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.3.1 c) | Suggests clarification: Looking to enhance public accessibility by obtaining new or additional waterfront open spaces as public spaces, or is the public being allowed to use private spaces, or do you care which? Prefer the city clearly state that obtaining additional publicly accessible lands is a priority. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 92 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.3.2 a) | Remove "where feasible". should be mandatory, until all options have been exhausted and it still can't be achieved. | Policy maintained. "Where feasible" is intended to allow some flexibility for those situations where all options have been exhausted and it can't be achieved. 4.5.3.2 e) provides more detail on this. |
| S. 4. 93 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.5.3.2 d) | The density calculation proposed here are not in keeping with Provincial rules for calculating densities in the Growth Plan (2017) – waterfront trails is not a listed takeaway. | Policy maintained. The listed takeaways in the Growth Plan (2017) apply to designated greenfield areas only (Policy 2.2.7). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 94 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.3.2 e) | We wondered who gets to decide whether the distance is sufficient to accommodate both the development and the Waterfront Trail. Certainly, the situation at Blue Water Place indicates that there is a standoff on whether it fits or not. We want the City to be the deciding body. | Policy modified. |
| S. 4. 95 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.5.3.2 e) | Is this fair to those who currently own land on the bay and lake and have access to boating? | This policy only applies to development proposals made through the Planning Act and would not impact landowners of single detached dwellings that wish to maintain their current land use and have boating access. |
| S. 4. 96 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.3.2 e) (ii) and (iii) | We were curious about the wording in one being "Should" and "would" and the next being "If" and "shall". We didn't know if they meant anything different as they were inconsistently worded. We thought consistent wording would be better, unless there is a nuance we are missing. | Policy modified for consistency. |
| S. 4. 97 | 29-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 4.5.3.2 e) (iv) and 4.5.3.2 i) | We were not sure if these two are different as they seem to say the same thing? Either eliminate the duplication or make the distinction clearer. | Policy modified to eliminate duplication. |
| S. 4. 98 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.5.3.2 g) | It should be clarified that public art provisions in this manner would be provided if community benefits through a Section 37 agreement are being provided, not as of right as part of development. | Policy modified. Chapter 12 policies have also been updated accordingly for clarity on Section 37 agreements. |
| S. 4. 99 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 4.5.3.2 i) | This paragraph should clarify that said survey and grading being provided is applicable if, and to the extent that, a portion of the Waterfront Trail is being provided by the development. | Policy modified. 4.5.3.(2) i) deleted and now reflected in 4.5.3.(2) e) iv) (applies to OPA, ZBLA and Subdivisions). |
| S. 4. 100 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.7 general | Include a mapped inventory of brownfield sites in the OP. | Policy maintained. The city does not have a mapped inventory of brownfield sites. Policies require that the proponent confirm if the site is contaminated and to complete any required remediation at the time of a development application. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 101 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.7 general | Include objectives and policies to test and, where necessary, remediate sites within Natural Heritage Areas or flood plains that have evidence of potential contamination. | Policy maintained. The existing policy framework encompasses all lands, including the natural heritage and hazard lands. If a development site includes natural heritage or hazard areas these lands would be tested and remediated along with any other contaminated lands. |
| S. 4. 102 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 4.7 general | This wording requires the landowner to incur significant remediation expenses before even finding out if re-development is possible. Wording should be added such that "confirmation regarding the level of contamination is required to ensure that they are suitable or have been made suitable, or can be made suitable for the proposed use. If the property owner hires a consultant who writes a report documenting the necessary remediation efforts, that should be sufficient for the sake of proceeding with development applications. The actual remediation work would then become a condition of approval, whereby the landowner could invest the money knowing that the ultimate development proposal is approved. | Policy maintained as it reflects the suggested approach. Policy 4.7.2 i) indicates that if site remediation works are required, the satisfactory completion of site remediation works shall be a condition of approval, which would allow the landowner to move forward knowing the development proposal is approved. |
| S. 4. 103 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.7.2 k) | Good to see | Comment noted. Thanks. |
| S. 4. 104 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.8 general | Include a policy to ensure adequate (e.g. heavy equipment) vehicular access to former waste disposal sites in the event of development encircling the site, so that future site remediation, if required, is possible. | Policy maintained. Provincial guidelines identify minimum operational/maintenance buffer requirements. These requirements (and other provincial requirements) would be implemented through policy 4.8.2 a). |
| S. 4. 105 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.9 general | Include objectives and policies to support local food production to promote the local economy, support farmers, and reduce Burlington's carbon footprint. Durham and Ajax Official Plan as examples. | Policy modified. Climate change policies (Section 4.1) now identify local agriculture and food production. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 106 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.9 general | Allow temporary, permanent and pop-up farmers' markets on residential, institutional lands and in underserved areas, and modify definition of farmers' market to "one to multiple vendors" to allow for pop up markets. | Policy maintained. Urban Centres, Mobility Hubs and Mixed Use Nodes and Intensification Corridors (Identified on Schedule B) would allow Farmer's Markets and both contain residential and institutional lands. The Burlington OP does not have an institutional designation. Single vendor markets are permitted in the Rural Area (Chapter 9) as part of a commercial agricultural operation. |
| S. 4. 107 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.9 general | On September 24, 2012 the City of Burlington endorsed the Halton Food Charter. The OP should make reference to this. | Policy modified to reference the Charter. |
| S. 4. 108 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | Section 4.10 - General | PERL supports stronger environmental, health and safety requirements and policies, which reduce the negative impacts from mineral extraction operations on people, communities and the environment. One of the desired outcomes of the Cornerstone Standard is for Municipalities and developers to specify that suppliers of mineral aggregates be certified under the Cornerstone Standards, à la FSC. | Comment noted. The policies are designed to achieve these objectives. |
| S. 4. 109 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 4.10 general | Amend the Mineral and Aggregate Resources section to clarify what objectives/policies apply to new/expanded quarries and those that are already licensed/closed. | Comment noted. |
| S. 4. 110 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 4.10.2.2 b) | How much effort is being put into this? Settlement areas are almost on top of some of these deposits. | Comment noted. The City attempted to ensure that development was not permitted adjacent to the North Aldershot Quarry but was unsuccessful. |
| S. 4. 111 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 4.10.2.2 j) (i) | Clarify that the NEP does not permit / allow mineral extraction in any part of the NEP, except through NEP amendment within the Escarpment Rural designated area. The wording in (i) implies that mineral extraction is allowed in NEP Escarpment Rural areas. Not so. | Policy maintained. This policy does not indicate that mineral aggregate extraction is permitted outside the areas identified, such as the Escarpment Rural Area. Section 4.2.2 h) clearly states that an amendment to the City's OP is required to designate a new or expanded Mineral Resource Extraction Area outside these areas. This applies to the Escarpment Rural Area. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 4. 112 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Strengthen linkages between policies in this chapter and other chapters and add more emphasis on climate change mitigation and adaptation planning strategies. | Policy modified. 4.1.2 has been updated and highlights mitigation and adaptation strategies addressed by other sections of the OP. |
| S. 4. 113 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Strengthen linkages between policies, for instance The City's Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP), transportation and economic development. | Policy modified. Section 4 preamble highlights the linkages between Sustainable Development and all sections of the plan. Modified to also identify economic development. |
| S. 4. 114 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | General | Add more emphasis on climate change mitigation and adaptation planning strategies. | Policy modified. 4.1.2 has been updated and highlights mitigation and adaptation strategies addressed by the OP. |
| S. 4. 115 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Modify intro so the description of Sustainable Development matches with the new Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives write-up. | Policy modified. The first paragraph of the introduction includes verbatim wording from the principles and objectives write up. Paragraphs 2 & 4 have been updated to further reflect updated Principles and Objectives write up. |
| S. 4. 116 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Consider adding a section to cover the re-development of golf courses as well as ongoing maintenance around Natural Heritage. Also need as North Aldershot still allows Golf Courses although Rural area does not allow. | Comment noted. Policy 8.4.2.2 d) d) specifies that a proposal to re-designate lands within the Major Parks and Open Space designation to permit urban development shall only be considered in conjunction with a municipal comprehensive review. This applies to golf courses. The Official Plan does not provide the means to set maintenance requirements. |
| S. 4. 117 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | General | Policies of the Plan refer to both Key Natural Features and Key Natural Heritage Features, as italicized defined terms. Only Key Natural Features is defined in Chapter 13. Please confirm that Key Natural Features and Key Natural Heritage Features are intended to be the same thing. Revise to consistent terminology throughout the Draft New OP, if required, or provide clarification on how these terms are different, including a separate definition for Key Natural Heritage Features. | Policies modified to use only the term Key Natural Feature. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FIVE - ECONOMIC ACTIVITY | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 5. 1 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.2 | The City's own studies have demonstrated that there is in fact a surplus of employment land. While we agree that viable employment land should be preserved, non-viable land, land which is not desirable for employment uses as demonstrated by decades of being on the market with no interest, should be considered for alternative uses. Bronte Creek Meadows is over 300 acres of developable land within the urban area that could be generating income for the city, which instead remains vacant farmland surrounded by urban development on 3 sides, and the environmentally sensitive Bronte Creek Provincial Park on the other. | The Phase 1 and Phase 2 Employment Lands Studies identified the finite supply of employment land and that the City has a sufficient supply to meet the Region's 2031 growth projections. The studies also noted that the supply of land will be needed for the long term (beyond 20 years). Bronte Creek Meadows comprises an important part of the City's vacant employment land supply available to accommodate future employment growth. |
| S. 5. 2 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.1.1 b) | Bronte Creek Meadows is not located in an urban growth centre, nor a major transit station area, so why does the City continue to insist that this property remain vacant indefinitely for major office or major institutional development, when neither have shown any prospect of ever happening for over 60 years? | Refer to response S.5.1. |
| S. 5. 3 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.2.2 a) | The City's own studies have demonstrated that there is in fact a surplus of employment land. | Refer to response S.5.1. |
| S. 5. 4 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 5.2.2 b) (vii) | This seems vague – not sure what it means. | Policy maintained. This policy implies that any issues that might have impacts to the Region of Halton, including the Towns of Oakville, Milton, and Halton Hills as well as Hamilton have been considered. |
| S. 5. 5 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 5.2.2 b) (x) | “shall meet at least two of the following conditions:” Why two, rather than one, three or some other number of conditions? | Policy maintained. This policy is additional discretionary policy which adds local context and consideration to a very comprehensive and detailed process to consider employment land conversions. |
| S. 5. 6 | 30-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 5.4.1 c) | Can the OP be more specific about the kinds of support (or incentives) to be considered? E.g. Full property taxes levied on unused properties, favourable development charges to re-purpose older buildings, etc. | Comment noted. These details are not available at this time. The City, in partnership with BEDC will be conducting a Community Improvement Plan Review in 2019. The findings of such a review would provide more details on the support that may be considered. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FIVE - ECONOMIC ACTIVITY | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 5. 7 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.4.1 d) | All development can be transit supportive if transit exists in the area, which is under the City's control. All development can provide opportunities to facilitate walking and cycling, if the infrastructure exists beyond the property boundaries, which again is under the City's control. For Appleby GO, which has no residential nearby, the majority of users will continue to require a car. As part of the development of this area as a Mobility Hub, high density residential uses should be included to create an area and bring in a population that will use transit, walking, and cycling options. | Comment noted. Schedule B-2 identifies Frequent Transit Corridors to communicate the city's long-term vision for frequent transit service and aligns to growth areas. The Area Specific Plan for the Appleby GO Mobility Hub is underway, and the appropriate mix of uses are being considered and evaluated. |
| S. 5. 8 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.4.1 d) | While we understand the goal for this area to be the "Prosperity Corridor", something needs to be done to rectify the traffic issues which currently make these properties undesirable. The QEW is often a parking lot, causing traffic to divert onto Harvester Road which again grinds traffic to a halt. Traffic movement along these corridors during rush hour is often horrific. | Comment noted. |
| S. 5. 9 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.4.2 a) | This property is not in a Primary Growth Area, is not within a Mobility Hub, is not along the QEW Corridor, and has displayed absolutely no desirability for employment uses for decades, yet for some reason it remains a "priority" for the City? It's time to change the thinking, and consider alternative uses (i.e.. mixed use). | Refer to response S.5.1. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FIVE - ECONOMIC ACTIVITY | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 5. 10 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.4.2 b) | The City can spend all the money it wants on studies, that does not change the reality that the property is not desirable for employment uses. Why is only a portion of the site the focus for the Area-Specific Plan, what's happening with the balance of the site? When is this Area-Specific Plan being developed, and will the landowner have any involvement? In the likely event that even after the City goes to the time and expense of preparing this Area-Specific Plan the property remains undesirable for the uses the City wants, then what? This is over 300 acres of underutilized land within the urban boundary in a City with no other land available. At what point can alternative uses be considered on at least a portion of this property, or is the intention to continue to let this property remain vacant for decades to come? The City is losing millions of dollars every year by not having this property develop for what the market wants, not what the City thinks the market wants. | Policy modified to acknowledge that the entire Bronte Creek Meadows district shall be the focus of an Area Specific Plan. Also refer to comment S.5.1. |
| S. 5. 11 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.4.2 c) | Same comments as before, this property just is not desirable from an employment perspective. Strong efforts have been made by the landowner and BEDC for over 7 years to convince employers to come to this property, and in each and every case, they've determined that the property is not desirable. While people may think that perhaps the landowner was asking for too much money, in reality the discussions ended before even reaching the point of talking about money. The prospective buyers/tenants just had no interest in that location. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FIVE - ECONOMIC ACTIVITY | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 5. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 5.4.4 | On Appleby Line, the area has a high rate of commercial retail business. Need for increased diversity of employment with advanced technology or professional business development. Would like to see a target sector including office space and limit 'retail' commercial space, in comparison to 'prestige'. Where "prestige" employment, would like to see a minimum building height (2 stories). | Policy maintained. This policy applies to the designated employment lands along the Highway 407 corridor and includes very few properties with frontage on Appleby Line. |
| S. 5. 13 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.5.1 | Add an objective to the effect "To understand the need to find a proper balance between Agriculture and NHS when NHS policies negatively impact farming within Prime Agricultural Areas." | Comment noted. Section 4.2 and Ch. 9 address the relationship between the Agricultural System and the NHS with land use policies recognizing that agriculture and natural heritage are compatible and complementary uses. |
| S. 5. 14 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 5.5.2 a) | Consider sale of property currently used for recreational purposes be zoned for agriculture purposes on Class 1(+). | Comment noted. It is not expected that the City would rezone Open Space lands for Agricultural purposes. |
| S. 5. 15 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 5.5.2 e) | Why? Are there enough farm properties within the urban area to warrant this? | Urban agriculture goes beyond farm properties. See Section 4.9, Community Gardens and Urban Agriculture. Urban agriculture encompasses many strategies including community gardens, farmer's markets, and other ways to produce and support local food on urban properties. |
| S. 5. 16 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Provide timelines to complete area-specific plans (McMaster Innovation District and Bronte Creek Meadows) and Employment intensification Study | This level of detail would not be provided in the Official Plan, however future city work plans will identify the timing of the other studies or Area Specific Plans noted in the Official Plan. |
| S. 5. 17 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | In conversations with BEDC, they mentioned it would be beneficial to define "Mixed Use" by degree or range of use. | Section 8.1 of the proposed new Official Plan contains objectives and policies pertaining to mixed use. The Official Plan, along with the zoning by-law are tools to define the specific requirements, depending on their context (e.g. within an urban centre, at a site level). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 1 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.1.1 a) | in the first line, “are” should be revised to “is” | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 2 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.1.1 b) | As noted elsewhere in our comments, it should be clarified that the Area Specific plans are a City initiative (both from a funding perspective and who is taking on the initiative). | Policy maintained. While Area Specific Plan are generally City-initiated (see policy 12.1.3.(2) b)) there are additional policies that allow for undertaking Area Specific Plans that are not included in the City's work program (see 12.1.3.(2) c & d)). This policy is meant to provide flexibility and the opportunity for development applications to influence the prioritization of Area Specific Planning should an opportunity arise. The Area Specific Planning policies also include direction for scoping. |
| S. 6. 3 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.1.1 b) | Please identify the “ areas in the Growth Framework” | Comment noted the Primary Areas in the Growth Framework are the Urban Centre and Mobility Hubs. |
| S. 6. 4 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.1.1 b) and 6.1.2 b) | How are you going to prioritize new development such as the Northwest corner of Dundas and Walker or Evergreen that is ready to go? | Servicing priority for greenfield areas such as these is addressed through the related Secondary Plan and the Region's servicing allocation process. The policies in this chapter are intended to assist in establishing how priorities will be identified in intensification areas. |
| S. 6. 5 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.1.2 a) v) | Please refer to our comment above regarding Area Specific plans. | Refer to Comment S.6.2. |
| S. 6. 6 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.1.2 c) | This statement refers to the area-specific plans determining priority growth areas, which to some may be misconstrued as Primary Growth areas. Wording to clarify that the intent is to determine areas within the Primary and/or Secondary Growth areas should be included. | Policy modified to clarify intent of the various policies of the plan that together describe priority growth areas. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 7 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.1.2 d) | This clause references that the highest priority will be given to the Downtown and Uptown Growth Centres. While we agree with this approach, it seems counterintuitive given that the mobility hubs are Primary Growth areas and the Uptown Growth node is a Secondary Growth area. This results in an inconsistency in the approach between planning (B1, Mobility Hubs) and provision of infrastructure. | Policy maintained. Policy 6.1.2 d) i) is intended to be read in conjunction with 6.1.2 d) ii), which addresses Mobility Hubs. Also as a point of clarification the Uptown Urban Centre along the Appleby Line corridor is identified as Primary Growth Area, see Schedule B-1 Growth Framework. |
| S. 6. 8 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2 general | What kind of programs does the city have to promote and facilitate carpooling-car sharing or bike –sharing? The Awareness sub-committee of the SDC could implement some free workshops for residence to increase environmental awareness. Or assigning some budget for Burlington Green to run the workshops | The city's TDM policies and Sustainable Building and Development guidelines promote carpooling, car sharing and bike sharing, and the city's Transportation Department has been pursuing opportunities to facilitate these options. The city would appreciate the support of the committee in promoting these programs through public workshops. |
| S. 6. 9 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2 general | Need to consider when we should prioritize transit over cycling and cycling over transit. Cycling cannot have priority over transit all the time as more people will use transit over cycling in the long run. | Policy modified. Now indicates a general shifting of priorities to support more sustainable modes of transportation such as walking, biking and transit, and that specific priorities may be determined based on context. |
| S. 6. 10 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2 general | Change “Public Transit/Transportation definition to “Transit/Transportation” definition which should include bus (public/school), taxis, for hire, car/bike share/rental, autonomous cars, etc. | Definition has not been added. The intent of these policies is to address public transit as a form of public infrastructure and in the city's jurisdiction to manage. Broadening the definition is not appropriate as the policies apply to public service. Instead additional policies have been added to address ride sharing, autonomous vehicles, etc., and that they will be evaluated in conjunction with providing transit service. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 11 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.1 j) | We are supportive of the City's desire to make a shift towards "other" forms of transportation. We recognize the City's work over the winter in providing draft parking ratio standards that are in keeping with influencing people to choose other means of transportation. We expect that finer grained documents, as they come to fruition, to be in keeping with this statement and the overall multi-modal transportation initiative. | Comment noted. |
| S. 6. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.1.1 g) | Like the context sensitive design concept. Design guidelines are definitely good to need to be flexible to make this work. | Comment noted. |
| S. 6. 13 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.1.1 h) | Will <i>complete streets</i> strategy truly work in all instances? A lot of streets are not wide enough. | It is anticipated that the complete streets strategy will identify different standards for varying street types/widths. |
| S. 6. 14 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.1.2 c) | Should effectiveness not also come into play? I would rather be carrying out the right thing inefficiently than the wrong thing efficiently. This holds true in a lot other areas. | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 15 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.1.2 d) | Please clarify if the "detailed transportation study" referred to here is the same as a typical traffic study/analysis that is often a condition of development approval. | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 16 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.1.2 i) | We note that the word "justified" should be removed, as discussed elsewhere in our comments. However, we also recommend that Primary/Secondary Growth areas be included in the list where enhanced infrastructure will be prioritized. | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 17 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.1.2 j) | Can the OP address the need for Area-Specific Plans to better coordinate economic activity opportunities with required MTO approvals to facilitate long term planning with developers? | Policy maintained. The city is currently undertaking a study to assess the impacts of MTO approvals along the QEW corridor and to recommend a streamlined pre-approvals approach for future developments. The OP will not need to address this through ASP's. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/ Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 18 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.10.1 b) | How the city does support sustainable transportation choices? And what are these choices? | The Transportation Demand Management policies in this section are intended to support sustainable transportation choices. See policy 6.2.10.(2) c) E.g. Bike facilities, supports for car-pooling, bike-sharing/car-sharing, provision of transit passes, etc. |
| S. 6. 19 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.10.1.(c) | Is this realistic in Burlington today? Is Burlington prepared to allow the high density residential and mixed use development that is needed to provide scenarios where residents can live, work and play all within a distance that encourages non-automobile modes of travel? | Yes, the new Official Plan identifies growth areas that support high density mixed use development. |
| S. 6. 20 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.10.2 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. | Policy maintained. Legal agreements, financial securities and other tools are used to ensure that measures are implemented to the satisfaction of the city. |
| S. 6. 21 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.10.2 e) | That's a great idea, but it is recommended to add a more detailed plan or program in the policy | Policy modified. Policy is intended to show general support for external service providers of TDM programs such as car share. |
| S. 6. 22 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.10.2 e) | It is noted that community or area-specific programs will be outside of the control/scope of private development. Therefore the encouragement of such programs is inappropriate – it is either something the City WILL or WON'T carry out. | Policy modified. Policy is intended to show general support for external service providers of TDM programs such as car share. |
| S. 6. 23 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.10.2.(b).(i) | What does this mean? QEW already has HOV lanes, is the City considering something similar for City streets? How much worse will that make traffic congestion? | The program elements this policy is referring to are listed in policy 6.2.10.(2) c) E.g. reserved car-pool spaces, carpooling and ridesharing programs, etc. It does not refer to HOV lanes on city streets. |
| S. 6. 24 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.2.1 b) | Yet you've already indicated that the City has no intention of widening roads to increase capacity. Where is this additional capacity going to come from? | Existing city streets and roads, combined with increased support and planning for other modes of transportation such as transit, biking, walking. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 25 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.2.1 c) | Does this even apply to Burlington anymore? Where are there developments occurring that are sufficient enough in size to require this policy? Development now is limited to infill and re-development. In most cases, if not all, the major road network is already in place, and no new roads are being built. | This policy would be implemented through Area Specific Plans (e.g. Mobility Hubs), large development applications where new streets are being considered and through the limited remaining greenfield area specific plans. |
| S. 6. 26 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.2.2 a) | Does this policy include the streets that new developments are applying for their permits at the moment in them? | No, the OP policies are not in effect until approved. |
| S. 6. 27 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.2.2 d) | What are daylight triangles? Please define. | Policy modified. Now refers to a definition of daylight triangles. |
| S. 6. 28 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.2.2 e) | We again recommend that Primary/Secondary Growth areas be included in the list where TPMs are considered. | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 29 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.2.2 l) | As noted elsewhere in our comments, it appears that the condominium development form is no longer desirable by the City. There will be few opportunities for development which includes public roadway provision, whereas in intensified low rise forms, condominium developments are far more viable. We request that this be discussed in detail with our members to understand the City's rationale and intent, PRIOR to implementing this OP. | Policy maintained. This policy is intended to set a priority for public streets, but is not intended to prohibit private roads. The policy lists that criteria that must be satisfied to consider a private condominium road. |
| S. 6. 30 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.2.2 m) and n) | Need to outline what are the consequences of "LOS'E" or better or "LOS "F". These terms mean nothing to the general public. | Policy modified. References to LOS removed. |
| S. 6. 31 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.2.2 n) | Please explain the rationale for encouraging an increased tolerance for at-capacity conditions in Mixed Use Intensification Areas and Areas of Employment. | Policy modified. References to LOS removed. |
| S. 6. 32 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.2.2 p) | We again recommend that "City initiated" be the preface for Area-Specific Plans. | Refer to Comment S.6.2. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 33 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.2.2.k) | What is the purpose of this policy? Private landowners cannot develop in the rural area in a manner whereby new public roads will be required. If the Province builds a highway, they're going to do whatever they want with little regard to what the City of Burlington wants. If by chance a new road does get constructed in the rural area, is there really any need to give consideration to pedestrian traffic and transit connections? How many pedestrians do you expect to see in the rural area? | This policy would be largely implemented through public infrastructure projects, such as a city or Regional Class Environmental Assessment or detailed design. It applies to expanded and reconstructed road projects as well. The policy relies on context sensitive design in order to evaluate the needs of all users, neighbouring communities and the environment. |
| S. 6. 34 | 30-Jun-17 | Burlington for Accessible Sustainable Transit (BFAST) | 6.2.3 | That the City commits to undertaking a comprehensive transportation study, such as the one completed by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, that analyzes the costs and benefits of a system based primarily on roads vs. one that puts more priority on transit. | Thank you for providing this information. This suggestion has been provided to the City's Transportation and Transit departments for consideration. |
| S. 6. 35 | 30-Jun-17 | Burlington for Accessible Sustainable Transit (BFAST) | 6.2.3 | That the City makes a commitment in its Official Plan to increase transit funding to a level that would enable it to meet and exceed its own stated goal of a 15% modal share for transit. | Policy 6.2.1.(2) i) speaks to the implementation of multi-modal transportation options (including transit) through the capital budget process. Council has made a commitment to invest in transit operations to improve service reliability in 2017, and further investment will be considered as part of the 2018 budget. At the same time work is being done to analyze alternative service models using existing service hours. In addition, once the service alternative work through the Integrated Transit Mobility Plan reaches completion in 2018, a 5 year Business Plan including a growth strategy will be developed. |
| S. 6. 36 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.3.1 | There is nothing in this that states there will be investment in a more convenient, affordable and reliable transit system. It only states that the city will promote the use of transit. It should be clear that the city will invest dollars in a better transit system not just promote it. | See response S.6.35. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 37 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.3.1 c) | Does touch on the implementation of a frequent transit system but it should be clear that there will be a financial commitment to make a better transit system. | See response S.6.35. |
| S. 6. 38 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.3.1 e) | How can you possibly carry this out under a <i>complete streets</i> strategy? | Connecting developments to transit should not be hindered by a complete streets strategy. |
| S. 6. 39 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.3.1 e) | It is again noted that development cannot provide transit connections – please clarify that this is infrastructure such as sidewalk connections to public roadways abutting the development, that then form part of an overall connectivity to transit locations, outside of the control of private development. | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 40 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.3.2 a) | With the coming of BRT along Dundas Street and Evergreen, should east of Appleby Line on Dundas Street not be considered Frequent Transit Network candidate? | The Frequent Transit Network has been located to align with the city's primary, secondary and employment growth areas. Regional transit planning by Metrolinx will evaluate BRT service for this corridor, and the plan will be amended accordingly once confirmed. |
| S. 6. 41 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.3.2 b) | We again note that Primary and Secondary Growth areas should be listed as priority locations for the provision of transit. | Policy modified |
| S. 6. 42 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.3.2 d) | This seems to be the only place in the document where justified and candidate options are noted for the frequent transit network. As mentioned elsewhere, it is recommended that the use of these terms be eliminated, as it assumes that a constructed network was justified, and a candidate route is a normal part of a decision making process. These terms are more appropriate within an overall transit study. | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 43 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.3.2 e) | It is recommended to bring some explanations about the “Region of Halton’s Transportation Master Plan” or to mention where this master plan can be found. | Policy modified to include full title of document. It can be found on the internet or by contacting the Region (this level of detail would not be included in an OP). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 44 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.3.2 f) | We again recommend the inclusion of Primary and Secondary Growth areas. Further, we refer you to our comment in 6.2.1 (j) regarding transportation management through parking initiatives. | Policy maintained. The policy refers to mixed use intensification areas and employment areas as identified on Schedule B: Urban Structure. These areas do include the Primary and Secondary Growth Areas that are identified on Schedule B-1: Growth Areas. Policy is intended to capture Primary and Secondary Areas in addition to other key elements of the Urban Structure. |
| S. 6. 45 | 29-Jun-17 | Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee | 6.2.4 | Cycling can fill in the transportation gaps in low density neighbourhoods that cannot be serviced by transit. Both transit and cycling should be prioritized together. | Policy modified. Text referring to prioritization in the Section 6.2 preamble has been updated to reflect general priorities to increase all sustainable modes of transportation, such as walking, cycling and transit, and to reflect varying contexts throughout the city. |
| S. 6. 46 | 29-Jun-17 | Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee | 6.2.4 | The fundamentally critical ingredient to building a culture of cycling is a minimum grid of safe cycling infrastructure designed for all ages and abilities. In other words, a AAA Cycling Network. Others might call this “8-80” infrastructure, building for the “interested but concerned”, or a “low stress” cycling network. In effect, these terms all refer to something that is more or less the same thing: a connected grid of cycling routes, safe for people of any age—from children to seniors—and any ability. Recommend that strong policy language supportive of a minimum grid of all ages and abilities cycling routes be included in the Official Plan. | Objective and policy modified to reflect this suggestion. An update to the City's Cycling Master Plan is underway and will further inform the implementation of this direction. Refinements to OP policies and mapping may occur as a result of that process. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 47 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.4 | The way Burlington was laid out does not lend itself well to major active transportation goals, particularly north of QEW. There are primarily segregated areas of residential, commercial and employment, all of which for most residents are a fair distance from each other. Active transportation may become more prevalent as mixed-use re-development takes place over the coming decades, but for now and the foreseeable future the automobile will remain the mode of travel most heavily relied upon. Canadian winter will also place limits upon active transportation initiatives. Of course active transportation should be encouraged, but not at the detriment to automobile users that make up the majority of the population. | Comment noted. |
| S. 6. 48 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.4.1 b) | It is recommended to consider about Health and safety of bike riders. | Objectives modified. See 6.2.4.(1) d) and new objective h). |
| S. 6. 49 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.4.1 b) | What percentage of the population do you expect to see riding bikes and walking to nearby municipalities as part of their commute? Given the growing traffic congestion problems in this City, an off-road system where possible would be a far better option, but then again where can you create this system when the City is already built out? If cyclists make up only 1% of the population in Burlington, let's not start narrowing roads or creating "road diets" to satisfy just that 1% at the expense of the 99%. | Comment noted. An update to the City's Cycling Master Plan is underway and these comments will inform that process. Refinements to OP policies and mapping may occur as a result of that process. |
| S. 6. 50 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.4.1 f) | Please preface Area-Specific Plans with "City initiated". | Refer to Comment S.6.2. |
| S. 6. 51 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.4.2 | A policy should be incorporated such that barriers should be provided to protect cyclists wherever feasible. | Policy maintained. 6.2.4.(2) g) speaks generally to the consideration of cyclist safety in the design and development of facilities. The Cycling Master Plan may identify specific requirements and the OP may be updated accordingly. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 52 | 29-Jun-17 | Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee | 6.2.4.2 a) | The language in this policy statement could be vastly strengthened with the addition of a few words: "Municipal cycling facilities appropriate for all ages and abilities <i>shall</i> be provided..." | Policy 6.2.4.(2) g) modified. |
| S. 6. 53 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.4.2 b) and d) | Changes made to these theses schedules could impact other areas in the Plan with unknown consequences. Saying an unapproved schedule takes precedent what is an approved schedule is dangerous. | Policy modified. Now indicates that an OPA is not required provided the modifications to the schedule are in keeping with a Council-approved Cycling Master Plan to ensure that a public process has been held. |
| S. 6. 54 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.5.2 a) | Please preface Area-Specific Plans with "City initiated" | Refer to Comment S.6.2. |
| S. 6. 55 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.5.2 b) | This item needs to be reviewed for safety matters | 6.2.5.(2) e) requires safety measures for developments adjacent to railways. |
| S. 6. 56 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.5.2 g) | What is the definition of "appropriate locations" | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 57 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.2.5.2.(c) | This policy contradicts the City's intentions for all but one of the Mobility Hubs, where high density residential and mixed use are planned right along the rail lines. Widely accepted construction methods are available to mitigate noise and vibration in high density buildings, therefore this should not be a concern. This policy should be deleted. | Policy 6.2.5.(2) b) has been modified to reflect that mitigation methods may be considered where sensitive land uses are proposed near a rail line. |
| S. 6. 58 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.6.1 | Does this include an oversight on the possible contaminant emissions by transportation systems? | No, this is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. |
| S. 6. 59 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.2.8.2 b) | In what situations is heavy truck traffic restricted? And what kind of goods movement? | The policy refers to residential areas. Goods movement is dealing with heavy commercial vehicles, policies also refer to heavy trucks and freight. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 60 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.2.9.2 c) | It is assumed that in this instance, the Area-Specific Plan noted is the Mobility Hubs study. However, we again recommend that the term be prefaced with "City initiated". | Refer to Comment S.6.2. |
| S. 6. 61 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.3.1 c) | Should be compatible | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 62 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.3.1 f) | Where is the policy encouraging this? | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 63 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.3.1.(c) | There is an "o" missing in the word "compatible". | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 64 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.3.2 d) | This sentence reads incorrectly and requires extra words. | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 65 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.3.2 j) | This will restrict the usage of electric vehicles and is a barrier. | Policy maintained. Consultation with the city on new electric power facilities should not present a barrier to the use of electric vehicles. |
| S. 6. 66 | 29-Jun-17 | Darlene Presley, MHBC agent for TransCanada PipeLines Limited | 6.3.2 r)ii) | Replace "right of way" with "centre line". | Policy modified. |
| S. 6. 67 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 6.4.2 | At various locations in this Section, the term Area-Specific Plans is included. We again note that the definition that all references to Area-Specific means that the funding and initiative be borne by the City. | Refer to Comment S.6.2. |
| S. 6. 68 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 6.5.1 a) | Support this objective. | Comment noted, thank-you. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 69 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.5.1.(d) | Agreed, therefore the City of Burlington and its residents need to stop opposing every development opportunity that arises just because it's a little different than the type of development than we're all used to in this area. Mobility Hubs and Primary Intensification Areas offer the most development potential for the high density highrise developments that this City needs. Burlington needs to embrace change and the idea of 25+ storey buildings in these areas, otherwise developers are going to invest elsewhere. | Comment noted. |
| S. 6. 70 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 6.5.2 i) | It is the opinion of our members that no individual development should be required to analyze their impact on the overall infrastructure model to determine its financial impact on the City. This work can and should be conducted by the City through its Development Charges By-laws, as may be updated from time to time, and the background studies done to prepare them. The City is very aware of its goals for intensification, and through the development of the OP is directing growth to specific areas. It is the City who should be responsible for ensuring this is done. This needs to be clarified. | Policy maintained. Where the City is considering a major development application that requires significant modification to the Official Plan this policy acknowledges that there may be a role for the consideration of the potential financial impact on the City. |
| S. 6. 71 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.5.2.(e) | Agreed. Same comments as above. | Comment noted. |
| S. 6. 72 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 6.5.2.(g) | Our experience with several of our properties suggests otherwise. | Policy modified to acknowledge that new opportunities for development must be consistent with the policies of this Plan. |
| S. 6. 73 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | general | Add appropriate policies to the OP in the "Complete Communities" and "Transportation" sections to achieve the goal of walkability, and include the adoption of a walkability score tool to measure results. | Policies throughout the plan have been improved to promote walkability. The walkability score tool has been identified in the Strategic Plan and would be implemented outside of the Official Plan. |
| S. 6. 74 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | general | The OP addresses most of the issues raised in the Strategic Plan related to transportation and BG looks forward to seeing more detail in this regard in the Transportation Plan. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SIX - INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORTATION & UTILITIES | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 6. 75 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | general | BG particularly supports the development of a robust public transit system as a key strategy in reducing Burlington’s carbon emissions. We are therefore disappointed that there appears to be a major disconnect between what the OP is saying and the reality of our public transit funding. Burlington contributes the lowest per-capita amount for transit of any comparably-sized city in the province. The same figures showed that while ridership is steady or increasing in most GTHA communities, Burlington’s fell by more than 15% over the three years following major cuts to the system in 2012-13. | Comment noted. Council has made a commitment to invest in transit operations to improve service reliability in 2017, and further investment will be considered as part of the 2018 budget. At the same time work is being done to analyze alternative service models using existing service hours. In addition, once the service alternative work through the Integrated Transit Mobility Plan reaches completion in 2018, a 5 year Business Plan including a growth strategy will be developed. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 1 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7 | General: Chapter 7, as discussed at meetings, results in a lack of flexibility that was provided for, and built into the Sustainability guidelines. | Policies modified to provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and provide non-prescriptive guidance. |
| S. 7. 2 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7 | Paragraph three indicates that “proponents shall implement the policies of this chapter....) and we are concerned that this statement will override the use of “should”, “consider”, etc. elsewhere in the document. | Preamble modified to acknowledge comment. |
| S. 7. 3 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 7.1 | The language in this chapter is overly prescriptive and many of the details should be left to other guidance documents like Site Plan Guidelines, Urban Design Guidelines and Sign Guidelines. The language could result in the need for an Official Plan Amendment to address these policies. The plan should recognize that simple, but attractive designs for affordable, special needs and assisted housing is appropriate. Requiring special design treatments could render these housing types unaffordable. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 4 | 6-Apr-17 | John Armstrong, Armstrong Strategy Group representing MasonryWorx (Verbal delegation at April 6, 2017 Council meeting) | 7.1 | Quickly review and update the design standards and guidelines following the implementation of the OP. DG Should take into consideration the optimal amount of glass versus other materials. Amount of glass should be reduced. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 5 | 6-Apr-17 | John Armstrong, Armstrong Strategy Group representing MasonryWorx (<i>Verbal delegation at April 6, 2017 Council meeting</i>) | 7.1 | As intensification occurs, bring quality of architecture and attention to details to rear facades of residential development and not only to the front facades. This would enhance the “urban ribbon system”. | Comment noted. Architecture quality of built form and its relationship with the surrounding uses is encouraged. |
| S. 7. 6 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.2 | Add “and costs” after “infrastructure demands”. Beyond environmental, economic, and social considerations, should you consider cultural. | Policy modified. |
| S. 7. 7 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.1 d) | Use Place Making approach previously sent to staff. We do not feel this is planner jargon. | Although the term "Placemaking" has not been added in policy, elements of this approach has been incorporated in preambles, objectives and policies of this Plan (e.g.. socially-active places, sense of belonging and engagement). Chapters 7 and 12. |
| S. 7. 8 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.1 d) | It has been noted previously that proximity of a project to public transit is outside of the scope of any private developer. This section requires a developer to “ensure” that projects “... Are well served by public transit”. While we believe we understand the intent of the statement, it is not executed properly and is easily misconstrued. | Policy modified to reflect the role of design in supporting public transit and active transportation. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 9 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.1 i) | We recognize a goal of the City is to create design guidelines. We support this approach. However, it should be a separate document that does not form part of the OP, but, like other documents, is listed in Appendix A-5 for reference. Further to this point, there are many locations throughout the document (as noted above) where detailed minutiae has been embedded into the OP, which if not specifically addressed would require an OP Amendment. We strongly urge staff to remove all such detail and include them in documents such as a Design Guideline. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 10 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.2 b) | This statement may have far reaching implications, not considered by staff. A new residential zoning by-law may then require even a small residential renovation to require innovations. Staff should review and revise as appropriate. | Policy modified. Zoning By-law regulations will assist in achieving the City's design objectives. |
| S. 7. 11 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.2 d) | Delete "The preparation of" – not needed) | Policy modified. |
| S. 7. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 7.1.2 d) | It is not appropriate for Policy 7.1.2 d) to elevate any City-approved design guideline to be considered City policy. Guidelines are non-statutory documents that are not subject to the approval process set out in the Planning Act. Any urban design directives that the City considers "policy" should be set out as policy in the Official Plan. See Policy 12.2.2.r), which appropriately addresses how guidelines should be used. | Policy modified. Clause is deleted. Policy continues to state that Council-approved design guidelines shall be utilized in the review and evaluation of development applications or City-initiated projects. |
| S. 7. 13 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.2 d) | This section refers the reader to the appropriate documents and guidelines that form policy of the City, in Appendix A. Appendix A includes draft policies that are not yet in effect at the time of the OP. These should be removed. | The appendices do not constitute part of the plan and are provided for information purposes only. Guidelines in draft form have been listed for information purposes only. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 14 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.2 e) | Need to develop urban design brief guidelines used in Development Applications. | Comment noted. |
| S. 7. 15 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.2 f) | Draw from the current and past members of the SDC for the Urban Design Panel. Need this tool in place to help ensure design excellence is achieved. | Comment noted. The City is developing terms of reference for The Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel which will establish the purpose, scope of work, membership, meeting procedures, etc. The City will initiate recruitment in Q4 2017. |
| S. 7. 16 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 7.1.2 f) | Strongly opposed to this. An additional level of subjective review of applications will do nothing but frustrate and lengthen the approvals process. | Comment noted. |
| S. 7. 17 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.2 f) | This section should be revised to read: "An interdisciplinary staff committee and/or an outside advisory body....." We assume this refers to the BUD/Design Review Panel. As such this should clearly be stated. | Policy modified. An Urban Design Advisory Panel will provide independent, objective and professional advice (Subsection 7.1.2). |
| S. 7. 18 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.2 g) | Urban design award is a good idea. What other tools are you going to consider? | Comment noted. The City continues to assess opportunities to achieve design excellence. |
| S. 7. 19 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.2 h) | What does this mean? How? | Policy deleted and new objective was added. The City will work with stakeholders in the implementation of the design objectives and policies. |
| S. 7. 20 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.2 h) | How are you going to get Senior orders of government to implement design objectives? | See response to comment S.7.19 |
| S. 7. 21 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.3 e) | This doesn't make sense because it leaves the entire City open for review with no prioritizing. It would be better to require any application to identify whether a landmark significance exists then address how to retain and enhance it. Consider that the Heritage Committee look at it and prioritize. | Policy deleted. New section on New Community design was included. The appropriate built form and urban design will be determined through a coordinated Area-Specific Planning exercise (7.3.1). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 22 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.3 f) | Distinctive and recognizable designs may not mean good designs. As such it may not be appropriate to model new developments after them. | See response to comment S.7.21 |
| S. 7. 23 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 7.1.3.(a) | This type of wording is misleading to the public. Burlington is built out, there are no new communities being built. What will be built however are more dense, taller forms of development that will not "maintain and support physical character". The NIMBY groups will hang their hats on wording like this in the Official Plan, putting Council and Planning Staff in a challenging position. Why not be more honest and up front with the public and just acknowledge that change is coming, and not everybody is going to be happy about it. | See response to comment S.7.21 |
| S. 7. 24 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 7.1.3.(c) | The City is already built out, are the gateways not already known and in existence? Seems like an unnecessary use of funds and staff time preparing additional studies for this. | See response to comment S.7.21 |
| S. 7. 25 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.4 | General: Many of the clauses in this section refer to improvements to the public realm, through municipal undertakings, reconstruction, etc. It must be recognized and acknowledged that improvements in level of service versus those improvements required for new population cannot be paid for through Development Charges. Further, new development should not be seen as a primary mechanism through which improvements in the level of service is provided for our City. Specifically, the City must develop a Section 37 Bonus standard/policy in which the protocol for these provisions is provided. | Comment noted. |
| S. 7. 26 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.4 c) | Human scale needs to be in italics. Does not make sense when use only "scale" definition in Chapter 13 with human in front. | Both "scale" and "human scale" are defined in Chapter 13 and shall be in italics. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 27 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.4 e) | Will also help tourism. | Comment noted. |
| S. 7. 28 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.4 i) | Are there design standards for Public Safety regarding safe sidewalks, accessibility, etc. that needs to be considered? | The City develops and permanently updates engineering and design standards that are implemented to ensure the safety and accessibility of all users. |
| S. 7. 29 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 | General: This section includes many details that we feel are inappropriate level of detail for an Official Plan, and more suitable in a site plan or design guideline. It makes it onerous on developments to implement some of this level of detail without the need for an OPA. Further, it may ease changing trends or desires for vision to put these types of criteria in a guidelines, allowing for changes by the City without the need for a public OPA. We recommend that a clause that references various documents be included to replace much of this detail and refer you to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c) as a good example of such a clause. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 30 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 7.1.5 a) | Again, this type of wording is misleading to the public. Burlington has traditionally been a lowrise, low density City. With Provincial intensification mandates and the City's own "Grow Bold" tag line and Tall Building Guidelines, issues of compatibility will undoubtedly arise. Look at downtown, a Mobility Hub and Primary Growth Area surrounded by 1 and 2 storey homes. If compatibility is the goal, then downtown will remain as-is, or under-developed with 4 storey buildings. If intensification and growth is the goal, compatibility will have to at times take a back seat to the achievement of the greater good for the City as a whole. | Comment noted. Policy maintained. Refer to revised Chapter 7 policies which communicate design priorities and guidance in ensuring appropriate transition, connections, and compatibility. Refer to the definition of "compatibility" in Chapter 13 and the Development Criteria in Chapter 12. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 31 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5 b) | If a real issue do not allow it to be built. | Comment noted. Design direction maintained in policy. |
| S. 7. 32 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 b) | The reference in this clause to buffering measures suggests that there will be buffering in all instances. We suggest that the wording be revised to “.... And buffering measures (if appropriate)...” | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 33 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 bb) | Please ensure that this reference to building design is in keeping with the wording recently approved through the revised Tall Buildings Guidelines. | Policy modify to "consider" cultural heritage resources. |
| S. 7. 34 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 c) | The wording “.... And reduce the adverse impacts of shadowing.” Suggests an improvement over existing conditions. We suggest that “reduce” be replaced with “minimize”. | Policy modified. |
| S. 7. 35 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5 g) | What are “terminus lots”? | Terminus lots are predominant locations fronting a T- intersection, generally located at the end of a view corridor, which has the opportunity to contribute to the public realm the pedestrian perception and the community identity. |
| S. 7. 36 | 7-Jul-17 | Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD | 7.1.5 h) | 1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: The prohibition of blank facades impact commercial buildings that cannot provide consistent windows and openings at ground level due to the requirements of internal operations. Replace "shall" with "shall, where possible". | Policy modified to consider avoiding the use of blank facades. |
| S. 7. 37 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5 n) | Not possible if no transit. | Policies modified to provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and non-prescriptive provide guidance. New policy considers improving the quality of streets, sidewalks and other facilities to provide more direct access to transit. |
| S. 7. 38 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 n) | As noted in a number of instances above, it is outside of the scope of private development to control the location and availability of public transit. Thus it is not necessarily possible to “connect to public transit”. This section needs revisiting. | Policies modified to provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and provide guidance. New policy considers improving the quality of streets, sidewalks and other facilities to provide more direct access to transit (7.2 a) (vii)). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 39 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 o) | This clause is problematic as all projects may not have publicly accessible open space at grade. Further, this is an example of site specific detail which is better included in a site plan guidelines or design guideline. If the OP is approved with this in, one may require an OP Amendment if this is not achieved. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 40 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5 q) | How do you intend to avoid acoustical walls? We have them all over the place. May need some guidelines. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 41 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 r) | This clause refers to "upgraded level of architectural treatment", however this term is neither defined nor explained within the document. | Policies modified to provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and provide non-prescriptive guidance. OP policies emphasize and promote high quality of design. |
| S. 7. 42 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 t) | We believe this clause should be revised to read: "The location, amount, position and design of ground related parking areas...." as an underground parking lot may not have access to, nor may it be desirable to provide access to pedestrian destinations. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 43 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 u) | Please clarify if it is the city's intent to mandate underground/internal parking outside of mobility hub areas, for smaller types of developments, etc. It will be rare that it is not possible, but may make smaller projects economically unfeasible. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 44 | 7-Jul-17 | Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD | 7.1.5 u) | 1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: Request clarification as to what considerations are intended under the "where feasible" language. Policy should be revised to "encourage" underground, internal or above-grade parking where appropriate. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 7. 45 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 v) | Please clarify how it will be determined where bicycle parking facilities SHALL be required. | Policy deleted. Bicycle facilities are listed as design measures under sustainable design and the guidelines reference the requirements of the zoning by-law. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 46 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5 z) | Should provide guidelines how this should be done. | Policy deleted. Sustainable Design policies and the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines encourage energy efficiency and low carbon buildings through many techniques, including passive design measures. |
| S. 7. 47 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5 z) | This clause suggests there is a move on the City's part to prefer solar heat provision to other sustainable goals such as green roofs, etc. all of which are beneficial to the environment but rarely able to be provided together. This should be clarified. Further, it is noted that the City has prepared a separate sustainability guideline and perhaps no reference to specific items such as this should be included within the document, rather a reference made to that guideline and the City's expectation that it be followed. | Policy deleted. Sustainable Design policies and the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines encourage energy efficiency and low carbon buildings through many techniques, including passive design measures. |
| S. 7. 48 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5.1 | General: It is surprising that there are sections in this chapter for both Mid-rise buildings and Tall Buildings, yet there is not reference to low rise construction. Further, the entire section on mid-rise buildings reads as a design guideline, and has no place in a high level document such as an OP. It is recommended that similar to the recently approved Tall Buildings Guidelines, a separate document be prepared for mid-rise should this level of detail be desired as policy by the City. We recommend that a clause that references various documents be included to replace much of this detail and refer you to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c) as a good example of such a clause. | Section on Mid-rise and Tall buildings were deleted and policies modified to provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and provide guidance. |
| S. 7. 49 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5.1 a) | Should provide guidelines fairly quickly in support of this. | Comment noted. |
| S. 7. 50 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5.1 f) | Stipulate in guidelines. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 51 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.1.5.2 | General: As noted above, this level of detail is not appropriate in the OP, given the City has recently approved a document outlining these requirements. We again recommend that a clause that reference the Tall Buildings Guidelines be included to replace much of this detail, and refer you to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c) as a good example of such a clause. This then allows the flexibility for that guidelines to be updated to reflect current trends and objectives, as may be deemed appropriate from time to time, without the need to carry out an OPA. | Section on Mid-rise and Tall buildings are deleted and policies modified to provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and provide guidance. |
| S. 7. 52 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 7.1.5.2 a) | Exactly, so why are there competing policies where sometimes this Plan says growth is going to happen, whereas other policies suggest growth can only happen if it's compatible? If tall buildings are meant to be built in certain areas, then stronger policy direction needs to be given, not mixed messages. | Section on Mid-rise and Tall buildings are deleted and policies modified to provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and provide guidance. |
| S. 7. 53 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.1.5.2 d) (i) | Put "human scale" in italics | Policy modified. |
| S. 7. 54 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.2.1 a) | Add an additional objective to improved energy generation efficiency and reduce greenhouse gases. | Objective modified. |
| S. 7. 55 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.2.2 | These are out of order with Appendix A17 and some are voluntary. One mandatory is missing. | Policy and guidelines modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER SEVEN - DESIGN EXCELLENCE | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 7. 56 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.2.2 | General: As noted above, this level of detail is not appropriate in the OP, given the City has recently approved a document outlining these requirements. We again recommend that the details in this section be removed, and limited to 7.2.2 Policies, Item (c), which is a good example of such a clause. This then allows the flexibility for that guidelines to be updated to reflect current trends and objectives, as may be deemed appropriate from time to time, without the need to carry out an OPA. This is perfectly explained in Clause (f) in the same section. | Policies maintained. The OP contains very general and non-prescriptive policies in 7.4.1 a) and b) to enable the related guidelines and to identify the broad categories that are "required" and "voluntary". |
| S. 7. 57 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 7.2.2 f) | If it is mandatory you may want to make an amendment to the plan. | That is correct. Changes to mandatory requirements would require an amendment to the plan, unless they have been mandated by other legislation (e.g. the Building Code). |
| S. 7. 58 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 7.2.2 g) | This section needs reviewing, as it implies that Area Specific Plan will be required. Please refer to other sections of this document regarding our concerns on Area Specific Plans. | Policy deleted. Section 12.1.3 identifies that sustainable design is an element that must be addressed when an area specific plan is completed. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 1 | 7-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8 | The document reads very prescriptive -more in keeping with a secondary plan and even site plan guidelines/conditions, which we do not consider appropriate for this high level document. | Policies modified. Chapter 7 provides design guidance. Approach in Chapter 8 describes appropriate policy permissions and requirements and establishes process to achieve the objectives of each land use designation. Other sections of the plan describe implementation and interpretation guidance. |
| S. 8. 2 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1 general | The Plan established a hierarchy within the Urban Area. Good. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 3 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1 general | The Downtown Urban Centre is the highest in the hierarchy and then the Uptown Urban Centre. | Policy modified for clarity. The Urban Centres and Mobility Hubs are both expected to play key roles in the hierarchy as demonstrated in the Growth Framework mapping. That said, it is recognized that the downtown has other roles in addition to being an urban centre as it is also an Urban Growth Centre and a Mobility Hub. |
| S. 8. 4 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.1.1 b) | While this section encourages higher intensity uses within the Urban Centre, the use of the term “retaining compatibility” is inappropriate as this section should address “fit” and the mitigation of potential impacts. | Policy modified. Policy will ensure compatibility is achieved. |
| S. 8. 5 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.1.1 b) | What does higher intensity uses mean? | "Intensity" is defined in Chapter 14 as a measure of the degree of development on a site, measured for non-residential sites, as the floor area ratio. To clarify, higher intensity uses should be read in relationship with the remainder of the sentence which includes two further qualifications (transit-supportive and pedestrian-oriented). |
| S. 8. 6 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.1.2 g) | Urban areas are intended to be priority locations for land assembly. How does this work? | Recognizing that new development is expected in Urban centres, property consolidation to achieve desired built form, setbacks, open spaces, etc. may be required. Area-specific plans may include implementation plans requiring assembly. Holding zones may also be used, where appropriate. |
| S. 8. 7 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.1.2 g) | Please review this section and consider to address matters including "priority locations for land assembly and incentives" | Policy modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 8 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.1.2 h) | Is there a hierarchy with which these sections apply, in the event of discrepancies? | Policy modified. In the event of a discrepancy, the more detailed area-specific policies apply. |
| S. 8. 9 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.1.2 l) | These site design policy appear to be too specific and arbitrary. Should these not be considered in a different policy or regulation? | See response to comment S.7.1 and policies contained in Chapter 7. |
| S. 8. 10 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.1.2 l) | As noted elsewhere in these comments, we are very concerned with the level of detail provided in this section, that is more appropriate as site plan comments, design guidelines, etc. It is inappropriate to have this level of detail in an OP, dictating detailed design of projects. | See response to comment S.7.1 and policies contained in Chapter 7. |
| S. 8. 11 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.1.2 l) (x) | What about the impact of light on park, open spaces, and natural heritage? | Policies have been integrated into modified Chapter 7. |
| S. 8. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.1.2 l) (xi) | Architectural features and setbacks will not totally fix. It is important to get the height, massiveness and transition correct. | See response to comment S.7.1 and policies contained in Chapter 7. |
| S. 8. 13 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.1.2 m) | Will the new parking standard be in place prior to adoption of this OP? Is the requirements for these plans to be provided only if the proponent is seeking to lower the standards proposed through that process? | The new parking standards will not be in place. TDM Plan is required in order to assess opportunities for reduced parking standards subject to policies of Section 6.2.10. |
| S. 8. 14 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.1.2 n) | In many instances, providing open space in an intensified development (i.e.. A tall building) is not appropriate. Please advise how this “appropriate amount” is to be determined. | Policy modified for clarity. The appropriate amount is not assessed solely on a site by site basis, rather the policy applies to achieving open space in urban centres as a whole. |
| S. 8. 15 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.1.2 o) | In many locations within this draft document, the term “justified frequent transit network” is used. We suggest the elimination of the word “justified” as discussed with staff during our meetings. | Policy modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 16 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.1.2 p) | A discussion needs to occur about Area-Specific Plans. These, as per the document definition, include secondary plans, neighbourhood plans, etc. which are typically prepared by the City. There further needs to be an understanding of how it will be determined when/where these are required. Please see our other comments which relate to area-specific plans elsewhere throughout this document. | Policy modified. See Chapter 12 for direction on Area Specific Plans. |
| S. 8. 17 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.1.2 q) | There needs to be an understanding that in many instances, commercial uses provided by a developer proponent provide for a range of zoning uses. They do not become tenants or owners of said commercial spaces. It would be more appropriate for the City to have verbiage to discuss what they may desire carrying out to promote an end user/lessee in providing such service. A proponent can only provide zoning for such use, not provide the actual service. | Policy modified. It is important that through redevelopment of commercial centres that the planned function of commercial plazas is retained and that the surrounding community has adequate access to food stores. |
| S. 8. 18 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.2 | There is a gap in the Downtown Urban Centre Policy. Until such time as the policies intended to be included in the secondary plan for the Downtown are available, we are unable to comment in detail – Depending upon the proposed policies, significant revisions to the entire New Plan may be required. | Downtown policies have been added to the plan, and policies continue to be developed as part of the Downtown Area Specific new Official Plan. Refer to Section 8.1.1.(3) Downtown Urban Centre. |
| S. 8. 19 | 30-Jun-17 | Deedee Davis, Burlington Waterfront | 8.1.1.2 | Policies for downtown should enable the existing eclectic character of the downtown to continue. | Comment has been incorporated into the record of engagement for the Downtown Mobility Hub Study and is considered as part of the area-specific plan currently underway. For the Downtown policies also See response to comment S.8.18. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 20 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.1.2 | Exactly, so why are there competing policies where sometimes this Plan says growth is going to happen, whereas other policies suggest growth can only happen if it's compatible? If intensification, higher densities, and tall buildings are meant to be built in the downtown area, then strong policy direction needs to be given, not mixed messages. Developers who attempt to build structures of any significant size downtown to achieve this policy are faced with nothing but pushback. | See response to comment S.8.19 |
| S. 8. 21 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2 | General: This section lacks considerable detail as a whole. Reference is made to establishing minimum density targets, but no detail is provided in terms of quantum of population or jobs to be achieved that will apply to this area of the City. There are no guiding objectives provided to give the reader an idea of the direction where this section "may" be going. It is understood that most information will come through the Mobility Hubs study. However, in its current form, the OP does not provide anything concrete on which a proponent could submit an application and understand if they were in conformity or not. This is not a supportable position. | See response to comment S.8.19 |
| S. 8. 22 | 22-Jun-17 | Tony Millington, Millington & Associates | 8.1.1.2 | 559 Brant Street (NoFrill Plaza): A park like setting is being proposed for a large portion of the site to allow for a connection through to the residential community to the east. Fragmenting these lands will do a lot of damage. | See response to comment S.8.19 |
| S. 8. 23 | 22-Jun-17 | Tony Millington, Millington & Associates | 8.1.1.2 | 559 Brant Street (NoFrill Plaza): A suggested mid-rise scenario does not allow the food store and the existing commercial tenants to function properly. | See response to comment S.8.19 |
| S. 8. 24 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.2 | It is important to finish the Site Specific work in this area quickly so we do not lose control of it. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 25 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.2 k) | Public Art should only be referenced in relationship to Section 37 benefits. The Plan appears to be missing some key elements of Section 37 policy. Concerns about Section 37 benefits being unique across the City. | Policy modified to replace "Public Art" with "Cultural Assets". In addition, Section 37, otherwise known as Community Benefit Policies are located in Chapter 12. |
| S. 8. 26 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.2 l) | The precinct system has failed to accommodate growth required in the Urban Growth Centre. All tall buildings have required Official Plan and/or Zoning By-law amendments. The city should consider a new approach. | Comment noted. The precinct system is maintained in a revised format in the new Official Plan. Land uses, height, density provisions have also been revised. however staff will continue to work on the Downtown Mobility Hub Area Specific Plan currently underway. |
| S. 8. 27 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.1.2.1 j) | Old way of thinking. How does this work with infill development where space is already at a premium? Large area development in Burlington where parkland can be dedicated is essentially finished. Development in the future will be on postage stamp properties where an old building gets demolished and re-developed. Where is this open space and parkland going to come from if it doesn't exist already? | New parks will be developed through area specific plans, both in existing urban areas and in greenfield areas, and through parkland dedication. As intensification occurs and underground parking becomes more prevalent, green spaces can be provided on former surface parking lots. |
| S. 8. 28 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.2.1 j) | The bottom of each street should have a view and access to the lake such as the bottom of Elizabeth or Martha Streets. | Comment noted. Staff have heard this message through public feedback as a part of the Downtown Mobility Hub Work. Comments are noted in the engagement record as an input to the Downtown Mobility Hub. |
| S. 8. 29 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.2.1 k) | City staff agreed to delete the reference to public art which was agreed to being a Section 37 contribution/benefit and replace it with "cultural assets". It was explained by City staff that "cultural assets" are a consideration within the public realm. | See response to comment S.8.25 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 30 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.1.2.1 l) | In respect of the continuation of the Precinct Planning framework for the Downtown, I clearly indicated that the current framework has failed and that such a framework should be replaced. The rationale for this is that the current rate of development/redevelopment/intensification is failing to meet minimum growth requirements. At 60 new residential new units per year (the current average for the Urban Growth Centre), I indicated that it would take the City 54 years to each the minimum targets for 2031. In addition, I indicated that to meet the current minimum population and employment targets for 2031 at least 15 new 24 storey buildings or 44 new 8 storey buildings would be required within the Urban Growth Centre by 2031 (one new high rise every year from now until 2031) – a 43% increase to the existing residential housing supply within the Urban Growth Centre. I also indicated that the failure of the existing Precinct Planning framework is demonstrated by the fact that all new tall buildings within the Downtown have required official plan and zoning amendments. | See the following responses: S.1.15 and S.8.26. |
| S. 8. 31 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.1 l) | Are we continuing with the term “precinct system”? | Comment noted. Yes. |
| S. 8. 32 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.1 n) | It should be acknowledged that while providing for adequate parking, it is the intent to minimize excess parking to support walkability, transit, etc. | Objective modified to emphasize transportation demand management measures and the provision of frequent transit corridors to support walkability and transit priorities. |
| S. 8. 33 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.1 o) | Spelling error support | Policy modified. |
| S. 8. 34 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.11 b) | This section refers to specific sites by anecdotal historical names, that may not be known to the reader, nor in the future may they be known by staff. It is recommended that these be revised to street addresses. | Policy modified to avoid the use of anecdotal names and refer to providing public access to the lake waterfront within the Downtown Urban Centre, where feasible. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 35 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.12 & 8.1.1.2.13 & 8.1.1.2.14 | General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details. | See response to comment S.8.19 |
| S. 8. 36 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.2 a) | Further detail should be provided in this section to inform the reader as to where the City currently stands relative to this target. This has been an ongoing request and is critical to understanding the growth of the City. | See response to comment S.1.15. |
| S. 8. 37 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.2 b) i) | “Shall” should not apply to the provision of commercial uses along pedestrian pathways. | Policy maintained. In this context, Pedestrian Parkway refers to a portion of the Elgin Promenade (western portion). |
| S. 8. 38 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.2 e) | The City may want to consider changing “shall” to “should” for the maximum size of individual commercial uses. There may be other uses (e.g. an urban gym facility) that exceed this size. | Policy modified. The new Official Plan will direct the Zoning By-law to establish appropriate maximum commercial unit size and maximum space at grade based on the objectives of the corresponding land use designation. |
| S. 8. 39 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.2 i) | There needs to be an understanding of “development close to cultural heritage resources”. Close is not defined. | Policy modified. Amended "in close proximity" to "in proximity". |
| S. 8. 40 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.3.2 | This section suggests that gentle intensification measures such as secondary suites, accessory dwelling units, which may be appropriate for these areas will not be allowed. | Policy modified. Secondary dwelling units and semi-detached dwellings, subject to criteria, have been added. |
| S. 8. 41 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.4 | General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details. | See response to comment S.8.19 |
| S. 8. 42 | 29-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.1.2.4 | 441 Maple Avenue: The results of the area-specific plan for the Downtown Mobility Hub will provide revised policies. Is each site/block being assess as to its development potential? | Comment noted. See response to comment S.8.19. The Mobility Hubs team is available to meet with property owners to discuss the study. |
| S. 8. 43 | 29-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.1.2.4 | 441 Maple Avenue: Would like the City to provide the detailed terms of reference and current City and consultant work program for the Downtown Mobility Hub study. | See response to comment S.8.42 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 44 | 29-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.1.2.4 | 441 Maple Avenue: Clarify the intended process and timing for the future policies providing direction for lands within Mobility Hubs. | See response to comment S.8.42 |
| S. 8. 45 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.1.2.4 | 360 Torrance Street and 2160 Lakeshore Road: The results of the area-specific plan for the Downtown Mobility Hub will provide revised policies either through the finalization of the Official Plan or through a future amendment. | See response to comment S.8.42 |
| S. 8. 46 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.5 | General: On the mapping documents, these areas are referred to as "Waterfront West". The wording and mapping sections of the document should be consistent. | Precinct name and Schedule modified. |
| S. 8. 47 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.5 | General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details. | See response to comments S.8.18 and S.8.30 |
| S. 8. 48 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.5 d) | The wording in this section is problematic in that it says that "... Waterfront shall come into public ownership" however is done through applications for redevelopment, which suggests that other options are available. The City should explain its intent for acquiring these lands, depth of expected acquisition, etc. | The policies in Chapter 4, Subsection 4.5.3.(2) e) provide detailed city-wide guidance regarding the dedication of waterfront lands. Any requirements specific to the downtown will be considered and addressed through the Area Specific Plan. |
| S. 8. 49 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.7 | General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details. | See response to comments S.8.18 and S.8.30 |
| S. 8. 50 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.1.2.7 | 419 Pearl Street: The results of the area-specific plan for the Downtown Mobility Hub will provide revised policies. The evolving directions from the Mobility Hub Study need to ensure a comprehensive block development approach in the Downtown. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 51 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | 8.1.1.2.7 | 571 Brant Street: Will provide additional comments in the future. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|--------------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 52 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.8 | General: It is impossible to comment or assess this document with a complete lack of content in this section. A significant portion of the growth, whether from population or jobs, will come from intensification of the downtown. The OP is incomplete without such details. | See response to comments S.8.18 and S.8.30 |
| S. 8. 53 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.2.9.2 a) iv) | This section refers the reader to Subsection 8.2.4, which does not exist. | Policy modified to correct the cross reference. |
| S. 8. 54 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3 | General: There are no quantum population or job target numbers provided to indicate how development is to occur in this primary growth area. Further, substantial detail is provided that is inappropriate for an OP document – it is more appropriate to a design guideline or site plan guideline (reference to fencing locations, landscaping, location of banners, façade articulation, etc.) This section is indicative of BOTH of our major concerns – lack of high level details, and yet detailed minutiae in other instances, neither of which is appropriate for an OP. | Rather than establishing growth targets in the Urban Growth centre or by major transit station areas, as guided by provincial policy, the approach in Uptown Urban centre is to establish vision through land use, height, and built form. Also, regarding urban design policies within this section, See response to comment S.7.1 and the policies contained in Chapter 7. |
| S. 8. 55 | 10-Sep-17 | Gavin Bailey, Fotenn Planning & Design | 8.1.1.3 | 1309 Appleby Line: Agrees that a portion of the property can be removed from the Area of Employment and converted to residential use; however, requests an enlargement of the area of residential use from that shown in the draft Plan. | Schedule E modified to slightly enlarge the area proposed to be redesignated Uptown Medium Density Residential. |
| S. 8. 56 | 31-Aug-17 | Jim Maxwell, LBS Group | 8.1.1.3 | 1830 Ironstone: Request a re-designation of the majority of the property to Uptown Corridor, with the north-east portion of the property re-designated to Uptown Central. | Policy modified. The existing site specific policy will remain in place for as long as the use currently on the site is in place. Future redevelopment is expected to develop per the Uptown Business Corridor - Employment Lands designation. The property has been identified to remain within the Area of Employment overlay. |
| S. 8. 57 | 13-Jun-17 | Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting | 8.1.1.3 | 1860-1880-1900 Appleby Line: Request re-designation of portion of the site from Uptown Corridor to Uptown Central, to permit residential uses. | Policies modified. An Official Plan amendment will be required to assess land use, height, intensity of development and functional considerations through a development application process to ensure land use compatibility with the existing employment area. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 58 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.3 | The proposed location of the Uptown Core is troublesome from the perspective of car traffic and the Region's intent to make Appleby an arterial road. Recommend staff take a very hard look at whether this is the absolute right location to planned mixed-use, walkable urban core. Appleby Line and Dundas Street would make a better location for an anchor hub as it is a near where the 407 commuter buses, Dundas BRT, Appleby Line Express Bus Route, and connections to Milton can readily be met. | Policy modified to clarify that the development of the Uptown Core designation will result in fine grain redevelopment of large parking lots. |
| S. 8. 59 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.3.1 e) | How do you intend to ensure social, cultural and entertainment uses are in place. They have a long way to go. | Comment noted. The objective is to support the continued development of an important destination within the City. The policies of this plan permit these uses. |
| S. 8. 60 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3.1 k) | It may be appropriate to provide a map of this area. | Comment noted. The utility corridor was added on Schedule E: Uptown |
| S. 8. 61 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.3.11 b) | Is this feasible given the amount of traffic coming from the proposed CN container shipping terminal on Tremaine? | Comment noted. The City will work with the Region in assessing this matter as it relates to the design of Appleby Line and Upper Middle Road. |
| S. 8. 62 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.2 | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: Appreciate confirmation that future development applications for the Millcroft Centre will not require Area Specific Planning. | Future development of this large site shall be considered comprehensively. The City may require the preparation of an area-specific plan. Scope of the area-specific planning exercise will be determined at that stage. |
| S. 8. 63 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.2 (b) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The prohibition against single storey buildings could preclude new buildings or extensive renovations to existing buildings on the site. | Policy modified. Single storey buildings will continue to be permitted. A minimum two storey height in new development will be encouraged. |
| S. 8. 64 | | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.3.2 h) | Great idea to link Dryden Avenue to Millcroft Park. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 65 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.2 h) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The requirement for a development proponent to provide a pedestrian connection from Dryden Avenue to Millcroft Park including a pedestrian overpass of the CNR tracks should be a municipal responsibility. | Policy maintained. The City will assess all opportunities to achieve such connection and negotiate through the development process of this large site. |
| S. 8. 66 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3.2 i) | Detailed criteria for developing specific properties are included in the OP. We do not consider this appropriate in an OP document for any specific property, that should be handled as part of a rezoning or site plan application. | Policy maintained. This site is being preliminarily recommended for an employment conversion and in this case this policy allows for special consideration of issues of land use compatibility and transition to the adjacent existing residential neighbourhood. |
| S. 8. 67 | 4-Apr-17 | Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting | 8.1.1.3.3 | 1860, 1880, 1900 Appleby Line: Policies recommend that approx. 25% of the subject lands be redesignated to Uptown Centre. Redesignating the entire site to Uptown Centre will meet the intent of the new Official Plan and the objectives of the Uptown Urban Centre. | Existing schedule maintained. Designation renamed to Uptown Core. |
| S. 8. 68 | 22-Jun-17 | Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting | 8.1.1.3.3 and 8.1.1.3.4 | 1860, 1880, 1900 Appleby Line: Given the planning justification supplied, the Official Plan should designate the entirety of these lands Uptown Central designation subject to the development criteria established in policy 2.5. This would have the effect of permitting residential uses on 100% of the site subject to the development criteria. The City should accept applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments after Council adoption of the Official Plan. | Refer to Chapter 12 which provides the opportunity to the Director of Planning and Building to provide information to Council to support a Council resolution that would establish which, if any, Official Plan Amendments could be accepted during the two year period after approval of any part of the Plan. |
| S. 8. 69 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3.3.2 a) i) | This section refers to freestanding townhouses not being allowed. Are condominium tenured townhouses acceptable? | Policy modified. Other forms of ground oriented dwellings may be permitted subject to criteria. |
| S. 8. 70 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3.3.2 b) | Two permitted uses may not be applicable nor desirous in residential forms. Please clarify. | Policy modified. Single purpose buildings are permitted. |
| S. 8. 71 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.3.2 b) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The prohibition against single purpose buildings policy conflicts with the existing uses of the site, including the new Movati athletic facility and could preclude redevelopment, intensification and reinvestment in the site. | See response to comment S.8.70 |
| S. 8. 72 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.3.2 c) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The cap on individual uses of 1,400 sq.m. at grade is overly and unnecessarily prescriptive. | See response to comment S.8.38 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 73 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3.3.2 d) | It is recommended that a statement such as this (the portion of individual use's floor area above or below the first storey shall have not maximum) be included in the Downtown sections of the OP. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 74 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3.3.2 e) | Is it the City's intent that all buildings have commercial/retail uses on the ground floor? I.e.. Traditional townhouses, stacked townhouses/back to back and variations therein cannot be provided within the Uptown area? | See response to comment S.8.69 |
| S. 8. 75 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.1.3.3.2 f) | Are the zoning clauses here still appropriate? There are now Tall Building Guidelines that were not in place when the specific policies were implemented. Further should details such as this be in the OP? Note: We discontinued reading the remainder of the Uptown Section based on the following: It is understood that a detailed review of the Uptown Area was carried out previously. However, this work may not be the current direction the city wishes to take, nor should details such as this be included in an OP simply because they are available. We are not supportive of zoning and/or site plan level details being included in any area of the Official Plan document. | Policy modified. A maximum Floor Area Ratio is provided as an indicator of the appropriate built form for the designation. Ultimate building heights can be assessed through the development process. Also, regarding urban design policies within this section, See response to comment S.7.1 and the policies contained in Chapter 7. Building height policies maintained. |
| S. 8. 76 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.3.2 f) and g) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The built form standards of height and density are not necessary and unduly constrain future development potential. Built form standards should be developed in the context of development applications, and not constrained by Official Plan policies. | See response to comment S.8.75 |
| S. 8. 77 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.4.2 b) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The prohibition against single purpose buildings policy conflicts with the existing uses of the site, including the new Movati athletic facility and could preclude redevelopment, intensification and reinvestment in the site. | See response to comment S.8.70 |
| S. 8. 78 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.4.2 c) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The cap on individual uses of 1,400 sq.m. at grade is overly and unnecessarily prescriptive. | See response to comment S.8.38 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 79 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.4.2 d) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: There should be no floor space restrictions in the Uptown Corridor designation. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 80 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.1.3.4.2 f) and g) | 2000-2080 Appleby Line: The built form standards of height and density are not necessary and unduly constrain future development potential. Built form standards should be developed in the context of development applications, and not constrained by Official Plan policies. | See response to comment S.8.75 |
| S. 8. 81 | 27-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 8.1.1.3.7.2 | 1830 Ironstone: Why have recreation and entertainment uses been deleted from the permitted uses? What does "accessory" mean? Does it relate to retail and service commercial uses accessory to, and on the same lot as an employment use or does it mean more broadly accessory to the broader Uptown Business/Employment area? The policy is not clear. | Policy modified to add recreation and entertainment uses. Accessory use is defined. |
| S. 8. 82 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.1.3.7.2 a) (i) | What is this? | Comment noted. Subsection (i) deleted and policies were renumbered. |
| S. 8. 83 | 27-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 8.1.1.3.7.2 b) and c) | 1830 Ironstone: These policies are far too limiting. Recommending the removal of the FAR limits in this designation (Uptown Business Corridor). This level of detail is best left to the implementing zoning by-law. | Policy modified. A maximum Floor Area Ratio is provided as indicator of the appropriate built form for the designation. FAR increases will be subject to a Zoning By-law amendment of minor variance application. |
| S. 8. 84 | 27-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 8.1.1.3.7.3 | 1830 Ironstone: Too prescriptive to determine that the built form of redevelopment be directed to the Heron Way right of way. It is also requested that the site specific policy acknowledge the long term home improvement use on the site. | Policy modified to acknowledge the existing use and Official Plan site specific policy. |
| S. 8. 85 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.2 | Downtown MH: Pleased with the direction however the Plan fails to provide details on the number and type of development expected in Mobility Hubs. | See response to comment S.8.19 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 86 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | 8.1.2 | General: This section refers to “accomodat(ing) a significant share of the City’s future population and employment growth”. It is our position that an understanding of significant is appropriate, through analysis of growth necessary to achieving the 2031 targets, and allocating them to the specific growth areas and mobility hubs. | Comment noted. Population and Employment targets to be established for Mobility Hub to build out through ASP. |
| S. 8. 87 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.2 | 92 Plains Road East: It is unclear how policies that apply to mobility hub lands will address current applications under review and how they will be impacted. | Comment has been incorporated into the record of engagement for the Mobility Hub Study and is considered as part of the area-specific plans currently underway. Until Mobility Hub policies are in place, existing Official Plan policies apply. Please note there is a site specific development application on the subject site. |
| S. 8. 88 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.2 | 1085 Clearview Avenue and 1082 St. Matthews Avenue: Within the Aldershot Mobility Hub area, the residential low density policies and any associated policies are deferred and are currently under review through an area-specific planning exercise. | Comment noted. Area-specific plans are currently underway. |
| S. 8. 89 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.2 | Ensure that Mobility Hub areas contribute adequate levels of high quality public green spaces and outdoor amenities that elevate the quality of the broader public realm within and adjacent to the primary hub boundary. | Comment has been incorporated into the record of engagement for the Mobility Hub Study and is considered as part of the area-specific plans currently underway. |
| S. 8. 90 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.2 | Burlington Mobility Hub: Total land area available for development in the near to long term may be inadequate to create complete community when considering the requirements for parks and open space, parking requirements and level of density. | See response to comment S.8.89 |
| S. 8. 91 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.2 | Aldershot Mobility Hub: Mixed Use Employment provision along Western edge and parts of the Eastern edge of Waterdown Road do not currently permit residential uses. | See response to comment S.8.89 |
| S. 8. 92 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.2 | Aldershot Mobility Hub: Through the area-specific planning process. Consider properties with a full range of permitted uses including residential, especially at the intersection of Plains Rd. E. and Waterdown Rd. | See response to comment S.8.89 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 93 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.2.1 j) | Downtown MH: Encouraged to see that tall building forms are to be accommodated. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 94 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.2.1 m) | Downtown MH: Similar comment on 2.5, 2.5.1 and 2.5.2. The policy should strive for new development in harmony with existing development. | Comment noted. This is the intent of the policy. |
| S. 8. 95 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.2.1 m) | Replace reflect with respect. | Policy modified |
| S. 8. 96 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, | 8.1.2.2 | General: We have noted our concerns with use of the term Area-specific plan. It is recognized elsewhere in the document that the OP will incorporate information from the Mobility Hubs Study to inform development. Therefore references to the 2014 Opportunities and Constraints Study is inappropriate as it will be out of date for the completion of this document. | Policy maintained. The policies in Section 8.1.2.(2) are to guide development applications that precede the completion of an area specific plan and will be replaced once Area Specific Plans are complete. Until then the Opportunities and Constraints Study can be consulted for guidance. |
| S. 8. 97 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.2.2 | Agreed that additional comments would review Section 8.1.2.2 in more detail and provide to City staff. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 98 | 26-May-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | 8.1.2.2 b) | Suggest that this policy be revised to establish what the key objectives of the City are in relation to the Mobility Hubs. | See response to comment S.8.89 |
| S. 8. 99 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3 | Further, there are again references to the areas being “highly accessible by public transit” – in the form of “shall”. This is NOT within the control of private developers, and therefore this issue should be addressed (in general, throughout the document as this is only one of many instances where such a reference is made”. It must be clearly understood that it is not the intent of the City to require private industry to develop and improve the City’s transit offerings. | Preamble modified to remove the word "shall" in order to interpret the section as a vision statement. Accessibility by public transit maintained in support of creating complete communities. |
| S. 8. 100 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3 | We applaud the fact that the intent for these areas is to intensify “generally within midrise and tall building forms”. However, in reviewing the details, we note that tall buildings are not allowed within any of the classifications throughout this section. | Comment noted. Different built form typologies are permitted as described in underlying land use designation. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 101 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.1.i) | How is development to be offset by a range of open space? Is this through the provision of parkland dedication or some other mechanism not yet described? | Objective maintained. Parkland dedication policies will apply. See Subsection 8.1.3.(2). |
| S. 8. 102 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.1.2 | There may be too many sub-categories defined through b) to g) inclusive. In reading through, we see the distinction, but suggest that these may limit potential for some areas which may, over time, be more appropriately re-classified from one to the other. | Policies modified. See Subsection 8.1.3.(2). |
| S. 8. 103 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.1.2 j) | There needs to be clarification provided with respect to “priority locations” for redevelopment: there is no reference here that these locations are secondary to the primary intensification areas of the urban growth centre, Uptown Growth Centre and mobility hubs. | Policy modified. |
| S. 8. 104 | 7-Jul-17 | Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD | 8.1.3.1.2 n) | 1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: The OP should include permissions for the addition of stand-alone infill buildings to existing sites to accommodate short and medium term infill that would otherwise be designed to meet the intent and standards of the in-effect OP and ZBL. | Policy added to support minor expansions and renovations to existing buildings, new small buildings and/or minor building replacements that contribute to achieving a vibrant, active and walkable built environment. See Subsection 8.1.3.(2). |
| S. 8. 105 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.1.2 q) | We question the inclusion of the reference to Primary and Secondary Growth Areas – does this clause not apply to mixed use nodes regardless of their location? | Reference to growth areas maintained. A small number of locations are identified as Mixed Use Nodes or Intensification Corridors but are not identified as Primary or Secondary Growth Areas. See Subsection 8.1.3.(2). |
| S. 8. 106 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.1.2 r) | Earlier in our comments we have noted concern about “Area-Specific Plan(s)” – this wording seems very appropriate and should be included elsewhere where we have raised this concern. | Comment noted and addressed in Chapter 6 and 12. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 107 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.1.2 t) | This clause includes a reference to a “full extent of development intensity” not being made available due to soil contamination. It is our position that money invested through redevelopment to mitigate these issues often is justification in itself to warrant increased intensification, otherwise development becomes unviable. This should somehow be addressed in the document, and if elsewhere, a reference made for the user to cross-reference. | Policy modified. This policy has been deleted and reference should now be made to Chapter 12. |
| S. 8. 108 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.1.2 v) | We again comment that some of the detail provided in this section is more appropriate in a zoning by-law or site plan guideline. Throughout the OP as a whole, this needs to be addressed. In some instances, parking requirements in (viii) to (x) may make it impossible to provide parking. Remaining clauses past (x) are again too specific for this high level a document. | Policy deleted. See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 8. 109 | 30-Jun-17 | Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT | 8.1.3.1.2 v) i) | Suggests adding language "where possible". May not always be achievable due to grading and other constraints. | See response to comment S.7.1 |
| S. 8. 110 | 30-Jun-17 | Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT | 8.1.3.2.1 a) & b) | Support these policies that support a for a wide range of retail and service commercial uses and flexibility to introduce mixed use. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 111 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.2.1 e) | The sizing of these areas (for all land use designations) should be more flexible, to allow fit and compatibility and intent to drive how intensification occurs. It may be that a site 18ha is appropriate in this form of redevelopment. This comment applies to all forthcoming designations throughout the document. | Policy modified to encourage the redevelopment of surface parking areas. See Subsection 8.1.3.(3). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 112 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.2.1 f) | Whereas the guiding principles of the Nodes and Corridors section refers to mid-rise and tall buildings, your largest and theoretically most intense version of redevelopment within your nodes and corridors precludes tall buildings. We believe there are opportunities throughout the City where tall buildings can and should be embedded into the OP, and it is a missed opportunity to <u>exclude them at this stage.</u> | Policy modified. Different built form typologies are permitted subject to the underlying land use permissions, including tall buildings, development application process and development criteria will apply. |
| S. 8. 113 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.2.1 l) ii) | Typo " a multi-residential <u>or mixed use</u> building form" | Policy modified. |
| S. 8. 114 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.2.1 n) | Are these public outdoor amenity spaces intended to be public or privately owned? | Policies enable opportunities for introducing these type of uses in support of achieving complete communities. |
| S. 8. 115 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.2.1 p) iii) | Throughout the document there are references for motor vehicle dealerships and the number of entrances. The reference in the document is to one "curb cut" – this is a construction term and really has no place in an OP. If the intent is to limit the number of access points, a terms such as that is more appropriate. However, all of the detail in (p) is again zoning and/or site plan related and should not be included in an OP. | Site design-related policies deleted and provide flexibility, communicate design priorities and provide non-prescriptive guidance (8.1.3.6.1 s); 8.1.3.7.2 k); 8.2.3.2 g)) |
| S. 8. 116 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.2.1.(f) | Why arbitrarily cap building height in intensification areas? During the presentations with Brett Toderian, the planner from Vancouver that the City has brought in and spent considerable time consulting with, he has expressed how focus should not be on number of storeys, but instead on design. If a 15 or 20 storey building with superior design is possible, and financially viable, why would the City handcuff progress by inserting an arbitrary height cap? Again, this displays an old way of thinking. | The new Official Plan sets the built form vision for the designation and enables process to assess ultimate building height responding to context and addressing the development criteria and built form guidance set in the OP and other tools such as design guidelines. |
| S. 8. 117 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.3.2.2 b) | 1385 North Service Road: Supports policies to increase density and height of future development of Mixed Use Commercial Lands. However property is not easily accessible due to physical constraints and natural barrier, which may not allow for its maximum development potential. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 118 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.3.2 | 777 Guelph Line: As the planned commercial function of the Burlington Mall is recognized as a critical part of the City's overall commercial structure, there should be no requirement for market studies that require the demonstration of "need" to support an expansion project. | Comment noted. Market studies are not required. |
| S. 8. 119 | 30-Jun-17 | Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT | 8.1.3.2.2 c) | Supports this policy as it allows for flexibility to accommodate new uses in response to market demand. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 120 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.3.2.2 d) | Consider replacing "The following uses may be permitted" to "The following uses shall be permitted". | Existing policies maintained. |
| S. 8. 121 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.3.2.2 d) | Consider replacing minimum and maximum building heights with minimum and maximum densities to provide flexibility for scale and massing of new development. | The new Official Plan establishes a built form vision from Mixed Use Nodes and Intensification Corridors using Floor Area Ratio as appropriate indicator of intensity of development. |
| S. 8. 122 | 30-Jun-17 | Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT | 8.1.3.2.2 f) | Understands that this policy does not establish minimum height for lands designated Mixed Use Commercial Centre | See response to comment S.8.63 |
| S. 8. 123 | 7-Jul-17 | Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD | 8.1.3.2.2 f) | 1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: Clarify if policy pertaining to Mixed Use Commercial Centres is intended to require or encourage a two storey minimum height. Requiring a two-storey minimum building height in the implementing zoning by-law would limit the potential to add stand-alone infill buildings to existing sites. | See response to comment S.8.63 |
| S. 8. 124 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | 8.1.3.2.2 f); 8.1.3.3.2 g) ii); 8.1.3.4.2 f) | 2400 Guelph Line; 2545 Appleby Line; 1045 Plains Road East; 571 Brant Street; 2025 Guelph Line; 3023 New Street: New policies require a minimum building height of two storeys. Current commercial market trend does not support multi-storey buildings, and existing functional single storey buildings would be rendered legal non-conforming. A special policy recognizing existing single-storey buildings is appropriate, as well as adding wording to allow consideration of a single storey building where appropriate without an Official Plan Amendment. | See response to comment S.8.63 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|--------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 125 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.3.2.2 f) | 777 Guelph Line: The built form standards (minimum 2 storeys – maximum 12 storeys) are not necessary and unduly constrain future development potential. Built form standards should be developed in the context of development applications, and not constrained by Official Plan policies. | Policy modified. A maximum Floor Area Ratio is provided as an indicator of the appropriate built form for the designation. Ultimate building heights can be assessed through the development process. |
| S. 8. 126 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.3.2.2 h) | 1385 North Service Road: The limitations set out by this policy may restrict future development on the site. | Policy deleted to introduce flexibility in support of achieving mixing of uses, intensification, and creating complete communities, among other objectives. |
| S. 8. 127 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.2.2 h) | This clause requires clarification – are you referring to lot coverage of at most 50%? Is this appropriate in a redevelopment and intensification situation? | See response to comment S.8.126 |
| S. 8. 128 | 26-Oct-17 | Joel D. Farber, Fogler Rubinoff | 8.1.3.2.2 h) | 777 Guelph Line: There should be no floor space restrictions related to office, hospitality or residential uses. These restrictions are problematic as they presumably would be applied over different parcels of land. Accordingly, development on parcels within the Mixed Use Commercial Centre could adversely affect development opportunities on other parcels. | See response to comment S.8.126 |
| S. 8. 129 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 8.1.3.2.2 i) | 1385 North Service Road: Retail and service commercial uses may not be feasible at-grade given the site's existing physical constraints, low visibility and access to the site. | Policy maintained. Development will be subject to the development criteria that will assess the site's physical constraints. |
| S. 8. 130 | 3-May-17 | Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited | 8.1.3.2.3 | 3091 Appleby Line: The site-specific policies are no longer relevant and are essentially inconsistent with the thrust of the proposed Mixed-Use Commercial Centre designation. | Policy maintained. Reflective of an existing decision. |
| S. 8. 131 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.2.3 | As noted above, we believe there are lost opportunities for redevelopment by limiting existing specific parcels to approved zoning (in the absence of other rationale, we have assumed this to be the case). Further, this section precludes the development of grocery stores, which are elsewhere virtually protected. This seems counter-intuitive. | Policy maintained. Reflective of an existing decision. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|---------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 132 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.2.3.(d) | This section goes on to discuss permitted uses, prohibited uses, and square footage caps. Why is this included in the Official Plan, when these are Zoning By-Law level details? Why is the City prohibiting residential uses, supermarkets/grocery stores, department stores, warehouse clubs, and retailing of non-work related apparel within this Mixed Use Commercial Centre? | Policy maintained. Reflective of an existing decision. |
| S. 8. 133 | 26-Jun-17 | Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited | 8.1.3.3 | North-west and north-east corners of Dundas Street and Walkers Line: The proposed Neighbourhood Centre policies are largely driven by older plazas in mature neighbourhoods in South Burlington. | Policies modified to reflect the diverse stages of development in commercial centres and to encourage the transformation of these centres into vibrant, walkable, complete communities. |
| S. 8. 134 | 26-Jun-17 | Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited | 8.1.3.3 | North-west and north-east corners of Dundas Street and Walkers Line: There is no evidence to support the introduction of a 2 storey minimum policy for Neighbourhood Centres in a suburban location like this node. The two sites should not be lumped-in with the other sites. | See response to comment S.8.63 |
| S. 8. 135 | 7-Apr-17 | Jonathan Rubin, EMBEE Properties Limited | 8.1.3.3 | North-west and north-east corners of Dundas Street and Walkers Line: The 2-storey is simply not viable. The policy is an attempt to create a new hybrid land use that would significantly diminish the existing land use permissions. | See response to comment S.8.63 |
| S. 8. 136 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.3 | 5353 Lakeshore Rd. (Lakeside Plaza): Although the site is not identified as a formal intensification area, it has been identified by Council as an area for which intensive mixed use redevelopment should be explored. | Policy modified to acknowledge opportunities to consider comprehensive development of large sites designated Neighbourhood Centre. |
| S. 8. 137 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.3 | 5353 Lakeshore Rd. (Lakeside Plaza): Consider a special policy approach for the Lakeside Plaza which does not highly constrain the objectives that can be achieved by such a significant and unique site. | See response to comment S.8.136 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 138 | 3-Aug-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.3 | 4033-4059 and 4011 New Street: Additional flexibility to allow for a mixture of uses within a building or a mixture of uses on a site would be more appropriate in order to ensure that the OP framework is responsive to changing market demands. | Policy maintained. The new Official Plan recognizes opportunities for intensification and the appropriate mix of uses at these locations in support of achieving strategic city objectives while recognizing the market dynamics. |
| S. 8. 139 | 3-Aug-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.3 | 4033-4059 and 4011 New Street: Reflect the need for a phased development approach to commercial plazas which allows the retail planned function to be maintained in the interim and consider incremental and phased redevelopment in the long tem. | Policy added to support minor expansions and renovations to existing buildings, new small buildings and/or minor building replacements that contribute to achieving a vibrant, active and walkable built environment. |
| S. 8. 140 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 b) | The last sentence of the paragraph should be revised to read “that is more appropriate at for each location.” | Policy modified. |
| S. 8. 141 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.3.3.2 d) | Add townhouses. | See response to comment S.8.69 |
| S. 8. 142 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 e) | Our comment above regarding specifying land sizes applies to this comment as well. | Policy modified to refer to land sizes in general terms. |
| S. 8. 143 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.3.3.2 f) and 8.1.3.6.2 g) | Have a concern with townhouses particularly back to back and stacked townhouses. Some of the developments have been awful and are going to lead to slums. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 144 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 g) ii) | We believe the limitation to 6 storeys is inappropriate. There are locations within the City where higher buildings are accommodated successfully into areas such as these. Please review and reconsider. | Policies modified. The new Official Plan recognizes opportunities for intensification and the appropriate mix of uses at these locations and introduces process to assess development applications of large sites that propose the introduction of tall buildings. |
| S. 8. 145 | 3-Aug-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.3.2 g) ii) | 4033-4059 and 4011 New Street: The proposed minimum height of 2 storeys limits the potential to develop and redevelop these lands as they exist today. Minimum height should not be required within the Neighbourhood Centre designation to allow flexibility for development. | See response to comment S.8.104 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 146 | 3-Aug-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.3.2 g) ii) and 8.1.3.3.2 h) | 4033-4059 and 4011 New Street: The proposed maximum height of 6 storeys (up to 11 storeys through bonusing) limits the potential to develop and redevelop these lands as vibrant mixed-use areas. Bonusing provisions should be flexible to allow for redevelopment and intensification and should be based on local context and not on a cap of 11 storeys. | See response to comment S.8.144 |
| S. 8. 147 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 h) | Reference is made to clause (f) in this paragraph, which should be corrected to reference paragraph (g). Further, you have specific criteria for redevelopment of areas in subsection (i) – any applications for redevelopment would have to undergo a ZBA (rezoning application) and therefore these clauses can and should be eliminated from this section as they can be appropriately included in said ZBA. This subclause also references two further subclauses, both as (a). And, the maximum height here refers to 11 stories whereas mixed use is up to 12 stories. (There are a number of instances where 11 and 12 stories are incorrectly mixed and should be reviewed and corrected throughout the document). | Policy maintained. Current land use permissions that allow a maximum 12 storey height at some locations are carried over. Also See response to comment S.8.144 on the introduction of tall buildings in Neighbourhood Centre lands. |
| S. 8. 148 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | 8.1.3.3.2 h) | Request clarification on the use of the term "may" as to whether it requires small incremental increases in floor area to submit a zoning by-law amendment application. Recommends wording be added to state that small increases could be addressed through a minor variance application. | See response to comment S.8.83 |
| S. 8. 149 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 i) | Reference is made here to subsections (f) and (g) which should be revised to (g) and (h). We again question the maximum of 11 stories. | Policy modified to reference subsection properly. The capacity to achieve maximum 6 storey height may be constrained at some locations. |
| S. 8. 150 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 l) ii) | We believe this clause to be unnecessary. If you are able to justify a full residential development, why would the location be dictated here? | Policy maintained. Commercial uses shall be located at grade in buildings fronting a major arterial street or urban avenue. Residential uses may be permitted in the upper stories. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 151 | 3-Aug-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.3.2 m) and n) | 4033-4059 and 4011 New Street: Proposed floor area ratio caps for retail and service commercial uses is limiting and does not reflect the broader range of retail and service commercial uses at grade requirement. Retail and service commercial uses within a mixed use urban built form cannot maintain the level of retail and nor should this be mandated in policy. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 152 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 m) and n) | The limitation in size for specific uses seems more appropriate in a zoning bylaw than an OP. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 153 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | 8.1.3.3.2 n) | 2025 Guelph Line: Provide clarification that the floor area maximum at grade applies only to buildings that are more than single storey. If not, it appears contrary to Subsection 8.1.1.3.3.2 m). Some existing uses within the plaza at 2025 Guelph Line could be rendered legal non-conforming. Recommend addition of a special policy to recognize the floor area of existing single storey uses. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 154 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2 p) | The wording in Section 8.1.3.2.2 n) refers to the same requirement for another land designation, but is better worded: there is includes "will encourage" not "shall require". We believe with the clarification requested in that section, "will encourage" is more appropriate. | Policy modified. |
| S. 8. 155 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.2h) iv) | Reference is made here to underground parking. We believe that a viable alternative is a parking structure, either standalone or incorporated into a building. This comment applies throughout the OP document – in some instances it is included as an option and elsewhere not. | Policy modified. Policy seeks to achieve a significant reduction of parking at grade. |
| S. 8. 156 | 30-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 8.1.3.3.3 | 5111 New Street: Dependant upon discussions with staff regarding how policy will be implemented in the case of an in process application there may be further comments submitted. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 157 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.3.3 a) | Again the reference to (f) and (g) should be to (g) and (h). Further, there is again an inconsistency between references to maximum heights of 11 and 12 stories. Further, the reference to Guelph Line and Upper Middle is not included in (h). We also believe there are other locations (i.e.. Including but not limited to Brant and Upper Middle) that are also appropriate for this type of development. Subsection (ii) is another example of where the inclusion of a parking structure, as discussed above, is an appropriate alternative to underground parking. | See response to comments S.8.147 and S.8.155 |
| S. 8. 158 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | 8.1.3.4 | 2384 Queensway Drive: Please reflect the Council approved decisions related to 2384 Queensway Drive. Specifically, OPA 103. | Schedules modified to reflect the Council approved decision (OPA 103). |
| S. 8. 159 | 5-Apr-17 | David McKay, MHBC | 8.1.3.4 | 1450 Headon Road: Stacked townhouses would meet the intention of the Local Centre designation and be compatible with the surrounding area. | Policy maintained. Townhouse forms are not permitted in local centre lands. |
| S. 8. 160 | 5-Apr-17 | David McKay, MHBC | 8.1.3.4 | 1450 Headon Road: A proposal for the subject lands may contemplate a total commercial gross floor area greater than 1,200 sq.m given the size of the site. | Draft policy established maximum floor area per commercial unit, however policy is modified to direct the implementing Zoning By-law to establish this metric. |
| S. 8. 161 | 5-Apr-17 | David McKay, MHBC | 8.1.3.4 | 1450 Headon Road: It is unclear why the draft OP would impose a height restriction of 4 storeys. | Policy maintained. Maximum 4 storey height permission is based on the small size that characterizes these commercial centres and the nature of the established neighbourhoods that generally surround them. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 162 | 5-Apr-17 | Colin Chung, Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. | 8.1.3.4 | 3505 Dundas Street, Local Centre: We suggest that the City consider policies that would allow for stand-alone medium density residential uses adjacent to residential uses, on a site specific basis and where appropriate. Additional provisions could include: where mixed uses are maintained along road frontages adjacent to employment lands and retail and service commercial uses, where the amount of stand-alone medium density residential being requested is small and where the stand alone medium density residential being requested is adjacent to other residential uses. This flexibility is consistent with the Mixed Use Node/ Intensification Corridor policies which require development to be compatible with adjacent residential uses in terms of form and intensity. Request that internal to the subject parcel be considered for stand alone medium density residential. | Policy maintained. These lands are directly adjacent to employment lands and in close proximity to the future location of the Court House. The City is looking for vertical integration of uses in Local centre lands and permits residential use above the ground floor. No special exception is being considered for this site. |
| S. 8. 163 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.4.1 b) and c) | The references and objectives to “provide opportunities for a limited range” In (b) and “to retain a significant retail and service commercial presence” seem at odds with each other. This should be reworded for clarity. | Policy maintained. The planned commercial function is retained and the range of permitted uses is established in accordance with the intended function of the designation. |
| S. 8. 164 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.4.2 c) | Our comment immediately above also applies to the reference to a limited range of issues here. | See response to comment S.8.163 |
| S. 8. 165 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.4.2 d) | It appears the intent is that there be no entertainment, recreational uses in this category (thus eliminating uses such as neighbourhood pubs or eateries). | Policy maintained. Service commercial uses are permitted. |
| S. 8. 166 | 27-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 8.1.3.4.2 d) (iv) | 2258 Mountainside Drive: Restricting offices on the ground floor is not appropriate or reasonable for this particular area | Site specific policy added. |
| S. 8. 167 | 27-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 8.1.3.4.2 e) | 2258 Mountainside Drive: Staff need to confirm that the extent of the Local Centre designation exceeds the minimum one (1) hectare threshold | The polygon that defines the area, which comprises various properties at the street intersection, exceeds one (1) hectare. Also See response to comment S.8.142 on providing flexibility in interpreting land size. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 168 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.4.2 f) | Again we believe that the height limitation (max. 4 storeys) is too significant. | See response to comment S.8.161 |
| S. 8. 169 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | 8.1.3.4.2 g) and 8.1.3.3.2 j) | 2400 Guelph Line; 2545 Appleby Line; 1045 Plains Road East; 571 Brant Street; 2025 Guelph Line; 3023 New Street: Clarify what constitutes a "significant" reduction of floor area. Add wording that confirms reductions in floor area could be permitted that do not compromise the planned function of the centre. | Policy modified to ensure a reduction of existing commercial space does not compromise the planned commercial function. A retail and service commercial needs assessment will be required. |
| S. 8. 170 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.4.2 h) through j) | Please refer to our comment above re limitation of square footages for specific uses, which we believe more appropriate in a zoning bylaw. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 171 | 27-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 8.1.3.4.2 g) | 2258 Mountainside Drive: Maximum individual retail use floor area of 600 sq.m. at grade is too restrictive and limiting for grocery store uses. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 172 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | 8.1.3.4.2 j) | 2400 Guelph Line: Existing No Frills supermarket could be impacted by the maximum floor area cap. Request to increase maximum floor area to 3700 sq. m. | See response to comment S.8.38 |
| S. 8. 173 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.4.3 b) | Reference is made to specific sites which are existing, and are exempted from the above height limitations. These are examples of GOOD intense use of land that can be seen as examples of how to intensify elsewhere. We suggest that these are rationale enough to re-look at the height limitations in these various categories. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 174 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.4.3 c) and d) | We believe the limitations on these properties precludes flexibility in redevelopment. This is a recurring theme in the various land use designations. | Policy maintained. Reflective of an existing decision. |
| S. 8. 175 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.5.1 a) iii) | This is not a characteristic and should be removed from the list. | Comment noted. Policy modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 176 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.5.2 b) | Part of our various discussions re the OP and the Mobility Hubs was the notion that a mixed employment/residential mix was being considered for intensification in employment areas, on the basis that it did not limit the employment, but was rather in addition to that “amount” of use. Some reference to this should be included in this section. | Policy maintained. The concept of employment and residential mix described in the comment relates primarily to the mobility hub areas, which are being assessed through area specific plans. Employment Commercial Centres has restrictions in line with the function of the designation. |
| S. 8. 177 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.5.2 e) | The wording should be revised to “the City shall support.....” as is included elsewhere in the document. | See response to comment S.8.63 |
| S. 8. 178 | 26-Jun-17 | David A McKay, MHBC | 8.1.3.6 | 3050 Davidson Crt.: Policies should allow for a certain amount of retail stores below 1,000 sq.m. which would allow for flexibility to occur when a full or partial redevelopment of the subject lands occurs. Alternatively, the plan could include a policy to allow a reduction below 1000m2 subject to a market study through a Zoning By-law amendment. | Policy modified to provide flexibility. The planned function is maintained to protect the commercial function throughout the City. |
| S. 8. 178 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 e) | We again refer you to our concerns above to “shall” and “frequent transit network” and the use of “frequent” in this context. | Policies throughout the document have been modified to address this concern. The Frequent Transit Corridors will be serviced by Burlington Transit and are aligned with growth areas. Other policies have been updated to clarify that the role of private industry is to design sites that facilitate active transportation connections to transit stops. |
| S. 8. 179 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 f) ii) | There seems to be inconsistency in the document with respect to motor vehicle dealerships. While outside of our association’s scope, it is evident and brought to your attention to address. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 180 | 28-Jun-17 | Ed Fothergill | 8.1.3.6.2 h) | 2071 and 2090 Queensway Drive: Amend the Urban Corridor policies to eliminate the floor area ratio and maximum building height and include them in the implementing Zoning By-law. | Policy maintained. The subject lands are designated General Employment. As is the case for any lands currently designated for employment use, preliminarily recommended for conversion, and within a Mobility Hub Study Area the existing land use designations will remain until such time as the Mobility Hub Area Specific Plans are approved. It should be noted that since these lands are within the Regional Employment Overlay these designations will remain until the completion of the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review. |
| S. 8. 181 | 28-Jun-17 | Ed Fothergill | 8.1.3.6.2 h) | 2071 and 2090 Queensway Drive: If a limit is to be established, suggests that a floor area ratio of 6.0:1 be used to reflect expectations based on current built form and applications that are being considered by the City. | See response to comment S.8.83. Maximum FAR for Urban Corridor designation remains 2.0:1. |
| S. 8. 182 | 28-Jun-17 | Ed Fothergill | 8.1.3.6.2 h) | 2071 and 2090 Queensway Drive: If a height limit is required, suggests a limit be set at 25 storeys given the site's location within a mobility hub area. | See response to comment S.8.180 |
| S. 8. 183 | 28-Jun-17 | Ed Fothergill | 8.1.3.6.2 i) | 2071 and 2090 Queensway Drive: Retain policy to permit an increase in floor area ratio beyond the 6.0:1 limit recommended, subject to criteria. | Maximum FAR for Urban Corridor designation remains 2.0:1. See response to comment S.8.83. |
| S. 8. 184 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 j) | We again note the discrepancy between 11 and 12 stories. There are references to nodes within Mobility Hubs. It is our opinion that a statement should be made that all areas within a mobility hub are subject to that plan and outside of this type of classification. Otherwise, references within the respective mobility hub should have these definitions and clarifications within those sections of the document. As these uses are as yet undetermined, it seems inappropriate to make specific requirements available here – it predetermines the outcome of the mobility hubs study areas. | Policy modified and no longer provides direction to mobility hubs. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 185 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 j) ii) | Subsection (ii) should again include the option for a parking structure. | See response to comment S.8.155 |
| S. 8. 186 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 j) iii) | Subsection (iii) refers to community benefit. This is more appropriate when a Section 37 bonus policy is in place. | Policy modified. Policies on Section 37 will apply. |
| S. 8. 187 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 l) and m) | A clause should be included that where lands are within a mobility hub, those rules supercede this section. Further, reference is made to “within the podium of a mid-rise or tall building”, however tall buildings have been excluded from these land designations. Subsection (m) may be re-worded as follows: “An alternative target may be established through an area specific plan, such as the Mobility Hubs study.” | Policies modified. Also, please note that any new Official Plan policies related to Mobility Hubs will be amended as required to reflect the outcome of the area specific plans (i.e. mobility hub study). |
| S. 8. 188 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.3.6.2 m) | We need more affordable family units. Suggest increase to 50%. | See response to comment S.8.89 and S.8.187. |
| S. 8. 189 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.1.3.6.2 m) | 92 Plains Road East: Requirement of minimum of 30% of residential units within a mid-rise development in mobility hubs to consist of two bedrooms or more seems relatively high even for a mobility hub and will reduce the units provided within smaller development and increase the required parking. Suggest revising the criteria to developments of a particular unit count and reducing parking requirements. | See response to comment S.8.89 and S.8.187. |
| S. 8. 190 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | 8.1.3.6.2 c) | 2400 Guelph Line; 2545 Appleby Line; 1045 Plains Road East; 571 Brant Street; 2025 Guelph Line; 3023 New Street: Clarify what the minimum floor-to-ceiling height along Main Street Retail Streets is likely to be, how this will be interpreted for existing buildings, and how it will be interpreted if minor or incremental changes are proposed to an existing building in the future. | Policy applies to Urban Corridors and in the Downtown. The Zoning-By law will establish the appropriate general or context-specific floor-to-ceiling height metric. Additional general policy was added to permit minor expansions or renovations that are consistent with the existing scale and built form. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 190 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 v) | Our concerns related to the level of detail required for motor vehicle dealerships is noted above. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 191 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.2 w) | This section belongs in the Mobility Hubs section. There needs to be consistency in the approach here. | Comment noted. Policies maintained within this section. Area specific plan to provide direction in policy. |
| S. 8. 192 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.6.2.(h) | As policy 8.1.3.6.(b) states, "Development in Urban Corridor areas shall be designed to incorporate a compatible and intense mix of retail, office, employment and residential uses, and amenities and public service facilities...". Placing an arbitrary cap of 6 storeys limits the potential for this "intense mix" of uses, and should be increased. | The height parameters established for the Urban Corridor designation will help achieve the objectives of the Plan. Development proponents can apply for a height increase and will be subject to the review process and evaluation criteria. Urban Corridor lands located within Mobility Hubs will be evaluated as part of the area specific plan process which may result in alternate height permissions. |
| S. 8. 193 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.6.2.(j) | 11 storeys is not nearly enough! These are the MAJOR urban growth and intensification areas, why would the City arbitrarily cap growth at 11 storeys? What's the point of Tall Building Guidelines if 11 storeys is the cap? These should be 25+ storeys, otherwise it's a wasted opportunity if and when development within these areas present themselves. Failure to provide sufficient height and density within the Mobility Hubs and growth areas will put the remainder of Burlington's lowrise neighbourhoods at risk of "incompatible development" in the future. The Paradigm development at the Burlington Mobility Hub is already 20+ storeys, therefore this policy doesn't even respect what's already been built. | The height parameters established for the Urban Corridor designation will help achieve the objectives of the Plan. Development proponents can apply for a height increase and will be subject to the review process and evaluation criteria. This policy no longer applies to mobility hubs and we note there may be further updates land use permissions for lands within a mobility hubs as a result of the mobility hub study/area specific plans. |
| S. 8. 194 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.6.2.(m) | We understand the intent of this policy, but urge caution when dictating number of bedrooms, as this could have substantial cost implications that will price these units out of the market for many people. | See response to comment S.8.89 and S.8.187. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 195 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.6.2.(n) | Consideration should be given on a broader scale than just the specific property upon which the development is proposed. If the proposed development of a single use building compliments the broader corridor area, why would flexibility not be included to at least allow for this possibility? | Policy modified to allow flexibility in the introduction of a mix of uses in certain areas along the urban corridors. |
| S. 8. 196 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.3 | Further clauses in this section area again too detailed for a document of this high level. | Policy maintained. Reflective of an existing decision. |
| S. 8. 197 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.3 | We again note our concern that the limitations on existing properties should be reviewed in the context of a future rezoning and new OP, as they current zoning may limit opportunities for redevelopment and intensification. Further, the level of detail for some properties is best left in a zoning bylaw vs. an OP. | Policy maintained. Reflective of an existing decision. |
| S. 8. 198 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.3 b) v) | There should be a minimum building height. | Policy modified to acknowledge property is located within a mobility hub study area. |
| S. 8. 199 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.3 b) vi) | We question “majority” vs. “all” | Policy modified to acknowledge property is located within a mobility hub study area. |
| S. 8. 200 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.3.6.3 c) | Is this what current zoning for the ADI development? | Policy deleted. The property is located within a mobility hub study area. Area specific plan process is underway. A development application on the site has been submitted. |
| S. 8. 201 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.6.3 d) | We note that there is only one instance in the entire version of the OP where a tall building is allowed. This illustrates the core of our main concerns with the document – that while great effort has been made to create a Tall Building Guideline, at this time only one building in the entire City has as of right official plan approval, and that only limited. | Area specific plan process is underway for four areas. The new Official Plan has not changed underlying permissions; some of which are tall buildings (e.g.. 12 storeys or more). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 202 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.6.3.(b) | This property is located within the Appleby GO Mobility Hub, and along the Fairview Street Urban Corridor, where major growth and intensification is intended to go. Why would the City place such restrictions on this property? Residential and a mix of higher density uses SHOULD be permitted on this property, which is one of the only vacant properties in the vicinity of and within easy walking distance to the Appleby GO station. This policy as written contradicts the City's plans for Mobility Hubs. Also, where did the 3,000sq.m figure come from? The current zoning permits a maximum of 5,600sq.m, which should remain in place. | Area specific plan process is underway for four areas. Policy will be reviewed as part of this process. |
| S. 8. 203 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.6.3.(c) | This is the ADI Developments property which is being developed with townhouses. Not only does it not provide retail for the residents, it is located within the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub, and represents under-development. This should therefore place even more importance on the remainder of the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub to be developed at higher densities with both residential and retail uses to meet the goals of the Mobility Hubs. | See response to comment S.8.89 and S.8.187. |
| S. 8. 204 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.7.2 f) ii) | We question why industrial buildings are limited to two storeys if they can be built higher therefore using employment lands more efficiently. | Policy modified. All buildings are permitted to a maximum of 6 storeys, including those containing employment uses. |
| S. 8. 205 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.7.2 i) | We again recommend that there be a blanket statement within each designation that refers users to the Mobility Hubs sections that supercede these sections, to ensure there is no conflict in statements once the Mobility Hubs work is complete. | Policy deleted. Refer to Section 8.1.2 on Mobility Hubs. |
| S. 8. 206 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.3.7.2 k) | Why not quote exact heights here? | See response to comment S.8.83 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 207 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.7.2 k) | We recommend that for consistency, similar verbiage to this replace similar clauses for other land use designations that refer to FAR, square footage, etc. | See response to comment S.8.83 |
| S. 8. 208 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.7.2 l) | Our same concerns apply to this set of motor vehicle policies. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 209 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.1.3.7.2 m) | Link to subsection 8.1.3.6.2 u) makes no sense | Policy modified to cross reference subsection properly. |
| S. 8. 210 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.1.3.7.3 | Our previously noted concerns apply. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 211 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.1.3.7.3.(a).(ii) | It is well known that Aldershot needs a new grocery store, why would the City prohibit a grocery store on this large undeveloped property, a portion of which is within the Mobility Hub where significant residential and mixed use development is planned? The City's construction of the South Service Road would create an ideal scenario for a supermarket in connection with the greater development of this property as a whole. The only other property of sufficient size to build a grocery store is already being developed by ADI Developments as townhouses. | Comment noted. These lands are considered part of the City's and the Region's area of employment. The easterly portion of 1200 King Road was not considered for conversion. In Areas of Employment major retail uses are prohibited. |
| S. 8. 212 | 16-Oct-17 | Andrew Eldebs, Branthaven Development Corp. | 8.2 general | 720 Oval Court and 5135 Fairview Street: Request the City reconsider its decision to retain 720 Oval Court and 5135 Fairview Street in the City's employment lands supply, and requests that the City re-designate these lands to part of the Appleby GO Mobility Hub. | Policy maintained. The subject lands are included within the mobility hub study area. In developing the preliminary recommendations for employment land conversion these sites were assessed and recommended to be retained. Refer to staff report PB-30-16, staff report PB-50-17 and the proposed Official Plan for further details. |
| S. 8. 213 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.2 general | Saw nothing outlining how Bronte Meadows was going to be handled. Site specific study? | Comment noted. Please refer to Chapter 5 Section 5.4.2. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 214 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.2 general | Several cross referencing issues noted | Policy modified. |
| S. 8. 215 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.2.1.1 j) | Is there not a longer term strategy developed than 5 years? | Comment noted. The Burlington Economic Development Corporation has a 5 year Economic Development Strategy that is reviewed and updated regularly. |
| S. 8. 216 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.2.1.1.(a) | So even though the City's Land Needs Study demonstrated a surplus of employment land, and even though the comprehensive review process allows for re-designation requests, the City has already put it's foot down and closed the door on any opportunity for re-designation, even in cases where there would undeniably be positive outcomes for the City? | Policy maintained. The Phase 2 Employment Lands Study identified that there is sufficient supply of vacant employment lands to 2031, and that supply will be required beyond 2031. |
| S. 8. 217 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.2.1.2 d) | This is a good example of how a clause can be worded to eliminate the need for zoning and/or site plan level detail. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 218 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.2.1.2 e) | These type of details are inappropriate in an OP and are better left for a zoning bylaw and/or site plan guideline. The "intent" of what is desire here is covered in clauses such as (d) above, and/or other recommendations/suggestions made in Part A of our comments. | Comment noted. |

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 219 | 23-Mar-17 | Marcus Gagliardi | 8.2.2.2 f) and 8.2.3.2e) | Some of the development criteria recommended for recreational uses in order for them to be permitted as stand-alone uses on employment lands cause concern. The criteria requiring that the site has direct access to at least one Major Arterial Street or Multi-Purpose Arterial Street allows very few sites to permit these uses. Additionally, the comments found tension between forcing the use to the periphery while stating that the intent is to serve the employees in the area. Consider: located within 500m of a 'Highway Interchange Crossing'; uses be located within 500m walking distance of existing and/or planned public transportation; remove the requirement forcing recreation uses on the periphery of the employment areas, in our opinion, will decrease the number of employees the recreation use is able to serve. | Policy modified. Additional road classifications types added to criteria. See Chapter 8, Subsection 8.2.2. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 220 | 29-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3 | <p>901 Guelph Line: Our client continues to request that the subject lands be removed from the City's employment land base to allow for the comprehensive development of the site as a unique mixed use community. A concept for a complete, connected, affordable community was developed that would meet the needs for employment but would add significant community benefits and integrated residential development in addition to showcasing the potential for sustainable building practices comprehensively across the site. The redevelopment of the site has the potential to provide 329 people and jobs per ha where currently this site provides 6 jobs per ha. Numerous technical supporting documents were submitted at the time of the request for conversion including a Preliminary Servicing Review; Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan; Traffic Impact Study; Economic Benefits Analysis; and a Planning Justification Report. The City's assessment of the conversion request did not, in our opinion, fully consider the context for the site not only within the area but within the City's urban structure as a whole, nor did it comprehensively review the above-noted technical information provided. It assessed the conversion based solely on the principle of existing land use and viewed the site as a large parcel of land with good access in an employment area and did not consider its context or proximity ... <i>continued</i></p> | <p>Policy maintained. The subject site remains designated for employment use. Staff acknowledge that the site is located within an area formally referred to as Midtown. Midtown was previously designated as a mixed use node premised on achieving a 30% total modal split, requiring significant improvements to local and interregional transit services, including the provision of a new GO station. The land use vision for these lands were inextricably linked to the transportation infrastructure. The following is a summary of considerations for retaining the existing employment function, in addition to staff's rationale presented in PB-30-16, rather than converting the site enabling mixed use residential intensification. Existing Physical Constraints: bounded to the south by rail corridor, to the west by significant grade changes as well as traffic constraints. Together they compromise the ability for connection with adjacent land uses and transportation infrastructure and limit permeability - a trait common to mixed use areas.... <i>continued</i></p> |

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 221 | 29-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3 | <p>901 Guelph Line continued ... to the Burlington GO Station or the Fairview Street Urban Corridor. The follow-up response from City staff on this matter has been that the urban structure provided in the Draft Official Plan is firm, will generally not change in future drafts, and complements the City's local vision. We would hope that the continued public process is intended to allow for ongoing review and discussion and that such elements of the plan are not fixed until such time as Council makes this decision. We have provided staff with details about the proposal and rationale for consideration of these lands for conversion, through this Official Plan review, given the site context, constraints, and locational opportunities. We further provided staff with a policy structure for how the opportunity for the site's inclusion in the mobility hub can be addressed. It is our opinion that the employment designation applied to this site is limiting in nature, out-dated and that conversion of the subject lands is both appropriate and desirable as well as in alignment with the majority of the Council approved conversion policy. The current proposed Official Plan framework would create a restrictive policy framework which would stagnate any development potential on the lands for at least another decade. ... continued</p> | <p>continued... Potential Land Use Constraints: bounded on the north and east by employment uses. The site is part of a well established and contiguous employment area. The existing and future employment uses have the potential to generate land use compatibility issues (noise, dust, odour and vibration). Introduction of sensitive land uses on the east side of Guelph line could erode the planned function of employment. Neighbourhood Isolation: The constraints outlined above compromise the ability to create a strong public-private realm relationship and could result in a potentially isolated community without adequate connections to the surrounding area. Constraints may compromise the ability to increase modal split targets despite increase in density and employment. Diversion of Resources: Mobility Hubs are the focus for the... continued</p> |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 222 | 29-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3 | <p>901 Guelph Line continued... We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the new Official Plan as it applies to our client's lands and look forward to meeting with you to further our comments and requests outlined herein, being that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject lands be converted from employment (as justified by the supporting studies submitted by our client) to allow for the site to develop as a gateway site to the City, which includes a mixture of uses (employment, residential, retail); and, • The subject lands be considered as "Special Site Area" within the context of the Burlington Go Mobility Hub | <p>continued... creation of new neighbourhoods. The premise is to integrate land use with transportation infrastructure in association with Mobility Hubs. New and/or infrastructure and public service facilities will be required to support new growth in Mobility Hubs. A new mixed use neighbourhood outside of the areas that the City has identified for intensification to date, may lead to diversion of financial resources from new neighbourhoods elsewhere. Fostering Economic Activity: Through the proposed new Official Plan the City has confirmed the Urban Structure. In the future it will be rare, or impossible for the city to add more land to its "Area of Employment". Protection of employment land is essential to ensuring future supply. There are sites throughout the City suited for this type of redevelopment. Retaining these lands as part of the larger employment area affords the maximum flexibility to permit a range of employment uses.</p> |
| S. 8. 223 | 1-Sep-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3 | <p>901 Guelph Line: Requests removal of the lands from the City's employment land base and its inclusion in the Burlington GO Mobility Hub Area Specific Plan.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comments S.8.220, S.8.221 and S.8.222</p> |
| S. 8. 224 | 30-Jun-17 | Debra Kakaria, MHBC | 8.2.3 | <p>3455 North Service Road: The addition of stand alone recreational is not permitted by the draft policies on this site. Consistent with earlier submissions additional flexibility had been sought to allow the securement of additional tenants. There appears to be an opportunity to discuss a collaborative solution that achieves the City's objectives and allows the site to be developed. At a minimum the site specific policy established in OPA#89 should be maintained.</p> | <p>Policy modified to expand the opportunities for locations for stand alone recreational uses throughout the Area of Employment. The existing OPA#89 has not been incorporated.</p> |
| S. 8. 225 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3.2 e) | <p>3007 & 3200 Harvester Road: There would be some value in considering allowing a broader area to be considered a lot /occupied employment site for the purposes of the retail, service commercial and recreation uses permitted.</p> | <p>Policy maintained. The purpose of this policy is to reinvest in existing occupied employment sites to meet two objectives, support the continued employment use of the site and to provide amenities to existing employees close to where they work.</p> |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 226 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.2.3.2 g) vi) | Enhanced landscaping is not required for any other land use. Why here, and why this level of detail in an OP? | Policy maintained. The need for enhanced landscaping for a specific use relates to the objectives of the Business Corridor designation. The exposure of these lands to key Provincial Highway corridors requires enhanced features to support the prestige nature of the Business Corridor designation. |
| S. 8. 227 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3.3 | 441 North Service Road: The site specific policy has been removed. Please ensure that the existing facility and its range of supportive uses are reflected in the draft Official Plan. Please also ensure that the expanded facility being considered through a zoning by-law amendment is also recognized in the Official Plan including the lands on which the expanded parking area is located. | Policy maintained. The site specific policy permitting a large-scale motor vehicle dealership is found in 8.2.4.(3)a). The Hydro Corridor lands will be retained in the Infrastructure and Transportation Corridor designation. |
| S. 8. 228 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.2.3.3 a) | The level of detail in the subclauses is more appropriate in a zoning bylaw and/or site plan guidelines. | Comment noted. This policy is carried forward from the existing Official Plan based on an existing site specific policy. |
| S. 8. 229 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3.3 g) i) | 3007 & 3200 Harvester Road: Maximum flexibility is required to support a range of development options as the office market for this location is limited due to several constraints. | Existing policy modified to incorporate the full range of permitted uses. |
| S. 8. 230 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.2.3.3 g) v) | Reference is made here to a “comprehensive site plan” – is this an Area Specific Plan? | Policy modified to clarify that development in the area identified shall be considered comprehensively. |
| S. 8. 231 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | 8.2.3.3 h) | While not familiar with the specifics of this site, we question why a parking structure or underground parking would NOT be permitted. | Policy maintained. This policy is reflective of an existing site specific policy . |
| S. 8. 232 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.3 general | Ensure that intensification in established neighborhoods has tighter controls, including rules that prevent developer-initiated OP amendments and zoning by-law changes | Policies modified. Intensification is discouraged in the Established Neighbourhood Area of the growth framework. Development in Residential Neighbourhood Areas is subject to development application process and applicable policies of the Plan including Development Criteria. Also refer to response to comment S.2.27. |
| S. 8. 233 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.1.2 d) | There is little opportunity for the creation of public roadways in intensified situations, and infill is more likely to be of a private nature. This should be discussed as moving forward. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 234 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 8.3.2 | Add the clause “maximum density in residential low density areas should not exceed the lesser of 25 units/hectare or existing zoning. | Policy maintained. Density range maintained in policy. |
| S. 8. 235 | 5-Apr-17 | Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting | 8.3.2.1 | 143 Blue Water Place and 105 Avondale Court: Concerns related to height and the provision for new right of ways in residential low-density designation. Policies are too restrictive and redundant. Policies require that other ground-oriented dwellings, not including single and semi-detached housing types be compatible with the scale, urban design and community features of the neighbourhood. Compatibility is a defined term. This approach to determine maximum height is a appropriate as it does not limit redevelopment to existing by-laws or lands immediately around any property. | Policy maintained. Compatibility is a defined term, has been further modified and is embedded in the Residential Neighbourhood Area general objectives. Any development application will be subject to the development criteria contained in Chapter 12. Height is directed to be established in the Zoning By-law. The Policies only relate to minor variance application to the established height in the Zoning By-law. |
| S. 8. 236 | 5-Apr-17 | Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting | 8.3.2.1 | 143 Blue Water Place and 105 Avondale Court: The subject property is a private road which provides access to several residential units. New OP policies seek to encourage new redevelopment projects to dedicate these roads to the City. It is unclear how this provision is intended to be implemented. Compensation to the landowner should be made. | Policy maintained. Policies continue to encourage the dedication of public roads through the development application process. |
| S. 8. 237 | 5-Apr-17 | Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting | 8.3.2.1 | 800 LaSalle Park Road: Requests that the subject lands be designated Residential-High Density. High-rise uses comply with the development criteria (2.5.2 b). | Policy maintained. |
| S. 8. 238 | 5-Apr-17 | Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting | 8.3.2.1 | 800 LaSalle Park Road: Concerns related to height and the provision for new right of ways in residential low-density designation. Policies are too restrictive and redundant. Policies require that other ground oriented dwellings, not including single and semi-detached housing types be compatible with the scale, urban design and community features of the neighbourhood. Compatibility is a defined term. This approach to determine maximum height is a appropriate as it does not limit redevelopment to existing by-laws or lands immediately around any property. | See response to comment S.8.235 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 239 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 8.3.2.1 | Add the clause "except for townhouses" | Townhouses may be permitted. See Chapter 8, Subsection 8.3.3.(1). |
| S. 8. 240 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.3.2.1 | Specific edits suggested for residential low density | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 241 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.2.1 b) | An example of a compatible building product would be bungalow townhouses in a condominium form that often are calculated as low density. Confirm a product such as this is the type of example you are referring to. | See response to comment S.8.239 |
| S. 8. 242 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.2.1 e) | The determination for a height change appears to only apply to minor variances. Confirm that a rezoning application would be allowed the same leeway. | Policy maintained. Policy to apply to minor variances. |
| S. 8. 243 | 30-Jun-17 | Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates | 8.3.3 | 619 and 625 Maple Avenue : The stacked townhouse form being considered for this site exceeds the maximum density established in the Medium Density Residential designation. | Policy maintained. In this situation, development should balance the requirements of the underlying land use designation to accommodate a range of housing forms, including stacked townhouses. If density range is exceeded, an OPA will be required. |
| S. 8. 244 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.3.1 a) | The inclusion of single-detached dwelling in a medium density designation seems out of place. | Policy maintained. It allows for a range of housing forms that can be mixed and balanced to achieve the density range established for the designation. |
| S. 8. 245 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.3.1 b) | There is inconsistency in the density calculation between zoning and parkland policies. | Policy maintained. The city will complete an updated Parks Master Plan that examines the need for parkland in the City prior to amending Official Plan policies related to parkland dedication rates. Parks and Open Space staff forecast the delivery of a new Parks Master Plan by the end of 2018/early 2019, at which time OP policies will be amended accordingly. |
| S. 8. 246 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.3.3.1 b) and c) | Change maximum density to 50 units/ha and use Residential Policy Direction A 1. "Create the potential to permit ... to specific requirements" Use three requirements listed in original brief. This has the potential to intensify 3 fold. Two fold is bad enough. | Policy maintained. Proposed policy would allow the development of compatible built forms. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 247 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.3.1 c) (ii) | Why is there a requirement for limiting height to four storeys in residential medium density lands? There is a density limit to be reached. | Policy maintained. Both height and density provide the appropriate guidance for development within this land use designation. |
| S. 8. 248 | 29-Jun-17 | Elissa Quintanella / Cheryl Selig, T.Johns Consulting | 8.3.3.2 | 238 Sumach Drive: The features of the parcel support consideration for Residential - Medium Density designation with a site specific increase in density range for efficient redevelopment of the lands. The site is 1.5 ha (3.6 ac) in size and irregular in shape which does not lend itself to a lower density development that is consistent with the provincial and municipal growth objectives. The site is adjacent to residential uses with natural features directly south. These natural features introduce some environmental constraints, which could impact the extent of developable lands on site. The site itself is able to integrate a medium density development with the adjacent low density uses in a manner that provides for adequate buffering to the adjacent residential uses, provides appropriate on-site amenities areas and adequate parking facilities. Moreover, a medium density form will introduce additional housing options and uses to the mix of employment, recreational and low density residential uses already existing in the neighbourhood. It is our opinion that a site specific Residential – Medium Density designation is appropriate and represents good planning. | Land use designation maintained. Site specific policy added to acknowledge site constraints and remediation of the site. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 249 | 29-Jun-17 | Elissa Quintanella / Cheryl Selig, T.Johns Consulting | 8.3.3.2 | 238 Sumach Drive continued... With regards to the request for a site specific exception to allow an increase in density range to 110 units per net residential hectare (roughly 160 units, 1.49 net area), the current proposed Residential - Medium Density designation density range does not allow for the site specific features of this site and the ability to accommodate a larger amount of units in a stacked townhouse form on a site of this size. The size of the site functions well as an infill site for medium density but is inefficient for low density development. Given the planning justification supplied the Official Plan should include a site specific policy related to 238 Sumach to increase the density to 110 units per net hectare. | See response to comment S.8.248 |
| S. 8. 250 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.3.3.2 c) | Both addresses are west of William O'Connell Boulevard. | Policy modified to address comment. |
| S. 8. 251 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.4.1 b) | There is inconsistency in the figures used in determining high density project within the document between this section and 12.1.3.6.2 (parkland dedication). | Policy maintained. The city will complete an updated Parks Master Plan that examines the need for parkland in the City prior to amending Official Plan policies related to parkland dedication rates. Parks and Open Space staff forecast the delivery of a new Parks Master Plan by the end of 2018/early 2019, at which time OP policies will be amended accordingly. |
| S. 8. 252 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 8.3.4.1 c) | We do not agree with this. Any building intensification going above 185 units/ha should have an Official Plan Amendment. This will provide our citizens an early warning of what is taking place and provide them with an opportunity to comment on it. | Policy maintained. Staff believe that a development application can be assessed through a rezoning and effectively respond to context and address the development criteria and built form guidance set in the OP and other tools such as design guidelines. |
| S. 8. 253 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.4.1 c) (i) | Consistency with Provincial transit proximities of 500m or 800m is recommended. | Policy modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 254 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.4.1 c) (iii) | This clause should be deleted. It is counter-intuitive to have a policy that requires to conform to a zoning bylaw as a condition of being allowed to submit a zoning by-law amendment. | Policy maintained to assess increases in density but not in height. |
| S. 8. 255 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.4.1 c) (iv) | Clarify that community benefits may be provided as part of development through a Section 37 bonusing agreement, based on an approved Section 37 policy. The OP should reflect the practice that will be used in instances where high density projects are approved. | Policy deleted. Development subject to Section 37 policies. |
| S. 8. 256 | 30-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.3.4.1 e) | 5166 - 5170 Lakeshore Road: It is too restrictive to require that High Density Residential developments provide a functional outdoor common amenity area at grade level for use by residents. There are many examples where outdoor amenity is provided above grade. The City should consider means of building in flexibility in determining what constitutes outdoor amenity area. | Policy modified. "shall" replaced with "should". |
| S. 8. 257 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.4.1 e) | The provision of at grade common space for residents is a design element which is more appropriate for discussion with a design review panel and/or inclusion in a Site Plan Guideline. Detail of this nature is not appropriate in an OP. | See response to comment S.8.256 |
| S. 8. 258 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.4.2 | While not aware of the details of these cases, the inclusion of details such as this seem more appropriate in a zoning by-law than an OP. We would recommend that they be included in the comprehensive zoning bylaw that will follow the OP process. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 259 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.3.5 | The preamble refers the reader to Schedule 'B', where Neighbourhood Character Areas are mapped. However, Schedule B includes no such reference in either the legend or on the mapping. | Preamble modified. Neighbourhood Character Areas are identified in the Zoning By-law and not in Official Plan mapping. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 260 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 8.4.1 | Add a specific natural corridors section or references to this use in CHAPTER 8 LAND USE POLICIES - URBAN AREA and CHAPTER 9 LAND USE POLICIES - RURAL AREA. The natural corridor land use links Green Belt and Niagara Escarpment Natural Heritage Systems to each other and Lake Ontario. | Comment noted. Section 4.2.2 c) indicates that linkages (i.e..., natural corridors are a component of the Natural Heritage System. Schedule N identifies Enhancements, Linkages and Buffers. However, it also should be noted that Key Natural Features such as watercourses also may function as linkages (corridors). |
| S. 8. 261 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 8.4.2.3 a) (i) (ii) | The "Major Parks and Open Space" designation reference to (Wellness House) needs to be updated, since Wellness House is not located within the delineated private or public open space. According to Schedule C Land Use - Urban Area, Wellness House is within 'Urban Centres'. There should not be a public health care building within the private open space owned by The Villages of Brantwell. | Policy modified to clarify the address that this site specific policy applies to (it does not apply to the property owned by the Villages of Brantwell). This site specific policy was identified through a site specific Official Plan Amendment that was approved by Council in 2015. |
| S. 8. 262 | 13-Jun-17 | Al Ruggero, Rexton Developments | 8.6 general | Grahams Lane and parallel to the CNR: Lands previously designated "Mixed Use Corridor Employment" and "Residential Medium Density" and "Residential High Density" are being proposed to be designated to Infrastructure and Transportation Corridor. This change is not supported and will adversely impact the development potential of these lands. | Schedule C designates portions of these lands Urban Corridor-Employment Lands, Residential Low Density, Residential Medium Density, and Residential High Density, |
| S. 8. 263 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.7.1.1.(b) | Why prohibit drive-thrus outright? Would it not be more appropriate to allow them subject to appropriate design? Burlington is and will remain for a very long time car-dependent, therefore there is substantial demand for the convenience that drive-thrus offer. | Drive-throughs continue to be permitted in most areas subject to design criteria. Prohibition or additional evaluation criteria was added to those areas which are intended to support significant intensification and transition to a highly pedestrian and transit oriented environment. Existing drive-throughs will continue to be permitted. |
| S. 8. 264 | 7-Jul-17 | Jonathan Rodger, Zelinka Priamo LTD | 8.7.1.2 | 1220 Brant Street. 1250 Brant Street and 1326 Brant Street: Clarify if new accessory drive-throughs will be permitted on these lands. | An accessory drive-through may be permitted subject to rezoning, and design and development criteria. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|-------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 265 | 30-Jun-17 | Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates | 8.7.1.2 a) and b) | Objects to the proposed specific prohibition of DT in OP. OPs do not need to be prescriptive like ZBL. A specific prohibition is not justified as the existing policies would have to be complied with no matter what the proposed use to ensure all policy requirements to direct built form, density, etc. are achieved. | Prohibition in Urban Growth Centre and mobility hubs is consistent with City, Regional and Provincial intentions for these areas. For the other areas, the word prohibition was removed. |
| S. 8. 266 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 8.7.1.2 b) | Why must this be tied to a Zoning By-Law Amendment application? Drive-throughs with good design should be permitted in these areas as of right. What is the justification for the prohibition against drive-throughs? | Zoning amendments allow for a more detailed review of how an accessory drive-through, may impact compatibility, broader mixed use, intensification and pedestrian/transit focused goals of key mixed use, growth areas in the City. |
| S. 8. 267 | 30-Jun-17 | Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates | 8.7.1.2 b) | "shall be prohibited" in this context is not acceptable wherein the policy provides for a ZBL amendment. | Policy modified. In this context, accessory drive-throughs may be permitted subject to criteria. |
| S. 8. 268 | 30-Jun-17 | Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates | 8.7.1.2 b) | Objects to the specific need for a zone change in the noted areas. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 269 | 30-Jun-17 | Victor Labreche, Labreche Patterson & Associates | 8.7.1.2 b) | The context or notion that a DT cannot exist with or abutting a mixed use type zone permitting sensitive uses is not acceptable. Planning policies are encouraging mixed uses and intensification in close proximity to heavily traveled vehicle corridors. | Policy modified to ensure development achieve compatibility by appropriately separating and mitigating potential adverse impacts. |
| S. 8. 270 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission C | 8.7.1.2 d) | The clause should be revised to indicate that the drive through is not located between the building's front façade and a public right of way. | Policy modified. New section in Chapter 7 includes design considerations to be addressed in the design of accessory drive throughs including location of the accessory drive through. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 271 | 18-May-17 | Jean Roy, Canadian Fuels Association | 8.7.1.2 d) | The Draft OP indicates in its section 8.7.1.2 d) that: “An accessory drive-through shall not be located between a building façade and a public right-of-way”. This restriction should not apply in the case of a motor vehicle service station as in such a case locating the drive-through near the public right-of-way and between the building and the public right-of-way is often the most appropriate location as it is then located away from adjacent properties and doesn’t conflict with the fuel pumps area. For safety reasons, locating the drive-through on the same side of the building as the fuel pumps is not usually feasible. | See response to comment S.8.270 |
| S. 8. 272 | 30-Jun-17 | Ornella Richichi, SmartREIT | 8.7.1.2.1 d) | Suggest adding language to clarify the intent of the policy (e.g. pedestrian access) to allow for flexibility in the location of drive-throughs provided safe pedestrian access is provided. | See response to comment S.8.270 |
| S. 8. 273 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | “Affordable” needs to be carefully defined. In one context it suggests a variety of housing options and general market availability designed to allow greater access to a diverse population, in another context it specifically means providing housing for low-income families. | Policy maintained. There are definitions for affordable housing, assisted housing and special needs housing. The unitalicized term affordable is now used in select policies and is described in each policy. |
| S. 8. 274 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | General | There appears to be an approach to limit height in redevelopment, versus embracing it where appropriate. Given the inability to submit an OP amendment application within two years, the City is curtailing its ability to grow within the next two years, given the limitations here and the preliminary information provided through the mobility hubs study. | Comment noted. Refer to Chapter 12, Subsection 12.1.1.(3). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 275 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | General | <p>There are many references throughout the document linking “shall” with the provision of transit.</p> <p>We emphasize that while this is an appropriate goal of the City, private industry is not able nor is it appropriate to require private industry to provide transit. Accordingly, verbiage should be included, and the numerous clauses within the Official Plan as a hole should be changed, to reflect that it is the City who will provide transit, and that it will be directed to the nodes and corridor type locations where you would like to see intensification occur.</p> | <p>Policies throughout the document have been modified to address this concern. The Frequent Transit Corridors will be serviced by Burlington Transit and are aligned with growth areas. Other policies have been updated to clarify that the role of private industry is to design sites that facilitate active transportation connections to transit stops.</p> |
| S. 8. 276 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales, Carriage Gate | General | <p>In respect of the continuation of the Precinct Planning framework for the Downtown, I clearly indicated that the current framework has failed and that such a framework should be replaced. The rationale for this is that the current rate of development/redevelopment/intensification is failing to meet minimum growth requirements. At 60 new residential new units per year (the current average for the Urban Growth Centre), I indicated that it would take the City 54 years to reach the minimum targets for 2031. In addition, I indicated that to meet the current minimum population and employment targets for 2031 at least 15 new 24 storey buildings or 44 new 8 storey buildings would be required within the Urban Growth Centre by 2031 (one new high rise every year from now until 2031) – a 43% increase to the existing residential housing supply within the Urban Growth Centre. I also indicated that the failure of the existing Precinct Planning framework is demonstrated by the fact that all new tall buildings within the Downtown have required official plan and zoning amendments.</p> | <p>Refer to response to comments S.1.22 and S.1.15.</p> |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 277 | 5-Sep-17 | Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo | General | Any revisions to land use permissions and/or policies should be worded to provide flexibility and/or recognition of all of the existing uses, including flexibility for any minor changes or incremental changes over time. | Policies modified to provide flexibility and recognize existing development. |
| S. 8. 278 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | General | Provide adequate treatment for all future developments across the City as they relate to the provision of public space resulting from development. | Comment noted. |
| S. 8. 279 | 17-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Submission B | General | Significant detail is provided for specific properties. Without a proper understanding of the specifics of the properties in general, we offer that it would appear that many of the clauses and requirements are based on current zoning permissions. Whereas this may be what the City is desirous of maintaining, it may be more appropriate to review some or all of these properties to see what the highest and best use may now be, regardless of how recently the zoning was implemented. We consider this to be counterintuitive to moving forward with a new OP and new zoning, to embed current zoning into the new OP that may be a lost opportunity for good redevelopment. | Policies maintained. Reflective of OMB decision. |
| S. 8. 280 | 25-Aug-17 | Russ Fearon, Throat Threads Apparel | 8.1.3.7 | 1167 Plains Road East: Requests reconsideration of designation at 1167 Plains Road East. Currently Urban Corridor Employment, and requests Urban Corridor (MXC Zoning) to allow for assembly with 1134 Plains Road East. | Schedule B and C modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER EIGHT - LAND USE POLICIES URBAN AREA | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 8. 281 | 29-Sep-17 | Ruth Victor, Ruth Victor and Associates | 8.1.1.2 | 415-431 Burlington Ave and 1407-1421 Lakeshore Rd: Requests that the subject lands are reconsidered with regard to the Downtown Mobility Hub Study to be identified as Mid Rise Residential Precinct. The allows for a more suitable transition from the St. Luke neighbourhood to the west and the higher density area to the east. An opinion letter from a heritage consultant was provided and indicates that the lands do not preclude further consideration for development as they do not share the same attributes as the rest of the neighbourhood to the west. | Policy and Schedules maintained. Also, please note that any new Official Plan policies related to Mobility Hubs will be amended as required to reflect the outcome of the area specific plans (i.e. mobility hub study). See response to comment S.8.89 |
| S. 8. 282 | 21-Jul-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | 8.2.3.2 h) | 1569 Yorkton Court: Requests confirmation that a facility geared to utility vans and vans including full service department, sales services and finishing and assembly facility, storage and office and employee amenity. | Policy modified. As written the policy requires that a new large scale automotive dealership should be located on a Major Arterial or Multi-Purpose Arterial Street or Industrial Connector. |
| S. 8. 283 | 8-Aug-17 | Debra Kakaria, MHBC | 8.2.2 | 1121 Walker's Line: Confirm support for establishing the General Employment Designation for the entire site. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER NINE - LAND USE POLICIES RURAL AREA | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 9. 1 | 29-Jun-17 | PERL | 9.1 general | PERL supports the Rural Community policies. | Comment noted. |
| S. 9. 2 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.1.1 b) | Hard to do when the NHS regulations override agriculture, and the setbacks and buffers keep encroaching further and further into agricultural land, and the mere presence of certain birds or salamanders makes farming no longer possible on Prime Agricultural Land. While I know municipal and regional planners disagree completely with the private sector farm operators, the NHS policies are strangling agricultural operations and making agriculture more and more difficult. Farmers should not need Planning Degrees or a team of lawyers to farm their land. | Comment noted. The Official Plan only applies to agricultural development requiring Planning Act approval. It does not apply to farming activities, such as what to plant and where. Official Plan policies may lead to setback requirements for farm buildings but the setbacks may still be used for growing crops or pasturing livestock. Where regulations protecting species at risk impact on growing of crops or pasturing of livestock those regulations are implemented through the Provincial Endangered Species Act, not through the Official Plan. |
| S. 9. 3 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.1.1 c) | Missing severances of surplus farm dwellings. Why have the policies with respect to these types of severances been deleted from the Official Plan? | Policy modified. Regional staff are currently preparing a regional plan amendment to add surplus farm dwellings policies to the Region of Halton Official Plan to enable local municipalities to adopt Official Plan policies and zoning by-laws permitting the severance of surplus farm dwellings. City staff have been consulted on these draft policies and are supportive. City staff have included policies based on the draft regional amendment in the City's proposed new Official Plan (see Chapter 12, Subsection 12.1.12 (4.10) c). A policy has been added limiting the size of the dwelling permitted on the surplus lot so that the footprint shall be no more than twenty-five (25) percent greater than the footprint of the existing dwelling. |
| S. 9. 4 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 9.1.2 c) | The OP should permit the severance of surplus farm dwellings as per the Greenbelt Plan and the Niagara Escarpment Plan. | See response to comment S.9.3. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER NINE - LAND USE POLICIES RURAL AREA | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|-------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 9. 5 | 13-Jul-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 9.1.2 d) | Suggested additions to policy: (i) the development envelope shall be located within 120 m of a municipal road and shall not exceed one hectare in area. (ii) The development envelope shall be located so as to minimize impacts on the viability of the current and future agricultural use of the lot. (iii) A new or replacement dwelling shall not be greater than 225 sq. m in size | Policy maintained. The planning rationale for limiting the size of the dwelling 225 sq m is not provided. |
| S. 9. 6 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 9.1.2 j) | Location and construction of infrastructure and utilities in the Rural Area. It is necessary to provide the utmost protection to the agriculture and natural heritage systems ... Please make the referenced section much stronger to provide the utmost protection | Comment noted. The policy, which is now included in Ch. 6, Subsection 6.1.2 h), provides a strong basis for the City to respond to infrastructure projects. It provides for the City to request Agricultural Impact Assessments and other studies for major infrastructure projects and to object to projects that one or more of the studies conclude will have unacceptable impacts. |
| S. 9. 7 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 9.2 and 9.3 | On Farm Businesses. Language in the Burlington OP should reflect the new Provincial plans as much as possible. | Minor modifications to policies. The Plan permits on-farm businesses and agriculture-related uses that are small in scale and secondary to a commercial farm operation, in conformity with Halton's OP. The new Provincial plans permit a broader range of agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses, raising significant new issues. Full conformity with Provincial plans will be addressed through the Region's Official Plan review. |
| S. 9. 8 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.2 general | Agreed, so why then does the government over-run it with regulations and policies that threaten the viability of agriculture? The way the NHS policies are enforced are having a negative impact on agriculture. The NHS cannot always come first. | Comment noted. The NHS policies only apply to some agricultural buildings. They do not apply to other aspects of agricultural operations, such as the cultivation of land and growing of crops. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER NINE - LAND USE POLICIES RURAL AREA | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|---------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 9. 9 | 13-Jul-17 | Agriculture Sub-Committee | 9.2 general | The Bruce Trail should be recognized as a permitted use throughout the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area and subject to the Development and Growth Objectives found in the NEP. | The objectives of Chapter 9 include providing opportunities for non-intensive recreation uses in the Rural Area. Non-intensive recreation uses associated with the Bruce Trail are permitted in the Agricultural Area and NHS designations. Policy 9.1.2 j) has been added permitting Bruce Trail access points. |
| S. 9. 10 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.2.1.(a).(v) | Agreed. All Provincial and Municipal planning documents say this, yet in practice, normal farming practices and the right to farm are being negatively impacted as priority is always given to NHS over agriculture. It should be the other way around. | Comment noted. Agricultural uses are permitted in the Natural Heritage System. The Official Plan policies may impact on some agricultural buildings but do not apply to the growing of crops or pasturing of livestock. |
| S. 9. 11 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.2.2.(c).(i) | Agreed, good policy, unfortunately in practice it's not working this way. Policy needs to be added that makes it abundantly clear that Agriculture comes first, even in cases where there are conflicts with the NHS. | Comment noted. |
| S. 9. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 9.2.3 (b) | Definition of types of events seems rather vague, but also overly restrictive; should include events which raise awareness of local agriculture. Types of events allowed is very restrictive- allowing only events directly related to the farm operation or related to on-farm diversified use producing value-added agricultural products eliminates a farm's ability to host private events such as weddings, which may provide a much needed boost to bottom line while also functioning as a promotional tool to encourage interest in their agricultural products or encouraging agro-tourism in general. If the size, type and number of events were restricted, why not allow this use, as long as it doesn't negatively impact agricultural operations, natural areas or neighbours? It is another means of building in flexibility and enabling farms to be creative in adapting to being in a near urban context while remaining competitive at a level that allows them to invest in other types of agriculture related expansions and/or improvements | Policy modified to ensure that events support commercial agricultural operations. A new policy added to permit events supporting registered charitable organizations. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER NINE - LAND USE POLICIES RURAL AREA | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/ Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 9. 13 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 9.2.3 a) (xiii) | The policy should not prevent nature viewing and pedestrian trail activities on private lands, assuming owner permission. This is the current practice in parts of the rural area. The City should not discourage public enjoyment of our rural areas. | Comment noted. This policy would only apply to recreational developments requiring Planning Act approval or to or site alterations. It would not prevent nature viewing or hiking on private land. |
| S. 9. 14 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 9.2.3 b) | We do not agree with this policy. A private landowner having a farm property should be able to host 'special events' unrelated to their farm operations.....The City should not prevent NGOs' ability to use special events for fundraising in support of our mission.....The City should not require an amendment to the zoning bylaw, or a temporary use bylaw for special events. Bylaws take too much time and resources, effectively preventing Special Events. The current "permit" process is more than adequate,..... | See response to comment S.9.12. |
| S. 9. 15 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 9.2.4 | Specific wording edits suggested to Prime Agricultural Area policies in comments | Policy modified to require that proposals to redesignate land within Prime Agricultural Areas must demonstrate that alternative locations have been evaluated and demonstrated to be unsuitable. |
| S. 9. 16 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 9.2.4 | Should there be restrictions on aggregate extraction in the prime agricultural land designated area as it all seems to be prime land and just requiring a swap at time of rehabilitation seems unwise. | Comment noted. The PPS permits mineral aggregate extraction in Prime Agricultural Areas. The City's OP specifies that a new or expanded mineral aggregate operation requires an amendment to the Plan and requires that impacts on the Agriculture System be evaluated in considering such amendments. It also requires that when aggregate extraction is complete the site be rehabilitated to agricultural use where feasible. |
| S. 9. 17 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 9.2.4 | Not sure why the criteria applicable to areas outside the Greenbelt Plan area do not apply to those within, seems like we are putting too much faith in the Greenbelt Plan which is something that is out control of the municipality and could be impacted by changes in Provincial government. | Comment noted. The criteria do not apply to redesignation of Prime Agricultural lands within the Greenbelt as the Official Plan does not permit such redesignation within the Greenbelt. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER NINE - LAND USE POLICIES RURAL AREA | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 9. 18 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | 9.3 general | Add a specific natural corridors section or references to this use in CHAPTER 8 LAND USE POLICIES - URBAN AREA and CHAPTER 9 LAND USE POLICIES - RURAL AREA. The natural corridor land use links Green Belt and Niagara Escarpment Natural Heritage Systems to each other and Lake Ontario. | Comment noted. The NHS includes natural corridors and linkages and these are protected through the NHS policies respecting ecological functions. See Section 4.2.2. |
| S. 9. 19 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.3 general | As explained above, that is not always the case in reality. | Comment noted. |
| S. 9. 20 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.3.1.(b) | Directly contradicts what is said in policy 9.3.1.(g): "To protect or enhance Key Natural Features, without limiting the ability of agricultural uses to continue." So which is it? Is agriculture permitted within Key Features or not? | Comment noted. Existing agricultural operations are permitted in Key Natural Features. |
| S. 9. 21 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.3.1.(m) | The unfortunate and certainly unintended reality of this policy is that it encourages illegal trespassing onto private property and farmland, where people feel they can do whatever they want, go wherever they want, and damage whatever they want, all on property that they do not own. Rural property owner rights are infringed upon every day because of policies like this one. | Policy modified to only permit non-intensive recreational uses on lands that are publicly owned or are part of the Bruce Trail. See Subsection 9.2.3 a) (xiv) and 9.3.2 c) (xiii). |
| S. 9. 22 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.3.2.(c) | Object to the word "may" be permitted. If the agricultural operation is existing, it "shall" be permitted as of right. Let's not forget that most of the rural area farm land has been farmed for the past century, well before the government started introducing restrictive policies and designation labels. | Comment noted. The word "may" is used as the uses are permitted if they meet the other policies of the Plan. They are not permitted unconditionally. This is the approach that applies to permitted uses throughout the Plan. |
| S. 9. 23 | 14-Jul-17 | PERL | 9.5.2 f) | "Major rock cutting and blasting for road construction within Rural Settlement Areas. The regrading of the existing land for road construction shall be discouraged." Should require City 'site alteration permit'. | Policy maintained. Road construction is exempt from the by-law as the impacts of road construction are addressed under other legislation. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER NINE - LAND USE POLICIES RURAL AREA | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 9. 24 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 9.5.3.(b) | This is somewhat unfair to the purchaser of a rural settlement area lot, who may have purchased the lot with a particular home design in mind, only to find out after the fact that the City of Burlington may restrict the size of the house because of "other factors". How does a purchaser do their due diligence in this case without spending tens of thousands of dollars on studies and drawings BEFORE buying the lot? | Policy modified to specify considerations to be taken into account in assessing maximum dwelling size. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TEN - LAND USE POLICIES NORTH ALDERSHOT | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 10.1 | 29-Jun-17 | Hugh Handy, GSP Group | 10 | 1761 Old Waterdown Road: We understand that the maps and policies that apply to the North Aldershot area are not proposed to be changed as part of the City's new draft Official Plan. We request that we are informed of any future studies and plans undertaken by the City as they pertain to this property. | GSP will be included in the notification list for future City plans and studies. |
| S. 10.2 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 10.3.6 (b) | New public roads will be built to rural standards: We'd like clarification on what exactly this means (defined somewhere else in the plan?) but we question whether this is sufficient as we are trying to achieve a 'balanced' transportation system and there are plans in the works to widen a number of our rural roads to improve safety for cycling. | Existing policy maintained. A review of the North Aldershot policies will be done through the Region's Official Plan Review, and any changes will be made at that time. |
| S. 10.3 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 10.4.1.1 | Do these policies apply to Eagle Heights? If so, we have concerns, given that not all lots proposed are single detached dwellings. | The policy in the existing OP has been maintained. The North Aldershot policies will be reviewed as part of the Region's Official Plan review. |
| S. 10.4 | 20-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 10.4.4 (c) | Need to be careful that lower density appearance is not confused with sprawl | Comment noted. A review of the North Aldershot policies will be done through the Region's Official Plan Review, and any changes will be made at that time. |
| S. 10.5 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 10.4.7 f) (ii) | Use Audubon (or similar) standard for any expansion/change of golf operations | See response to comment S.10.4. |
| S. 10.6 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 10.5.1 | The policies break out the various development pods in Eagle Heights into "Sub-Areas", and dictate the maximum number of residential units permitted in each. We have an active application that exceeds these maximum number of units. These numbers warrant further review and discussion given the pending OMB Hearing. There are also policies regarding "Building Envelope Control" that should be deleted, given that this additional requirement was not identified in the OMB Decision. | The policies and mapping in the City's existing Official Plan have been maintained in the new Plan. A review of the North Aldershot policies will be done through the Region's Official Plan Review, and any changes will be made at that time. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TEN - LAND USE POLICIES NORTH ALDERSHOT | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 10.7 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 10.5.1.1.(i) | What does this mean? By whom? Is that valley not already in a natural state? | The policies and mapping in the City's existing Official Plan have been maintained in the new Plan. A review of the North Aldershot policies will be done through the Region's Official Plan Review, and any changes will be made at that time. |
| S. 10.8 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 10.5.1.2.(h) | What does this mean? This area is farmed, and the "natural vegetation pattern" has never been altered. What needs to be restored? We disagree with the need for this statement. | See response to comment S.10.7. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ELEVEN - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & ENGAGEMENT | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 11. 1 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.1 | "The City is known for its sound decision-making processes". Is this a goal? Or something already achieved? If so, it would be better to back it up with a reference (i.e. According to...). | Policy modified to reflect the source reference, the Strategic Plan. |
| S. 11. 2 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11 Preamble | suggest identifying which strategic plan you are referencing i.e. 2015-2040 | Policy modified. |
| S. 11. 3 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.1.1 | Objectives are general - It would be better to explain more about "how" the City is going to implement these | Policy maintained. Objectives are intended to be high level general statements, while the policies are intended to explain how the city will achieve the objectives. |
| S. 11. 4 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.2.1 | As Environmental awareness is a key factor in engaging the public community, we propose to add an item specifically for Environmental awareness maybe into this section or section 11.3.1 Procedures. The city could implement Environmental awareness seminars or workshops for residents/or consider a budget for this. Other possible engagement strategies could be inclusion in councillors' newsletters, website posting area, and automated e-mail notifications. | Policy modified. We agree that awareness is important on many matters, so we have added a broader policy that supports awareness related to all matters addressed by the Official Plan (this includes environmental issues, amongst many others). |
| S. 11. 5 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 11.2.1 a) vi) | While we recognize the importance of consultation in the development process, the Planning Act specifically outlines those processes by which the public has a say (at noted in your subsection (b) of same Section. Please clarify the intent here is not to make other processes, such as site plan approval, a public process. | Policy maintained. City Council has the authority to undelagate Site Plan approval and require a public process. |
| S. 11. 6 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 11.2.1 g) | We are very supportive of this initiative, and note that this is an area where the City needs improvement, based on experiences over the last one to two years. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ELEVEN - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & ENGAGEMENT | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 11. 7 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 11.2.1 j) | While we acknowledge the City’s intent to allow for a full spectrum of consultation as outlined earlier in this chapter, it may be misconstrued by some that EMPOWERMENT allows for a decision making process in all development applications, that supercedes that of the land owner and/or developer. Clarity needs to be provided about how and when (or if) instances of EMPOWERMENT occurs as part of private development. | Policy maintained. We acknowledge that there are limits to the ability to empower final decision making power as they relate to decisions made under The Planning Act. Policy 11.2.1 b) indicates that other legislation applies. |
| S. 11. 8 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 11.2.1.(j).(v) | Misleading policy. This gives the impression that land use planning matters will be voted on by the public, which is not the case. The public in general are not land use experts, nor have the knowledge to qualify them to make land use planning decisions. If the City's intention is to leave decision making in the hands of the public, then NIMBYism will rule the day. Surely that is not the intent of this policy. | See response S.11.7. |
| S. 11. 9 | 20-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.3.1 | Outline what citizens can do in terms of asking questions and providing opinion at each public meeting (Neighbourhood, Statutory, Recommendation to Committee and Council). | Policy maintained. This level of detail is not addressed by an Official Plan. Please refer to the Engagement Charter and the city's website for addition details on delegating to Council and participating in public meetings. |
| S. 11. 10 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.3.1 | Provide recommendations four weeks in advance of Planning and Development Recommendation meeting. Allow time to properly analyze. | Policy maintained. Committee agenda timelines are outside of the scope of the Official Plan. Your comment has been shared with Council and the Clerks Department for consideration. |
| S. 11. 11 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 11.3.1 a) | Ensure that there is adequate time for submissions made to Council. Add new policy in 11.3.1.(a), between (viii) and (ix)“at the public meeting, adequate time shall be provided to enable persons who are interested in the amendment to make submissions that fully and fairly address their concerns” | Policy maintained. Delegation protocols are outside of the scope of the Official Plan. Your comment has been shared with Council and the Clerks Department for consideration. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER ELEVEN - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & ENGAGEMENT | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 11. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.3.1 a) (xi) | In what circumstances does the City consider a high level of public engagement to be required? Provide reference to document that fully spells out this process or better describe in Official Plan. How is this defined? What is considered to be a 'potentially significant impact'? Who makes this decision? | Policy maintained. The term is not defined and has been left broad to allow for discretion in implementation. Typically this decision would be made by city staff or Council, often based on feedback received from the community that demonstrates the need for further consultation. |
| S. 11. 13 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 11.3.1 a) ii) | Wording to indicate that said webpage will be provided by the City, as is the current practice, should be included. This allows for control of the information by City staff, in a uniform manner and location understood by the public. | Policy modified. |
| S. 11. 14 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.3.1 a) iv) | Please consider adding more advisory committees and persons who have expressed interest to the circulation list. | Policy modified. |
| S. 11. 15 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 11.3.1 a) ix) | Consider changing "adequate time may be allowed" to "adequate time shall be allowed". Does the fact that it is a statutory public meeting imply that staff should analyze all public comments? | Policy modified. |
| S. 11. 16 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 11.3.1 a) viii) | It may be appropriate to add wording such as "and/or its successors" to the term Ontario Municipal Board, given the current Provincial review of the same. | Policy modified. |
| S. 11. 17 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 11.3.1.(a).(xi) | What does this do to application processing timeframes? The Planning Act still requires municipalities to make a decision within 180 days from the date an application is deemed complete. | Policy maintained. Planning Act timeframes still apply. |
| S. 11. 18 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Numerous editorial suggestions (e.g. punctuation, minor wording changes) made in comments | Policies modified. |
| S. 11. 19 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Graphic 11-1 | Could this be turned into a 2 x 5 table giving examples of situations when the City would employ one type of engagement over another? | Existing graphic maintained. A more detailed table regarding the spectrum of public engagement is found in the City's Engagement Charter. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.1 | 30-Jun-17 | Glenn Wellings, Glenn Wellings & Associates | 12.1 | 5111 New Street: Absent any direction on transition there may be some need to provide further comments in relation to an in-process applications Appleby Village OPA and ZBLA (505-01/14 & 520-05/14). Please confirm how transition will be addressed. | Policy modified. See Chapter 2 and Chapter 8. |
| S. 12.2 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.2 c) | Forecast should be replaced with forecasted (two instances in this paragraph) | Policy modified. |
| S. 12.3 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.2 e) | This statement is problematic and needs clarification and discussion with our membership. As it currently reads it is broad based with no limitation of implementation. | Policy maintained. This policy was brought forward from the existing Official Plan. |
| S. 12.4 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.2 g) | We again ask that the term Area-Specific Plan be prefaced with "City initiated" | Policy maintained. While Area Specific Plan are generally City-initiated (see policy 12.1.3.(2) b)) there are additional policies that allow for undertaking Area Specific Plans that are not included in the City's work program (see 12.1.3.(2) c & d)). |
| S. 12.5 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.2.1 b) | Wording needs to be added to clarify that after the initial 10 year review of an OP, further reviews shall not exceed five years (as per the Planning Act) | Policy modified. |
| S. 12.6 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.2.1 c) | Define "minor". | Policy maintained. The Plan does not define major or minor in order to allow for interpretation subject to context, scale and potential impacts. |
| S. 12.7 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.2.1 d) | We recommend rewording this sentence as follows: "... and may determine if an earlier or additional review is required." | Policy maintained. No time dimension established. |
| S. 12.8 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.2.1 f) | We recommend that this clause be reworded to replace "shall" with "may be assessed against any or all of the following" | Policy modified to clarify the intent to assess OPAs against a standard set of criteria, acknowledging that some criteria apply only to site specific OPAs and only the relevant principles, objectives and policies of the Plan will be assessed. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.9 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.3.1 | This section really highlights concerns we have noted throughout our comments: it is the intent that “the Official Plan provides high level direction” ,whereas in many instances it takes on the level of detail of Zoning by-laws, secondary plans, and in some instances, site plan level details. We again urge staff that an Official Plan is NOT the place for such level of detail. | Comment noted. |
| S. 12.10 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.3.1.2 | What is form based zoning? It is neither defined nor referred to elsewhere within the document. | Comment noted. Form based zoning address the relationship between building facades and the public realm, the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another, and the scale and types of streets and blocks. Form based zoning presents its regulations in both words and visuals. |
| S. 12.11 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.3.1.2 e) | What municipal requirements does that include? Agricultural zones will be re-developed as “urban zone” after interim period. Can this be explained a little more clearly? | In the case of a Development Zone, the Official Plan establishes a parent Designation which describes its ultimate urban land use, however the D zoning allows for existing uses or agricultural uses to continue until such time as development occurs. |
| S. 12.12 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.3.1.3.2 a) v) | The supporting studies noted here are typical of the requirements for development applications such as OPA,ZBA, subdivision, site plan. Given that they are to be submitted and approved as part of those applications, we fail to see the need for implementation of a holding provision on the same basis. | Policy maintained. While correct, there may be an instance where approval, subject to a Holding provision, would continue to be an appropriate use of the Holding provision. |
| S. 12.13 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.3.1.5 | As noted elsewhere in our comments, we recommend that the City review and consult on its Section 37 process and formalize same with our industry. We further recommend that wording be included in this paragraph to ensure that any benefit collected from private development be invested into the same ward in which the development occurred. | Comment noted. Policy maintained. The policies highlight the requirement of a reasonable planning relationship and also prioritize community benefits projects within the vicinity of the location of the increased density or height. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.14 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.3.1.5.2 | Suggest adding the following policy: Community benefits provision shall be considered where the increased density and height conforms with the intent of the e Plan and the increase in height and density is compatible with adjacent existing or proposed development. | Policy maintained. The policy requires that the development proposal constitutes good planning and is consistent with the intent of the policies of this plan. Compatibility is sufficiently addressed. |
| S. 12.15 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.3.1.5.2 e) | Please refer to our comment above regarding proximity of benefit to development. The word "should" should be replaced with "shall". | Policy maintained. In order to not conform a compelling planning reason would be required. This may be an important consideration in particular where a community benefit addresses a city-wide service or facility for example. |
| S. 12.16 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.3.1.7.2 | a) Items (i) to (v) Not clear enough regarding timing | Policy maintained. The Planning Act stipulates that a temporary use may be authorized by by-law and that permission shall not exceed three years. The Planning Act also allows extensions for three years each. The Planning Act further distinguishes that Garden Suites may be permitted, subject to certain criteria for not longer than 20 years. |
| S. 12.17 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.3.1.8.2 b) vii) | Safety matters should also be addressed. | Policy maintained. The list of criteria to be satisfied deal with a wide range of land use planning considerations. |
| S. 12.18 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.3.3.2 d) | Energy conservation could be added to the items | Policy maintained. The Planning Act does not allow for the regulation of energy conservation through Site Plan, unless it can be achieved through external features such as tree planting. |
| S. 12.19 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.3.4.2 | General: Through discussions about the Official Plan, it is apparent that staff is desirous of proceeding with future development via this means. However, as this is a departure from historical procedures at the City, this needs to be consulted on, and discussed IN DEPTH, with the industry and possibly other stakeholders, to understand the intent, and mechanisms on how this would work. | Agreed, comment noted. |
| S. 12.20 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 12.1.3.5.2 | Supports the designation of Community Improvement Plan Areas along key corridors. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.21 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.3.6 a) | Instead of saying "acquire land" perhaps suggest that new developments will need to develop parkland when a new development takes place. Instead of may which gives developers a loop hole, suggest using the words "will be required" to ensure compensation if parkland is not developed. | Policy maintained. Parkland dedication whether in the form of conveyance of land or payment of cash is a requirement of development, and is noted as "shall be required" in the policy. |
| S. 12.22 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.3.6.1 | What land? Burlington is built out, if the park doesn't already exist, there's not likely to be a new one. The entire Parkland Dedication policy is outdated, and based on a model that no longer exists in Burlington. | Policy maintained. New parks will be developed through area specific plans, both in existing urban areas and in greenfield areas, and through parkland dedication. Also, the city may use new parkland approaches in the future following the Parks Master Plan update (e.g. Strata Parks). |
| S. 12.23 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.3.6.2 | Again, this is the old way of thinking, back when Burlington had residential greenfield developments. Those don't exist anymore. Given that there is limited to no land available for new parks, perhaps it is time to do away with Parkland Dedication and associated fees in Burlington, given that the parks already exist, and are maintained via a portion of our property taxes. | See response S.12.22 above. |
| S. 12.24 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.3.6.2 d) | The collection of money for cash-in-lieu should be consistent with the recent changes to the Planning Act. | Policy maintained. The city will complete an updated Parks Master Plan that examines the need for parkland in the City prior to amending Official Plan policies related to parkland dedication rates. Parks and Open Space staff forecast the delivery of a new Parks Master Plan by the end of 2018/early 2019, at which time OP policies will be amended accordingly. |
| S. 12.25 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.3.6.2.(d) | Same comment as above. The collection of these fees will not be going towards new parks, so is there even a need to collect it anymore? | See response S.12.22 above. |
| S. 12.26 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.3.7.2 a) | More info about the program would be great | The property standards by-law 040-2009 is accessible on the City's website. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.27 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.4 | Throughout our comments we have urged the use of City initiated Area-Specific Plans. While we recognize this section indicates that plans shall be prepared by the City, this is qualified by the statement below (12.1.4.2 (c)). This is further confused with the inclusion of a reference to “privately initiated” in 12.1.5.1.2 (b). | Policy maintained. While Area Specific Plan are generally City-initiated (see policy 12.1.3.(2) b)) there are additional policies that allow for undertaking Area Specific Plans that are not included in the City's work program (see 12.1.3.(2) c & d)). |
| S. 12.28 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.4 | Further, we are not aware of a listing of area-specific plans that has been prepared by the City and is currently public. As such it is unclear as to whether or not, or when, a private investor may be required to undertake such a process, which puts growth (whether residential or employment based) at risk. | Appendix B deleted. |
| S. 12.29 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.4 | Further, there are instances noted where there is ambiguity as to who will undertake and fund said plan. Please clarify this in all instances throughout the document. | Refer to response to comment S.6.2. |
| S. 12.30 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 12.1.4.2 e) | This policy appears to allow either solely employment or solely intensification. It appears to ignore mixed use, non-intensification Area- Specific Plans (such as Evergreen). What is the purpose of this policy? Amend the second sentence 12.1.4.2.e) to permit a wide range of uses. | Policy modified for clarity. Policy is intended to communicate that ASP's focused on solely employment or intensification areas may be completed, in addition to the more traditional mixed use communities considered by ASP's. |
| S. 12.31 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.4.2.(c) | This is an unfair policy. If the City wants an Area Specific Plan, do an Area Specific Plan. Don't pawn this responsibility and cost onto a developer and make them pay for it. This adds significant time and expense, and certainly does not meet your goal of making development and investment in Burlington desirable. | Refer to response to comment S.12.29. |
| S. 12.32 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.4.2.1 a) iv) | Please clarify what is required by a Financial Impact Analysis | Please see policy 6.5.2 i). |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.33 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.4.2.1.(a) | This policy goes on to list 17 different studies which, if policy 12.1.4.2.(c) is enforced, means the private landowner that wants to develop a specific property now has to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars studying the broader area in connection with this Area-Specific Plan which should have already been completed by the City? How is this reasonable? | Policy maintained. This policy uses the term may to signal flexibility to consider an alternative to an exclusively city-initiated area specific plan. |
| S. 12.34 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.1.4.2.2 | Why such a high density of 300 people and jobs per ha? What is the make-up of the 28 percent? | The Metrolinx Mobility Hub guidelines provide suggested transit supportive densities and identifies 300 people and jobs per ha as the upper range for hubs serviced with Regional Express Rail. The new Growth Plan now sets a minimum target of 150 people and jobs per ha. The target will be confirmed/refined through the Area Specific Planning (ASP) process. 28% is identified by the Region of Halton's Transportation Master Plan. It is broken down as 20% Transit, 5% Cycling and Walking, and 3% Travel Demand Measures (carpooling). The ASP will look at this in more detail. |
| S. 12.35 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.4.2.2 c) | As noted in our meetings, we question why the potential Walker's Line/Cumberland Avenue GO station location was NOT included in the current Mobility Hub review. | The potential Walker's Line/Cumberland Avenue GO Station was not included in the current Mobility Hub Study work as there has not been a decision from Metrolinx on whether or not this station will be created. Further, there has been no direction from Council to expand the scope of our Mobility Hub Study beyond that originally approved in July 2016. |
| S. 12.36 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 12.1.4.2.2 k) | As part of area-specific planning, requirements for sustainable building practices "shall be identified" should be strengthened to "shall require" minimum percentages of sustainable infrastructure. | The ASPs for the Mobility Hubs will explore requiring new developments to incorporate sustainable building features within Mobility Hubs. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.37 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | 12.1.4.2.2 k) | City should consider providing incentives for development proposals that exceed base performance targets to encourage development proponents to raise established minimum standards for development. | On a city wide basis, the city is considering an urban design awards program that would include a sustainability component, and measures that exceed the requirements of the sustainable building and design guidelines may be considered as part of Section 37 negotiations. The Mobility Hubs ASP process will explore the use of Community Improvement Plans to achieve key city objectives within these areas. |
| S. 12.38 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | 12.1.4.3.2.1 | It is not clear how the Secondary Plan, once adopted, will be integrated into the City's Draft New OP. Proposed approach in the implementing OPA: 1: delete the Tremaine Road Special Planning Area overlay from Schedule B and be replaced by the appropriate components of the urban structure. 2: delete the Land Use Designation to be Determined and replace it with the appropriate land use designations. 3: Delete section 12.1.4.3.2.1. Details of implementing the OPA will be discussed through the Secondary Plan process. | Comment noted. It is expected that a new section will be developed in Chapter 8 Land Use Policies - Urban Area to capture "Area Specific Plans". Agree that the details of the implementing OPA will be discussed through the ongoing Secondary Plan process. Please see PB-50-17 for further details. |
| S. 12.39 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.5.1.2 a) | We note that the site plan process has been excluded from the list of applications, and believe this to be in error. | Policy maintained. Site Plan Applications are not subject to the Complete Application policies. |
| S. 12.40 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.5.1.2 b) | We again note our concern with the potential for Area-Specific plans to be referred to as privately initiated, and a lack of understanding of how/when this would be determined. | Refer to response to comment S.6.2. |
| S. 12.41 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.5.1.2.(b) | This will add considerable time and cost to development applications, delaying the process further. The City already has an Official Plan and Zoning By-Law that guide development, there is no reason to delay a developer at the time they submit an application and make them wait what could easily take well over a year or more to complete all of the studies needed for an Area-Specific Plan. If the City has certain areas they feel require an Area-Specific Plan, then do them now. | Refer to response to comment S.6.2. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER TWELVE - IMPLEMENTATION & INTERPRETATION | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | OP Section | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 12.42 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | 12.1.5.1.2.1 b) v) | Please define financial impact study and who is qualified to carry out same. | Please see policy 6.5.2 i). |
| S. 12.43 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.5.1.2.1.(a) | Sounds reasonable in theory, but in practice this never runs smoothly. The agencies need to be held accountable to respond within a reasonable amount of time. It should not take months of pushing, constant reminders, and follow-up attempts to obtain agency comments. If the City is going to manage this, firm commenting deadlines need to be given, and if the agencies don't comment, they missed their chance. This has caused major problems for us in the past, where multiple Region of Halton staff for example, did not return our calls or emails for a period of well over two years. | Comment noted. |
| S. 12.44 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | 12.1.5.1.2.1.(c) | When developers pay applications fees, that fee covers all municipal review costs. Why then, if the City does not have the staff time or expertise to review a study and needs to hire a peer reviewer, is that at the developer's cost, given that they're already paid for this review? If the City decides a peer review is needed, the City should pay for it using the application fees already secured from the developer, or if the developer needs to pay for the peer review, then the City should be crediting back a portion of the unused development application fee. Forcing a developer to pay twice for the same work is unfair. | Policy maintained. Application fees do not include contingency charges for peer review. |
| S. 12.45 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 12.2.2 g) | What is "minor"? Provide examples. | Policy maintained. The Plan does not define major or minor in order to allow for interpretation subject to context, scale and potential impacts. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THIRTEEN - DEFINITIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Definition | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 13.1 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Affordable Housing | Is this realistic in the GTA anymore? Housing prices are market driven, and not something that can be forced by a municipality. How can a developer produce housing and sell it at a reduced price when property values, planning applications fees, development charges, construction costs, etc... cannot allow them to do so? If people want to find "affordable housing" perhaps they need to look outside of the GTA. | Definition maintained. This is in conformity with the Regional Official Plan. |
| S. 13.2 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | Affordable Housing | There seems to be a suggestion that rental housing is only for those with low incomes, and home ownership those with high incomes. This needs to be corrected. | Definition maintained. This is in conformity with the Regional Official Plan. |
| S. 13.3 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Ancillary Employment Use and Area of Employment and Employment | Provide detailed definitions of employment uses with examples. | Existing definitions maintained. The policies of the Plan support the interpretation of these definitions. |
| S. 13.4 | 29-Jun-17 | Roger Broad, Habitat for Humanity | Assisted Housing | Habitat for Humanity would like confirmation that current and future projects for which we are proponents are considered under the definition of assisted housing. Although Habitat for Humanity projects are not always subsidized through a government program, they are subsidized through private donation and the housing serves the same function and purpose. Please revise to include non-government subsidies. | Definition maintained. This is in conformity with the Regional Official Plan. |
| S. 13.5 | 8-Jun-17 | Mark Bales Carriage Gate | Compatible | Stress the importance of "fit" and challenges with the term. Commit to review. Fit and Harmony should be the goals | Definition of Compatibility modified. |
| S. 13.6 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | Complete Community | Include access to food in the definition of a complete community and create a section in Chapter 3 to address it, or at minimum, a cross-reference to section 4.9. | Definition maintained, however the Chapter 3 preamble now highlights how the elements of a complete community are delivered by all sections of the plan, not just Chapter 3. Existing definition of a complete community is maintained to conform to provincial plans. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THIRTEEN - DEFINITIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Definition | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 13.7 | 8-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Development | The definition appears to be very limiting. | Definition maintained. Consistent with definition of development in Region's OP. |
| S. 13.8 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Enhancement Area | Revise to be consistent with the Region of Halton term: Enhancements to the Key Features. | Definition modified. |
| S. 13.9 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Flooding Hazard | Items 3, 4 and 5 could be revised to 2a, b and c. | Definition modified. |
| S. 13.10 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Hazardous Lands | The term Hazardous Lands is defined but the term Hazard Land is also italicized within the New Draft OP document. As these are the same thing, change all Hazard Land references to Hazardous Lands. | Defined term has been modified to Hazardous Lands. |
| S. 13.11 | 30-Aug-17 | Ruth Victor & Associates on behalf of Halton Interfaith Council | Institutional Uses | Places of worship should not be considered public institutional uses similar to a school or community centre, since they are not funded by the public and should not be obligated to provide community uses. | Definition maintained. The Plan proposes a careful distinction between public service facilities (funded by the public sector) and institutional uses (private services and or facilities). |
| S. 13.12 | 5-Apr-17 | David McKay, MHBC | Mid-Rise | Definition of Mid-rise building would like height to 6 storeys in the subject property. OPA proposing additional height would not meet the development criteria. | Definition of Mid-rise maintained but modified to refer to height range 5 to 11 storeys only. Development will be subject to growth framework and development evaluation criteria. |
| S. 13.13 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Mixed Use | Include "Mixed Use" in the Definitions section to make clear the City's intention in including this term in the OP; i.e. identify a minimum requirement for space allocation such as percentage of space by type (retail, commercial, residential), etc. to qualify as an acceptable Mixed Use. Confirm Mixed Use development has an inherent benefit to the community as a component of "placemaking". Suggest: Mixed-use development is a type of urban development that blends residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, or industrial uses, where those functions are physically and functionally integrated, and that provides pedestrian connections. | A definition of Mixed Use is not recommended in the OP. As an alternative, the preamble of Section 8.1 Mixed Use Intensification Areas, introduces the term. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THIRTEEN - DEFINITIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Definition | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 13.14 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | Net Density | As mentioned previously, we recommend that this definition be in keeping with that used by the Province in calculating densities. The list of exclusions in this definition are INCLUSIONS in the Provincial definition. This proposed definition would suggest densities are higher than they would be deemed to be per the Growth Plan. | Definition maintained. For the purposes of understanding development density at the site level the net density is a helpful tool to understand development and constraints. In terms of the Growth Plan density target for the Designated Greenfield Area this target is measured over the entire upper tier municipality and is not a relevant comparison. |
| S. 13.15 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Placemaking | Suggest adding: Placemaking is a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces, the public realm and communities that involves including people in the discussion of designing public spaces that reflect shared value and support healthy communities. | The term "Placemaking" is not used in policy. Elements of this approach to the design of spaces are incorporated in preambles, objectives and policies of this Plan (Preamble and 7.1.1 k), Chapter 12). |
| S. 13.16 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Regulatory Flood Plain | The term Regulatory Flood Plain is defined but not used in the OP text. Flood Plain is the correct term and is defined in the draft OP. Delete Regulatory Flood Plain from the definitions. | Definition modified. Regulatory Flood Plain and Floodplain have been deleted, and Flooding Hazard has been retained. |
| S. 13.17 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Right to Farm | Sounds great in theory, but other agencies are enforcing this differently. As previously mentioned, we have over 40 acres of designated Prime Agricultural Area in rural Burlington that had been farmed for nearly a century that we cannot farm anymore without facing threats of fines and/or imprisonment, all because of conflicting NHS policies and the potential that a salamander could walk across the field twice a year. There are major conflicts between NHS and Agriculture that have been expressed many times to all levels of government, yet the government has done nothing to assist. | Comment noted. |
| S. 13.18 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Service Commercial | Provide an example or two with definition. | Comment noted. Policy not modified. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER THIRTEEN - DEFINITIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Definition | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 13.19 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Significant | Items 5 to 8 under the Significant definition would appear to have been erroneously included under this definition as they are also repeated below in the Significant Wetland definition, which is where they are more appropriate. | Definition modified. |
| S. 13.20 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Stable Slope | Within the definition of Stable Top of Bank the term Stable Slope is italicized but there is no definition for this term provided. Add a definition or un-italicize. | Definition modified, stable slope has been un-italicized. |
| S. 13.21 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Sustainable Development, Sustainability, Etc | Need a better definition of Sustainable Development. Here's a suggestion - Sustainable Development as a pattern of resource use that "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". In order to preserve the natural world, economic, social and environmental factors must be jointly considered and harmonised. | Definition modified. |
| S. 13.22 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Transit | Define "transit" . | Definition not added, see Chapter 6. |
| S. 13.23 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | Urban Agriculture | Broaden the definition of urban agriculture to include animal agriculture: at a minimum it should include aquaponics, garden chickens, and bees. | Definition maintained. The Urban Agriculture Strategy will evaluate these types of agriculture and determine if and where they are appropriate. The definition and supporting policies may be amended at that time. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.1 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule A | This mapping is nearly impossible to read at this scale when looking at specific properties (i.e.. Eagle Heights). | Schedule maintained. The intent of this schedule is to show high level components of the city such as the Urban Area, Rural Area and North Aldershot Area. This schedule is not intended to identify land use permissions and the boundaries of land use designations and shall be used in conjunction with other schedules and policies in this plan. |
| S. 14.2 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule A | Bronte Creek Meadows and 1200 King Road are shown outside of the built boundary, which is incorrect. Similarly, the "Greenfield" designation needs to be corrected to "Urban Area'. | Schedule maintained. These properties are within the Designated Greenfield Area, within the Urban Area. |
| S. 14.3 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule A | Green System is not shown accurately on Bronte Creek Meadows or 1200 King Road. | Schedule maintained. The Green System conforms to the Region's Natural Heritage System. Modification would occur through future planning approvals outside of this Official Plan. |
| S. 14.4 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule A | e) Properties at 3075 and 3095 Dundas Street are incorrectly shown as "Green System". | Refer to Response S.14.3 |
| S. 14.5 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule A | Label for Major Transit System easily gets lost on the map. A brighter colour or image i.e. star, diamond, etc. would be better. | Comment noted. Schedule modified. |
| S. 14.6 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule A | Green Belt Plan Area and Built Boundary are too similar in colour/style when looking in the Aldershot area – change colour or line type on one of them for ease of reading. | Comment noted. Schedule modified. |
| S. 14.7 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule A | Parkway Belt West Plan hard to understand in the east end. | Schedule modified. Please refer to Schedule A-1 for provincial plan boundaries. |
| S. 14.8 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | 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 modified to provide clarify. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.9 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule A-1 | Bronte Creek Meadows, 1200 King Road and the Alton commercial plaza are incorrectly shown as "Greenfield" and outside of the built boundary. | See response to comment S.14.2. |
| S. 14.10 | 29-Jun-17 | PERL | Schedule A-1 | The map does not show the MNRF 2010 designation, and 2017 NEP 'escarpment natural' designation which is the Grindstone Creek Headwaters Wetland Complex Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW) | The components of the wetland complex are within areas designated Natural Heritage System on Schedule J, Land Use Rural Area. Conformity with the mapping in the new Niagara Escarpment Plan will be addressed through the Region's Official Plan Review. |
| S. 14.11 | 29-Jun-17 | PERL | Schedule A-1 | The map does not show the MNRF designation areas for the Jefferson Salamander habitats on and adjacent to the Nelson Aggregate lands, which was substantive in the Joint Board's application 'denial' decision of October 2012. | The habitat of endangered species and threatened species is shown as being a component of the NHS in the text of the City's OP (see Section 4.2.2 (b)) but is not identified on the Schedules to the Plan as the locations are confidential. |
| S. 14.12 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule B | Bronte Creek Meadows - The NHS designation covers way too much area, and does not accurately reflect what's actually on the property. | Schedule maintained. The NHS designation conforms to the Region's Natural Heritage System. Once such refinements have been approved through an approval process under The Planning Act, The Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act or Federal or Provincial Environmental Assessment requirements, these refinements will be in effect on the date of such approval. The City will maintain mapping showing such refinements and incorporate them as part of the City's statutory review of this Plan. |
| S. 14.13 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule B | 1200 King Road - The NHS designation covers way too much area, and does not accurately reflect what's actually on the property. | See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.14 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule B | The Natural Heritage System and Major Parks and Open Space area do not reflect the appropriate NHS (see comments below for Schedule C and N). Mapping of the NHS then needs to be updated to reflect the appropriate NHS set out in the revised Schedule N. | See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.15 | 31-Jul-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA, Part D | Schedule B and C | We have previously brought to your attention mapping areas respecting the Aldershot Mobility Hub on B and C, with an inconsistency between a Primary Growth Area and a stable residential area. This should be rectified. | Schedule maintained. These areas will be addressed by the Mobility Hubs Area Specific Plan. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.16 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule B1 | Urban Growth Centre is noted at 'UGC' - use full name as there is space | Comment noted. Schedule modified. |
| S. 14.17 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule B-1 | Bronte Creek Meadows is incorrectly shown outside of the built boundary, has far too much NHS shown, and is shown not subject to Intensification Framework, which makes no sense given that it is one of very few properties that has potential to help the City meet its intensification targets and bring significant income to the City, if planned properly. | With respect to the NHS mapping see the response to comment S.14.12. Please also refer to response to comment S.2.37. |
| S. 14.18 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule B-1 | 1200 King Road is incorrectly shown outside of the built boundary, has far too much NHS shown, and is shown not subject to Intensification Framework, which makes no sense especially since part of this property is within the planned Mobility Hub area. | See response to comment S.14.12. Please also refer to response to comment S.2.37. |
| S. 14.19 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule B-1 | Alton commercial plaza is incorrectly shown outside of the built boundary. | Schedule maintained. The built boundary, which identifies the built-up area, is defined by the Province who is responsible for reviewing and updating it. The line shown was delineated in 2006. |
| S. 14.20 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule B-1 | Evergreen is identified as Undeveloped Area Outside Built Boundary (not subject to Intensification Framework). How will the Evergreen Lands be identified in the future? Mapping of the NHS then needs to be updated to reflect the appropriate NHS set out in the revised Schedule N. | Until the Growth Framework is reviewed Evergreen will remain "Undeveloped Area Outside Built Boundary". Once developed the lands could then be assessed for inclusion in the Growth Framework. The NHS mapping will be maintained. See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.21 | 10-Mar-17 | Mark McConville (Humphries Planning Group Inc.) | Schedule B-1 | 5230 Harvester Road should form part of the Primary Intensification Area. | Comment noted. This property is located within the Primary Growth Area. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.22 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule B2 | This schedule should also show external linkages to Oakville, BRT, Hamilton, and 403 & 407 Bus Routes. A separate map showing all non-car/truck linkages to Mobility Hubs should be developed for walking, cycling and public transit routes along with external links. | Schedule maintained. This schedule is intended to show the relationship between growth areas and higher order levels of transit, such as the GO Regional Express Rail Line and the frequent transit corridors, other transit service is illustrated on transit maps external to the Official Plan. Area Specific Plans will contain schedules outlining multi-modal connections in Mobility Hubs. |
| S. 14.23 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule B2 | Primary Mobility Hub Connector, make line type have a smaller dash, for legibility. | Schedule modified. |
| S. 14.24 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule B-2 | Bronte Creek Meadows is not shown as an Employment Growth area, is not shown having Justified Frequent Transit Network access, and is not shown having even Candidate Frequent Transit Network access, supporting our position that this property is not desirable for employment uses, as evidenced by years of marketing it for such use, unsuccessfully. It's time to consider other uses on this property. | Schedule maintained. Changes to OP Schedules, including Schedule B-2 and the Frequent Transit Corridors, will be made as part of an Area Specific Plan to support the development of these lands. Also see response to comment S.2.37. |
| S. 14.25 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule C | From roughly Kerns Road to Hendon Road – south of Dundas to Lake – why is no Natural Heritage shown. | Schedule maintained. The NHS mapping conforms to the Natural Heritage System in the Region's approved OP. Policies in Section 4.2 have been updated to include direction for unmapped features. |
| S. 14.26 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule C | Way too much NHS shown on the mapping for Bronte Creek Meadows and 1200 King Road, not reflective of actual conditions. | See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.27 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule C | Mapping of the NHS then needs to be updated to reflect the appropriate NHS set out in the revised Schedule N. | See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.28 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule C | Northeast corner of Walkers Line and Upper Middle Road is not Open Space and Park Area. It is a hockey arena. | Schedule maintained. Municipal parks and related public service facilities (e.g. an arena) are permitted in the Open Space designation. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.29 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule C | From roughly Kerns Road to Hendon Road south of Dundas to Lake why is there no Natural Heritage shown | Schedule maintained. The NHS mapping conforms to the Natural Heritage System in the Region's approved OP. |
| S. 14.30 | 28-Jun-17 | Ed Forthergill | Schedule C | 2070 and 2090 Queensway Drive: These lands are designated Mixed Use Nodes and Intensification Corridors in Schedule B, however are designated General Employment in Schedule C. Recommends that these lands be designated Urban Corridor in Schedule C. | Proposed designation maintained. As is the case for any lands currently designated for employment use, preliminarily recommended for conversion, and within a Mobility Hub Study Area the existing land use designations will remain until such time as the Mobility Hub Area Specific Plans are approved. It should be noted that since these lands are within the Regional Employment Overlay these designations will remain until the completion of the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review. |
| S. 14.31 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule D1 | Watercourse is not labeled | Schedule modified. Watercourse designation is now shown on Schedule D only. |
| S. 14.32 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule F | 'Rail Line' is very difficult to identify on the plan, and the rail line does not continue south past Grahams Line, unlike what the schedule shows. | This schedule has been removed. Please now refer to Schedule D. |
| S. 14.33 | 29-Jun-17 | Dana Anderson, MHBC | Schedule G | 901 Guelph Line: It is also our opinion that the proposed Mobility Hub boundary for the Burlington GO station should be extended to include the subject lands, and other parcels, as identified on our proposed mapping. Similar to our comment above, we would hope that these boundaries are not fixed and are open to ongoing review and refinements through the public process. We note that the other mobility hub boundaries extend far further beyond a 500 metre suggested radius and believe this mobility hub should be no different. In fact, given its activity and context, the boundary should be greater than originally recommended. | Existing Mobility Hub Study Area to remain. The study areas were carefully established to recognize context, the major transit station area, established neighbourhood areas, walking shed distances, among other considerations. Refer to response to comments S.8.220, S.8.221 and S.8.222 |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.34 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule H | Should include all of the 1200 King Road property, not just the western portion. This property offers a great opportunity to do something special. Why limit that potential? | Existing Mobility Hub Study Area to remain. The study areas were carefully established to recognize context, the major transit station area, established neighbourhood areas, walking shed distances, among other considerations. |
| S. 14.35 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule I | Consideration should be given to including 4450 Paletta Court as part of the Mobility Hub as well, given that it is under the same ownership of neighbouring land that is included in the Mobility Hub. | Existing Mobility Hub Study Area to remain. The study areas were carefully established to recognize context, the major transit station area, established neighbourhood areas, walking shed distances, among other considerations. In this case only properties with frontage onto Appleby Line were included within the study area boundary. |
| S. 14.36 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule J3 | The NHS mapping for the residential lots on the east side of Escarpment Drive is inaccurate, as it shows far too much NHS. Also worth noting are the areas behind that section of NHS identified as "Agricultural Area", as these are the areas referred to earlier that we are not allowed to actually farm. There are also agricultural areas not shown correctly in this vicinity, which have instead been shown as NHS. | Schedule maintained. The NHS mapping conforms to the Natural Heritage System as designated in the Region's approved OP. |
| S. 14.37 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule K | As identified above, there are agricultural lands in the vicinity of The Bluffs that are incorrectly shown as NHS. | See response to comment S.14.36. |
| S. 14.38 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule L | How was the mapping in and around Eagle Heights determined? Does this accurately reflect the existing OMB approval and future development plans? Again, it's difficult to tell how accurate this mapping is given the scale, but it appears that there are errors. | The Schedule maintains the mapping contained in the City's Existing Official Plan, which was based on Amendment 197 to the City's OP as approved. |
| S. 14.39 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule M-2b | This map incorrectly shows a large green Environmental Protection Area running right down the middle, which doesn't exist, at least not to this extent. This needs to be revised. | See response to comment S.14.38. |
| S. 14.40 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule N | As stated previously, the NHS mapping on Bronte Creek Meadows, 1200 King Road and at The Bluffs is incorrect, and at least near The Bluffs is missing sections of Prime Agricultural Land. | See response to comment S.14.26. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.41 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule N | The Key Natural Heritage Features mapped on Schedule N are incorrect and actually include Key Features, Buffers and Linkages. | See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.42 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule N | The extent of Key Features and Linkages has been revised based on further study and agreed to with the Region at the OMB (as per the decision PL111358 dated April 6, 2016) | response to comments S.14.12. |
| S. 14.43 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule N | The extent of Buffers is still to be confirmed through the area-specific planning process but it has been agreed by the Region and City that at this stage it is appropriate to show (precautionary) 30 m buffers to all Key Features except the wetland at the corner of Highway 407 and Tremaine Road where 15 m is to be applied. This is consistent with the OMB decision (PL111358 dated April 6, 2016). | See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.44 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule N | The NHS as mapped is inconsistent with the site-specific OMB decision (PL111358 dated April 6, 2016) as well as the Draft Secondary Plan for this area. The reference to in the legend to Prime Agricultural Lands in Enhancements, Linkages, and Buffers should be corrected to refer to Enhancement Areas. | See response to comment S.14.12. |
| S. 14.45 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | Schedule N | Therefore, Schedule N of the Draft New OP needs to be updated to reflect the Key Natural Heritage Features that were agreed to with the Region (see survey attached to this letter), included in the OMB decision and subsequently staked, as well as the Linkages that were agreed to with the Region through the OMB. Buffers should be applied to the revised Key Features and illustrated separately on Schedule N in accordance with the OMB decision. This is important because policy 4.2.2 j) requires an OPA for major changes to boundaries or the removal or addition of Key Natural Features. This would mean in the case of Evergreen an OPA would be triggered to make changes that have already been approved by the OMB for the Evergreen lands. | See response to comment S.14.12. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FOURTEEN - SCHEDULES & TABLES | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Schedule/Table | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 14.46 | 29-Jun-17 | PERL | Schedule N | Schedule N Map: Why are the agricultural lands on the Mount Nemo Plateau not identified as 'prime agricultural lands'? Schedule K map shows that most of these agricultural lands as "prime agricultural area". | Schedule N identifies only Prime Agricultural Areas that are within the NHS. Much of the Prime Agricultural Area on the Mount Nemo Plateau is not in the NHS. Schedule K shows the Prime Agricultural Area on the Mount Nemo Plateau. |
| S. 14.47 | 29-Jun-17 | Don Thorpe, Cycling Committee | Schedule Q | Recommend that the city replace the Long-Term Cycling Master Plan map in Schedule Q with a AAA Cycling Network map. | Schedule maintained. The City is undertaking an update to the Cycling Master Plan. This map will be updated to reflect the new Cycling Master Plan. |
| S. 14.48 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule Q | Shows 'Highway Interchange Crossing' along Harvester Rd, likely a mistake? | Schedule Modified. |
| S. 14.49 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Schedule Q | Add carpool parking lot at QEW & Guelph line and at Appleby & 407; change label on map to be 'Car Pool Lot' rather than 'Go Transit Car Pool Lot' | Schedule maintained. The intent of showing the GO Transit Car Pool lot is to reflect the use of this lot as a GO Bus Stop. No edits needed. |
| S. 14.50 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Schedule R | It's interesting that 6 different Future Trail Connections are shown at Bronte Creek Meadows, a block of land that the City will not allow to be developed with anything but employment uses, in an area not desirable for employment uses, with no transit to speak of, in a part of the City that is really only accessible by car. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| CHAPTER FIFTEEN - APPENDICES | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|---|--|
| Row Number | Submission Date | Name/Company/Organization | Appendices | Stakeholder Comments | Staff Response |
| S. 15.1 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | B | Update upon the adoption of the Secondary Plan and associated Official Plan amendment. | This appendix has been removed from the Official Plan as all Secondary Plans and Area Specific Plans will be brought into the OP through an Official Plan amendment. |
| S. 15.2 | 30-Jun-17 | Evergreen (Wood Bull LLP) | C | The Tremaine and Dundas Secondary Plan Subwatershed Study (AECOM, 2009) should be listed as an approved Subwatershed Study. | The subwatershed study is under review and will be added to the list when updated and approved. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| General Comments | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|---|---|---|
| Row Number | Date | Name/Company/Organization | Comments | Response |
| S. G. 1 | 30-Jun-17 | Gloria Reid, Burlington Green | Strengthen the Official Plan by including a clear outline of accountability measures. Include more information about the timing and specific relationship between other City planning documents and the OP. | This level of detail would not be provided in the Official Plan, however future city work plans will identify the timing of the other city documents noted in the Official Plan. |
| S. G. 2 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | With all the plans, studies, guidelines, area-specific work, new processes, etc. proposed in this new Official Plan, it is important to put together an overall Work Plan outlining the scope of work, timeline, and resources. This Work Plan should be monitored and controlled to ensure the Work Plan is carried out successfully in a timely fashion and those responsible are held accountable. | This level of detail would not be provided in the Official Plan, however prioritization of various initiatives are considered on an annual basis to determine timing, budget and resources. |
| S. G. 3 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | a) There is considerable wording and thinking in this draft Official Plan that appears to be from the past, when greenfield development was the norm. That isn't the case in Burlington anymore. Consideration should be given to updating the general policy concepts to reflect the current and future reality of where and how Burlington will grow. Generally speaking, this Official Plan does not appear to accept or acknowledge the challenges resulting from the fact that this city is essentially already built out. | While the OP includes policies to guide greenfield development for the limited remaining parcels of greenfield land, the new OP includes principles, objectives and policies that are intended to reflect an urbanizing city that is growing primarily through intensification. i.e. urban structure and growth framework policies, multi-modal transportation policies, mixed use designations, etc. |
| S. G. 4 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | b) With the Provincial government's decision to essentially abolish the Ontario Municipal Board and remove all checks and balances in the municipal planning system, it is critical to get this Official Plan right. This is the primary planning tool that will be relied upon, therefore there must be enough flexibility to allow for greater densities that meet Provincial intensification goals, even if those densities are beyond what may be popular with residents. Failure to put policies in place that will allow the development community reasonable opportunities for success will only result in reduced development, under-development, reduced housing supply, reduced income for the City, increased taxes, and even more significantly rising housing costs. | Comment noted. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| General Comments | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--|---|
| Row Number | Date | Name/Company/Organization | Comments | Response |
| S. G. 5 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Burlington is at a turning point and it knows the services it needs to offer residents to improve transportation and promote economic success, yet remains reluctant with the concept of intensification and increased residential densities that will provide both the finances and population justification to provide those services. In other words, not enough people live here yet to achieve many of the City's objectives. | Intensification in accordance with the policies of the new Official Plan are intended to deliver these outcomes. |
| S. G. 6 | 20-Jun-17 | Penta Properties | Based on this draft Official Plan, the "Grow Bold" tagline does not seem appropriate. This Official Plan does little to promote bold growth, and instead offers a very tentative and old fashioned approach to growth, one that will lead to continued conflict between City Hall, developers, and residents. This Official Plan seemingly handcuffs this City's potential for growth and economic success. | Comment noted. |
| S. G. 7 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | The level of detail in many sections is not appropriate for an OP. This was a unanimous concern of the various stakeholders in our membership, including planners, consultant, and builders alike). | All policies of the Official Plan have been reviewed to consider the appropriate level of detail. Please note the responses to feedback throughout all chapters - in some cases detail was removed to respond to this concern, where in some cases detail was retained where city staff felt it appropriate to guide development. |
| S. G. 8 | 29-Jun-17 | Suzanne Mammel, HHHBA | There is insufficient direction provided to consider the Official Plan complete. | See response to comment S.1.15. |
| S. G. 9 | 30-Jun-17 | Jeff Kelly, Emshih | Provide adequate treatment for all future developments across the City as they relate to the provision of public space resulting from development. | Policies maintained. All development applications will be subject to the Development Applications policies in Chapter 12 including the Preconsultation and Complete Application requirements and the Development Criteria. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines Comments | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| Row Number | Date | Name/Company/Organization | Section | Comment | Response |
| S. S. 1 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Should stress the importance of: Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, Water Conservation, Energy Generation and Conservation, Waste Reduction. May want to consider a priority scheme similar to Toronto. | Guidelines modified, and now identify these items and stress the importance of implementing voluntary items that deliver Strategic Plan and Community Energy Plan goals (e.g. carbon neutrality, energy generation and conservation, etc). A priority scheme may be considered through future updates to the guidelines. |
| S. S. 2 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | General | Should develop guidelines for single family homes. | Guidelines maintained. Burlington no longer requires Site Plan for single detached dwellings and receives very few subdivision applications, so there is not a clear implementation mechanism. |
| S. S. 3 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Intro, Page 2 | After "Compliance for additional voluntary building measures ...award", add "if received community benefits, non-monetary benefits or monetary benefits". | Document modified to reflect change. |
| S. S. 4 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Intro, Page 5, Next Steps | May have a difficult time trying to carry out this training for everyone who needs it. If inspectors are going to do this, you have a lot of work in front of you. | Comment noted. At this stage inspectors will not be reviewing compliance of voluntary measures. |
| S. S. 5 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Transportation, Item 1 | How handle cycling or walking paths that going through the site? | Guideline modified for clarity. |
| S. S. 6 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Water Conservation and Quality, Item 1 | Can we not go pass level one for requirements? | Guideline maintained. Level one is the highest standard. This equals enhanced quality treatment which requires 80% long term suspended sediment removal or better. |
| S. S. 7 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Water Conservation and Quality | Add New: Do not forget, in February 2017 Ontario Regulation 20/17, Reporting of Energy Consumption and Water Use was filed and published. The regulation outlines what building owners must do to comply with Ontario's Large Building Energy and Water Reporting and Benchmarking (EWRB). | Guideline modified, in maintenance, monitoring and communication category. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines Comments | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Row Number | Date | Name/Company/Organization | Section | Comment | Response |
| S. S. 8 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Water Conservation and Quality | Consider LEED criteria for Water Efficient Landscaping, Reduce by 50% | Guidelines maintained. Low maintenance landscaping is reflected under natural environment. |
| S. S. 9 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Water Conservation and Quality | Consider LEED criteria for Water Reduction, 30% Reduction | Guideline maintained. Encouraging WaterSense fixtures was selected as an alternative to the LEED criteria as it is easier to demonstrate compliance. |
| S. S. 10 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Energy | Rename to Energy and Emissions | Guidelines modified. |
| S. S. 11 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Energy | Follow Strategic Plan focus on net zero carbon and new SDC Principles and Objectives | Guidelines modified to refer to net zero. |
| S. S. 12 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Energy | Heat Island Items normally fall under Sustainable Sites. | Comment noted, this guideline achieves both objectives. |
| S. S. 13 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Energy, item 4 | Provide a metric similar to Toronto in kWh/m ² or LEED criteria: Minimum Energy Performance and Optimize Energy Performance | Guideline maintained as energy guideline # 4 is based on LEED. LEED grants points for energy optimization for 6% improvement or better for new construction. The city has set a minimum target of 10% or better as the aspirational voluntary guideline. |
| S. S. 14 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Energy, item 7 | Add metric similar to Toronto in kgCO ₂ /m ² . New LEED Net Zero can provide some background. | Guidelines modified. LEED Zero Carbon Building Standard and Toronto Zero Emissions Building Framework have been added as references. |

Draft New Official Plan: Stakeholder Feedback and Response Table

| Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines Comments | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|----------------|---|---|
| Row Number | Date | Name/Company/Organization | Section | Comment | Response |
| S. S. 15 | 30-Jun-17 | Guy Sheppard, Sustainable Development Committee | Energy, item 8 | Do not forget, in February 2017 Ontario Regulation 20/17, Reporting of Energy Consumption and Water Use was filed and published. The regulation outlines what building owners must do to comply with Ontario's Large Building Energy and Water Reporting and Benchmarking (EWRB). | Guidelines modified, noted in maintenance, monitoring and communication category. |