

Appendix C-1: Staff Responses to Submissions Received

Note: Comments have been summarized.

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Comments	Staff Response	Suggested Modification
1	Jan 10, 2020	E.J. Fothergill on behalf of The Molinaro Group (Paradigm – 2089 and 2095 Fairview Street)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with the delay in process for Paradigm Site Plan application due to the ICBL Concern with the proposed bicycle parking regulations. The three existing buildings do not comply with requirements. Accommodating the requirements in the two remaining buildings will be problematic. Request that the by-law be amended to exempt the site from the regulations and recognize the existing Paradigm development form Concern with proposed policy 7.2.3.1 (h). Includes design elements which cannot be met, either by the existing form of development or the final stage of the site plan process. Particularly the following: ii,iii,v,vi,vii,x,xi and xiv. Recommended that that policy provisions not apply to the Paradigm site or provisions be amended so they are consistent with the approved built form. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>Staff are proposing a site-specific Official Plan policy and Zoning By-law amendment to recognize the OMB decision, PL061117, dated July 23, 2014.</p>	<p>See proposed policy modification contained in Appendix C-2, Row 15 regarding existing development permission for the Paradigm project.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item 7. Staff have noted in EXCEPTION 386 that the bicycle parking rates in Part 5, Subsection 4.6, Table 5.4.3 shall not apply.</p>

2	Jan 10, 2020	E.J. Fothergill on behalf of The Molinaro Group (747,767,769,779 Brant Street and 2023 and 2027 Ghent Ave.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request removal of the provision of the ICBL from sites or an exemption to the ICBL to allow submission of rezoning and official plan amendment. No specific development issues or constraints associated with this site arising from staff report PL-01-20. 	Staff are not recommending any site-specific exemptions from the ICBL in advance of Council's consideration of the amendments.	No modifications proposed.
3	Jan 10, 2020	E.J. Fothergill (2070 and 2090 Queensways Dr)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with proposed policy 7.2.1 (g). A strict interpretation of this policy could lead to a position which is inconsistent with previous recommendations made by staff with respect to this site. To recognize this potential of this property, it is recommended that the proposed Official Plan be amended to note that considerations of the establishment of Mixed Use designations on lands north of the rail line, south of Queensway Drive and between Brant St. and existing residential development, may provide further intensification opportunities and will be subject to further review. This could be included at the end of Policy 7.2.3 or as a separate policy to 7.2.3.2. 	Until the completion of the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review process, which will include an analysis of all employment conversion requests, it is premature for staff to introduce policies which propose non-employment land uses.	No modifications proposed.
4	Jan 13, 2020	Jennifer Meader, Turkstra Mazza Associates on behalf of Better Life Retirement Residence Inc. (441 Maple Ave)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that the application for an official plan amendment and zoning by-law amendment for 441 Maple Avenue be delayed no further. Ask that Council now exempt the subject lands from the ICBL so that staff will continue to process the Application. 	Staff are not recommending any site-specific exemptions from the ICBL in advance of Council's consideration of the amendments.	No modifications proposed.

5	Jan 13, 2020	Attached to above correspondence – Dana Anderson, MHBC on behalf of Better Life Retirement Residence Inc. (441 Maple Ave)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject lands and current zoning on the subject lands were not reviewed or analyzed other than a statement in the report of what the current OP and Zoning are for the area • There has been no assessment or analysis of the current land use context in relation to the subject lands • There was no public engagement or stakeholder consultation as part of the study or consideration of current applications. • Proposed OPA adds new overlay designation and new development criteria and OPA criteria. Many of these are new mandatory policy requirements that have not been founded in any evidence in the Study. While not applicable to the current application, the requirements have already been addressed in relation to the current proposed application • There is not a sufficient technical assessment or evidence upon which to justify the draft OPA or ZBLA. • Recommend that Council immediately exempt the subject lands from the ICBL as they are not affected by the recommendations and should not be any further delays in the planning process as a result of any appeal to the proposed OPA and ZBLA. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>The ICBL Land Use Study statutory notice and release of materials was provided in December 2019 in accordance with the notice requirements of the Planning Act. A statutory public meeting was held on January 14, 2020 in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington’s long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community</p>	No modifications proposed.
---	--------------	---	---	--	----------------------------

				<p>partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>Staff are not recommending any site-specific exemptions from the ICBL in advance of Council’s consideration of the amendments.</p>	
6	Jan 14, 2020 (letter and delegation)	D.R. Fletcher on behalf of Citizens’ PLAN B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The John Street Bus Terminal does not and will likely never meet the definition of an MTSA. How can the desire for literal conformity with the provincial and regional policy to gain OP approval justify the continued misuse of the term MTSA downtown, with all of its’ intensification implications? • How do you plan to win LPAT 2.0 appeals by developers for tall building well in excess of Burlington OP policies, on the basis of proximity to a Downtown Burlington MTSA? • What options does Burlington realistically have to make timely and fundamental changes to our MTSA and UGC designations then, or even once our OP is approved? 	<p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton’s Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region’s current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	No modifications proposed.

7	Jan 13, 2020	<p>Scott Snider, Turkstra Mazza Associates on behalf of Carriage Gate Homes and Related Companies (2069-2079 Lakeshore Road & 383-385 Pearl St.[Lakeshore Burlington Inc.]; 2107 & 2119 Old Lakeshore Rd [Old Lakeshore Inc]; 535-551 Brant St. [Rennimob]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed policies in Section 7.2 purport to provide “transitional” criteria to guide the evaluation of development applications until the completion of secondary plans for MTSA’s. Given reference to this “transitional” function, this provision should clearly indicate that these policies should only apply to applications received following the final approval of the proposed OPA. Concern with the MTSA “typology” and policies that speak to the role of the MTSA’s in driving intensification and further require that development applications be “consistent with” the overall role and function of the MTSA’s. This is clearly inappropriate prior to the completion of the Regional work in respect to the MTSA’s Concern that proposed section 7.0 appears to effectively supplant the policy direction unique to UGCs whether or not the lands are also part of an MTSA Concern with policies 7.2.2 (o) and (p) as well as 7.2.4.2 (b). The clear intent of these policies is to suggest that the minimum population targets and directions to optimize land and infrastructure should not be considered in evaluating site specific applications. Concern that there is little indication of any interest in long-term planning requirements for the downtown MTSA. Unclear how policy 7.2.2 (j) is intended to relate to parkland dedication requirements of the Planning Act. 	<p>City staff have worked closely with Regional staff during this land use study to ensure that the proposed policies do not conflict with Regional Official Plan policies and/or planning processes. Further, the Region of Halton has reviewed the proposed OPA and has provided a preliminary exemption of OPA 119, dated January 24, 2020, subject to the outcome of the January 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting.</p> <p>See proposed policy modification regarding 7.2.2 p).</p> <p>Planning, transportation and transit staff continue to be committed to supporting the Downtown MTSA through Transit’s 5 Year Business Plan, the Integrated Mobility Plan and other initiatives. Proposed policy 7.2.2 n) provides transit priority measures to be considered by the City in the MTSA Special Planning Area.</p> <p>Until the Province releases the regulations and transitional provisions surrounding parkland dedication, the existing approach to parkland dedication remains in effect. Staff notes that proposed policy 7.2.2 j) includes a variety of green spaces such as trees, landscaped areas, parks and open spaces which may include but are not limited to parkland dedication and privately-owned, publicly-accessible spaces.</p> <p>The City is proposing to amend the Urban Growth Centre boundary in the existing Official Plan to conform with the Urban Growth Centre boundary contained in the Region of Halton’s Official Plan. Further, the Region of Halton has reviewed the proposed OPA and has provided a preliminary exemption of OPA 119, dated January 24, 2020, subject to the outcome of the January 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting.</p>	<p>See proposed policy modification to 7.2.2 p) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 6 regarding clarity on optimization of land.</p> <p>See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv) contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 1 and 7 regarding Urban Design Guidelines.</p>
---	--------------	--	--	---	--

			<p>Province is currently reviewing these issues and new City policy is premature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with the elimination of Spencer Smith Park from the UGC area. • Concern with the distance separation between tall buildings. It is contrary to the existing Tall Building Guidelines and inappropriate given the importance of optimizing the use of land and infrastructure in these areas. • Requiring (using “shall”) incorporation of affordable housing or related community benefits in every development is inappropriate. • Concern that some of the proposed OPA seeks to convert matters that are appropriately dealt with in guidelines into legally binding OP policy. • Concern that the proposed OPA appears to be directed to discouraging the efficient and effective intensification of the UGC. 	<p>In areas without established maximum building heights, staff is of the opinion that it is appropriate to establish through policy, minimum tower separation distances that should be met.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv).</p> <p>Impetus for the Study is to ensure that the City’s in force Official Plan provides guidance for planning around transit until the new Official Plan and Halton Region Official Plan are updated and in effect. Proposed amendment supports the achievement of the UGC’s density target of 200 people and jobs per hectare by 2031.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

8	Jan 13, 2020	<p>Scott Snider, Turkstra Mazza Associates on behalf of Brookfield Properties, InterRent REIT and CLV Group Inc. (Fairview Limit Partnership) – 2243, 2269 Fairview St. and 864 Drury Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with downzoning of the subject lands, excessive minimum distance separation requirements between buildings, maximum floor plates that will discourage units for families and new right of way requirements 	<p>Proposed maximum heights for the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor are proposed to be modified (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p> <p>In areas without established maximum building heights, staff is of the opinion that it is appropriate to establish through policy, maximum floor plate and minimum tower separation distances that should be met.</p> <p>Staff is of the opinion that providing permeability and connectivity in the Burlington GO MTSA and to the GO Station is an important consideration and part of a complete community. Please see the proposed policy modifications to Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 regarding transportation connection. (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p>	<p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III, Subsection 7.2.3 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 8 - 13 regarding the Burlington GO MTSA and the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item #4 regarding built form at street edge and item #6 regarding removal of Diagram 5A.</p> <p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 10, 13 and 14 regarding transportation connection.</p>
---	--------------	--	--	--	---

9		<p>Attached to above correspondence - Dana Anderson, MHBC on behalf of Brookfield Properties, InterRent REIT and CLV Group Developments Inc. - 2243, 2269 Fairview St. and 864 Drury Lane</p>	<p>Owners have undertaken extensive technical review and analysis of lands and have undertaken consultation with neighbouring landowners.</p> <p>Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been no opportunity for public engagement or review. It is not clear how the process meets the fundamental objectives from the City's community engagement charter in relation to accountability, transparency, early and widespread notice and access to information for review and input. While staff note that the proposed policies and zoning are to provide guidance prior to the completion of the Area Specific Plan, the specific nature and application of the new policies and provisions on the Subject Lands has not been justified with any sufficient planning or technical evidence given the nature and scope of the proposed OPA and ZBLA. <p>Comments on Land Use Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neither the Land Use Study Report, nor the staff report contains any analysis of how the proposed recommendations, OPA and ZBLA conform to Provincial and Regional policy in relation to growth requirements and minimum density targets. Was there any additional land use analysis or modelling to evaluate the feasibility of the site specific prescribed heights and building locations? How did staff conclude that the proposed prescriptive orientation of buildings with maximum heights "encourages transit-supportive development while 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>The ICBL Land Use Study statutory notice and release of materials was provided in December 2019 in accordance with the notice requirements of the Planning Act. A statutory public meeting was held on January 14, 2020 in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.3.2 h) viii) requires a minimum of two uses and provides policy direction for office as a third use. Staff is of the opinion that office uses are an integral part of a complete community.</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington's long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the</p>	<p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III, Subsection 7.2.3 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 8 - 13 regarding the Burlington GO MTSA and the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item #4 regarding built form at street edge and item #6 regarding the removal of Diagram 5A.</p> <p>See proposed policy modification to Part III, subsection 7.1.1 a) and Part III, subsection 7.1.2 a) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 3 and 4 regarding future studies and further</p>
---	--	---	---	---	--

			<p>ensuring that the development is appropriate and compatible in the context of the area”? Was there any additional land use analysis to justify the feasibility of multiple uses being required within mixed use building including office uses which past work has noted should be directed and provided on the north side of the rail line?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the Land Use Study Report states that they “interim” policies and zoning are needed for city building objectives, how do the recommendations provide for the feasible provision of development in the “interim” given the additional and mandatory requirements for parks, public facilities and public roadways in addition to the existing site constraints and rails setbacks? • How do the recommended policies provide “interim guidance” when they specifically speak to required elements of a “complete community”, including a new road network, which would usually be part of an Area Specific Plan? • No chart provided to compare proposed policies to Grow Bold • It is not clear what evidence or findings in the Land Use Study Report provide evidence or justification for zoning recommendations, including no evidence provided in relation to the recommended floor areas and heights. 	<p>co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>In areas without established maximum building heights, staff is of the opinion that it is appropriate to establish through policy, maximum floor plate and minimum tower separation distances that should be met.</p> <p>Proposed maximum heights for the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor are proposed to be modified (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p> <p>The MTSA typology applies to all 4 MTSA’s in the city. Staff is of the opinion the associated policies within the MTSA’s provide direction for the City’s to complete secondary plans which are underway. See proposed policy modification regarding Part III, subsection 7.1.1 a) and Part III, subsection 7.1.2 a).</p>	<p>planning for future development.</p> <p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 10, 13 and 14 regarding transportation connection.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear what evidence the study relied upon to justify a prescribed policy and regulation in only one block of land in the ICBL study area. <p>Comments on Staff report and recommended OPA and ZBLA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the intent of the ICBL study to address emerging growth pressure, it is not clear why only this block of land is now the only areas to which site specific zoning to control height and land use is prescribed. • Concern with additional criteria related to design and development elements, affordable housing and design guidelines/separation distances beyond mid-rise and tall building guidelines that are not discussed in the Land Use Study Report. • Concern with OPA policies that apply to areas outside the ICBL study area (ie. MTSA typology). It is not clear why these policies, which include the new MTSA typology are not part of the re-examination of the OP as they apply to much broader areas. • Concern with the public right-of-way. No analysis or justification. 	<p>Staff is of the opinion that providing permeability and connectivity in the Burlington GO MTSA and to the GO Station is an important consideration and part of a complete community. Please see the proposed policy modifications to Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 regarding transportation connection. (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

10	Jan 13, 2020	Amy Shepherd, IBI Group on behalf of Nalco/Ecolab (1055 Truman Street)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are opportunities through OPA 119 to better recognize that existing industrial sites within the MTSA Special Planning Area may continue to operate over the medium to long-term and efforts must be taken to ensure future development does not compromise the retention and expansion of these long-standing local businesses. • Table 1 provide requested additions/amendments to select policies and objectives proposed by OPA 119: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 7.1.2 a) o 7.2.1 g) o 7.2.2 q) o 7.2.3 o 7.2.3.2 d) 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns and considered the proposed additions/amendments that were provided.</p> <p>Staff note that there is an existing policy in the General Employment designation (Part III, 3.3.2 h)) which states “The City will encourage the retention of existing industrial uses and permit a wide range of industrial uses at these locations”. The proposed Official Plan amendments do not impact the underlying General Employment policies which is how existing industrial uses are considered.</p> <p>Staff are of the opinion that the existing Official Plan policy in Part II, Subsection 2.7.3 n) addresses the encroachment of sensitive land uses on industrial uses including the use of separation distances and the placement of non-sensitive land uses in buffer areas.</p> <p>Staff are proposing some policy modifications. (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p>	<p>See proposed policy modification to Part III, Subsections 7.2.1 g), 7.2.3 and 7.2.3.2 d) contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 5, 8 (second paragraph) and 12.</p>
----	--------------	--	---	---	---

11	Letter Submitted with no date	Penny Hersh, co-chair, Engaged Citizens of Burlington; Roland Tanner, co-chair, Engaged Citizens of Burlington; Lynn Crosby, We Love Burlington; Blair Smith, We Love Burlington; Don Fletcher, Plan B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The John Street Bus Terminal is not and will never be a Major Transit Station Area Planning staff have recommended that the John Street Bus Terminal remain classified as an MTSA despite Dillon's findings, albeit distinguished from the three MTSA's in Burlington. This recommended use of MTSA designation serve no purpose other than to continue to imply a level of transit infrastructure that does not and can never exist. It is apparent from the PL-01-20 report that the Region made an error in classifying the John Street Bus Terminal as an MTSA, and we must not propagate the error through Burlington's Official Plan and supporting policies. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton's Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region's current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	No modifications proposed.
12	Letter Submitted with no date	Jim Young	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ICBL has achieved nothing for the people of Burlington So long as that John St. MTSA designation stays in place, any changes to the OP are meaningless and the proposed scoped review of the OP bears this out The year would have been better served by planners creating the transit plan that would have connected the city's UGC to its Go Stations, eliminating the need for a downtown mobility hub, working instead with the Region to remove the downtown MTSA designation. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton's Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region's current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	No modifications proposed.
13	January 13, 2020	Devine Park LLP on behalf of Northgate Properties Inc. regarding 920	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the policies in the report were developed without public engagement, particularly because the new policies depart from prior policy directions which benefited from stakeholder engagement. 	The ICBL Land Use Study statutory notice and release of materials was provided in December 2019 in accordance with the notice requirements of the Planning Act. A statutory public meeting was held on January 14, 2020 in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.	See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III, Subsection 7.2.3 contained in

		<p>Brant Street and 850 Legion Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the policies have not been adequately justified in the Report or its supporting materials, with reference to mandatory requirements for affordable housing and the specific policies for the Burlington GO Major Transit Station Area including limits on height. • Concern that the proposed policies and their method of development set a bad precedent for similar planning approaches in the future. • Request to undertake further community consultation and a further report either recommending policies in keeping with the prior direction staff recommended following the Burlington GO Mobility Study or demonstrating the necessity for the shift in policy direction. 	<p>Staff note that a draft precinct plan and associated draft key land use policy directions were presented in July 2018 for discussion and for community and Council feedback as input into the creation of a future Area Specific Plan (ASP) and it was noted at that time that the draft precinct plans were preliminary and subject to change.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>Proposed maximum heights for the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor are proposed to be modified (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p>	<p>Appendix C-2, Rows 8 - 13 regarding the Burlington GO MTSA and the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item #4 regarding built form at street edge and item #6 regarding the removal of Diagram 5A.</p>
--	--	---	---	--	---

14	January 14, 2020	WeirFoulds LLP on behalf of Branthaven Development Corp (720 Oval Court)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that there could be an interpretation that proposed policy 7.2 sets out criteria for development applications that precede secondary plans and that the policy as currently written will adversely affect lands outside the study area as the policies could be interpreted to preclude an application on the property • Proposed resolution: Revision of policy 7.1.1 a) and 7.1.2 a) to be consistent with 7.1.2 b) such that they read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “To conduct secondary plans and/or major planning studies that establish long term development policies for Major Transit Station Areas <u>in the Special Planning Area, as shown on Schedule M of this Plan</u>” ○ “The City shall undertake secondary plans or major planning studies to ensure that all Major Transit Station Areas <u>within the Special Planning Area, as shown on Schedule M of this Plan</u> are planned to implement mixed use, transit supportive development including employment uses while ensuring compatibility with surrounding areas is achieved. 	<p>Staff have reviewed the policies in 7.1 and can confirm that the proposed policy does not preclude the submission of applications in advance of secondary plans.</p> <p>Please see the proposed policy modifications to 7.1.1 a) and 7.1.2 a).</p> <p>Staff note that the policies contained in Section 7.2 are applied to the MTSA Special Planning Area, as shown on Schedule M of this Plan.</p>	<p>See proposed policy modification to Part III, subsection 7.1.1 a) and Part III, subsection 7.1.2 a) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 3 and 4 regarding future studies and further planning for future development.</p>
15	January 13, 2020	Turkstra Mazza representing Leggat and 850 Brant St Properties Inc representing 2207 Fairview Street, 850 and 629 Brant Street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client adopts the submissions made on behalf of Fairview LP. 	<p>See response in Row 9.</p>	<p>See response in Row 9.</p>

16	January 13, 2020	Goodmans LLP representing Wal-Mart Canada Corp (2065 Fairview Street)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about maintaining the Regional Commercial designation for the Wal-mart site. • Concern about the maximum heights for Area B1 of 19 storeys. • Concern about the proposed public right-of-way through the Burlington GO MTSA. • Concern about the timeliness of the proposed amendments and concern that the proposed amendments could hamper the client’s ability to adapt its current store as needed over time. • Premature for the City to adopt amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law until a comprehensive study and planning justification are prepared. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>Any major change in land use designations will be contemplated through the Area Specific Planning process.</p> <p>Proposed maximum heights for the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor are proposed to be modified (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p> <p>Staff is of the opinion that providing permeability and connectivity in the Burlington GO MTSA and to the GO Station is an important consideration and part of a complete community. Please see the proposed policy modifications to Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 regarding transportation connection.(See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p>	<p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III, Subsection 7.2.3 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 8 - 13 regarding the Burlington GO MTSA and the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item #4 regarding built form at street edge and item #6 regarding removal of Diagram 5A.</p> <p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 10, 13 and 14 regarding transportation connection.</p>
----	------------------	---	--	--	---

17	January 13, 2020	Turkstra Mazza representing Emshih Developments (2250 Fairview Street, 895 Brant Street, 372 to 380 Brant Street, 433 to 439 Brants Street and 901 Guelph Line)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the City press pause on its consideration of the proposed OPA and ZBA to engage the public on its contents; to allow for public review; to establish a sufficient technical assessment to support it; and to permit Emshih an opportunity to submit a modified OPA and ZBA for staff and Council’s consideration. • Concern regarding prescriptive housing policy requirements absent a broader housing strategy • Concern regarding Major Transit Station Area “MTSA” restrictions on height that do not reflect appropriate levels of development; and • Restrictions on boundary adjustments to MTSAs 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington’s long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval</p>	<p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III, Subsection 7.2.3 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 8 - 13 regarding the Burlington GO MTSA and the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item #4 regarding built form at street edge and item #6 regarding the removal of Diagram 5A.</p>
----	------------------	---	--	---	---

				<p>process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>Proposed maximum heights for the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor are proposed to be modified (See "Suggested Modification" column for more detail.)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

18	January 8, 2020	Attached to above correspondence - Dana Anderson, MHBC on behalf of Emshih Developments (2250 Fairview Street, 895 Brant Street, 372 to 380 Brant Street, 433 to 439 Brants Street and 901 Guelph Line)	<p>Emshih Developments Inc. has been an active stakeholder in the City’s planning processes, contributing their experience and expertise in City building.</p> <p>Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been no opportunity for public engagement or review. It is not clear why the City would not provide for stakeholder and public engagement as part of the ICBL process as it is common practice and in the public interest to fully engage the public and stakeholders in land use studies undertaken under Section 38. • There is no technical or planning evidence on which the formulated OPA and ZBLA are based. The Land Use Study completed with the Interim Control By-law does not include, in our opinion, a sufficient technical assessment or evidence upon which to justify the draft OPA or ZBLA. <p>Proposed Major Transit Station Area – Special Planning Area Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove restrictive policies and provisions at this time, approving only those policies that are general in nature to guide development in the interim. • New development criteria, many of which are new mandatory policy requirements were not fully assessed or founded in evidence in the Land Use Study. • New policy related to Official Plan amendments to require affordable and rental housing as part of a proposed development or public service facilities and 	<p>The ICBL Land Use Study statutory notice and release of materials was provided in December 2019 in accordance with the notice requirements of the Planning Act. A statutory public meeting was held on January 14, 2020 in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington’s long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan</p>	<p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III, Subsection 7.2.3 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 8 - 13 regarding the Burlington GO MTSA and the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item #4 regarding built form at street edge and item #6 regarding the removal of Diagram 5A.</p>
----	-----------------	---	---	---	---

			<p>community space , together with sustainable building design measures. Providing additional affordable housing should be done within the City’s housing context and with support as part of a broader housing strategy...does not serve to meet the affordable housing objectives as set out in the Regional Plan, the Growth Plan or the Provincial Policy Statement.</p> <p>Site Specific</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 895 Brant Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Considerable restrictions have been placed on this site and the proposed OPA represents a substantial change from the Mobility Hub Study work released in mid 2018. Not clear why such a substantial change is recommended for this prominent corner. It may not be feasible to implement and is not reflective of transit oriented development. • 901 Guelph Line <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Additional submissions will be made related to 901 Guelph Line through the Official Plan re-examination process. Do not support the policies proposed under the Interim Control By-law draft OPA that restrict adjustments and changes to the Burlington GO MTSA boundaries through the Region’s Municipal Comprehensive Review. 	<p>addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>Proposed maximum heights for the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor are proposed to be modified (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p> <p>With regard to 901 Guelph Line, staff have noted these concerns. The subject site is not located within the ICBL Study Area. The final delineation of the MTSA boundaries will be established by the Region of Halton through the Municipal Comprehensive Review and will be implemented through a future Official Plan Amendment.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	January 14, 2020	Realtors Association of Hamilton-Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the City did not consult with RAHB realtors before the ICBL was put in place to ensure the by-law was effective for its intended outcomes • Concern that the ICBL placed disproportionate restrictions on property owners (e.g. building additions on homes) • Concern that the temporary freeze on development in downtown Burlington may have resulted in the rising of house prices. • Concern that restrictions on building apartment-style properties within the downtown core will reduce inventory in a market that is currently in demand which could increase prices and hinder first-time home buyers. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>Staff note that staff report PB-40-19 allowed for some exemptions from the ICBL.</p> <p>Staff also note that there are no recommendations arising from the ICBL Land Use Study that place restrictions on building apartment buildings in the downtown core.</p>	No modifications proposed.
----	------------------	---	--	---	----------------------------

20	January 13, 2020	WeirFoulds LLP on behalf of ADI regarding 101 Masonry Crt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that there could be an interpretation that proposed policy 7.2 sets out criteria for development applications that precede secondary plans and that the policy as currently written will adversely affect lands outside the study area as the policies could be interpreted to preclude an application on the property • Proposed resolution: Revision of policy 7.1.1 a) and 7.1.2 a) to be consistent with 7.1.2 b) such that they read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “To conduct secondary plans and/or major planning studies that establish long term development policies for Major Transit Station Areas <u>in the Special Planning Area, as shown on Schedule M of this Plan</u>” ○ “The City shall undertake secondary plans or major planning studies to ensure that all Major Transit Station Areas <u>within the Special Planning Area, as shown on Schedule M of this Plan</u> are planned to implement mixed use, transit supportive development including employment uses while ensuring compatibility with surrounding areas is achieved. 	<p>Staff have reviewed the policies in 7.1 and can confirm that the proposed policy does not preclude the submission of applications in advance of secondary plans.</p> <p>Please see the proposed policy modifications to 7.1.1 a) and 7.1.2 a).</p> <p>Staff note that the policies contained in Section 7.2 are applied to the MTSA Special Planning Area, as shown on Schedule M of this Plan.</p>	<p>See proposed policy modification to Part III, subsection 7.1.1 a) and Part III, subsection 7.1.2 a) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 3 and 4 regarding future studies and further planning for future development.</p>
----	------------------	---	---	--	---

21	January 13, 2020	WeirFoulds LLP on behalf of York Trafalgar Homes Corp regarding 2085 Pine Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with the analysis in the Dillon report that concludes that it is not currently functioning as a major bus depot. The proposal to differentiate the Downtown Bus Terminal from the Burlington GO Station based on their respective current roles and functions is short sighted for the future growth, significance and sustainability for Downtown Burlington and does not reflect the future linkage opportunities. A policy to include directives along Brant Street to facilitate a link and enhance connectivity between the Downtown MTSA and Burlington GO Station MTSA should be included. Request for revisions to the following policies: Part II, Sec 3.7.2 (a) and Part II, Section 3.11 to add a statement or policy language to encourage the potential for transit improvements along Brant Street to enhance connectivity between the Downtown MTSA and the Burlington GO Station MTSA; Part III, Section 7.0 to include strong policy directives that focus on the opportunity to facilitate the link between the Downtown Bus Terminal and the Burlington GO Station; and Part III, Section 7.2.2 (a) and 7.2.4 which should be revised to remove introduction of new typologies and instead provide strong policy directives that strengthen the role and function of the bus station. Concern that the requirement for affordable housing, which only applies to Official Plan amendment 	<p>The proposed Official Plan Amendment recognizes the current role and function of the Major Bus Depot and includes policies to encourage and support transit improvements in the Downtown, as well as improved linkages along Brant Street (see proposed policy Part III, 7.2.2 n)).</p> <p>The OPA does not preclude additional improvements stemming from future planning processes (such as the City-wide Integrated Mobility Plan, Region of Halton Transportation Master Plan, etc).</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington’s long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan</p>	No policy modification proposed.
----	------------------	--	--	---	----------------------------------

			<p>applications in the downtown is redundant and unnecessary and concern that there is no analysis with respect to affordable housing within the Dillon report, therefore requesting that this section be removed.</p>	<p>amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

22	January 13, 2020	WeirFoulds LLP on behalf of Landform Development Group Inc. and 2413350 Ontario Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the impetus for de-emphasizing the Downtown MTSA is to reduce density within the downtown and that this is contrary to not only the Growth Plan but also does not conform with the Region’s Official Plan. • Concern that proposed policy 7.2.2. c) will result in the reduction of densities in the Urban Growth Centre. • Concern that the proposed policy regarding public service facilities is vague. • Concern about the proposed policy regarding green spaces going beyond the City’s authority under the Planning Act. • Concern that proposed policy 7.2.2 l) conflicts with Part I, 3.0 d) of the existing Official Plan which states that the Plan will support the downtown as the cultural and entertainment centre of the City while fostering cultural activities throughout the City. • Concern that proposed policy 7.2.2 p) does not conform to the 2019 Growth Plan. • Concern regarding the development criteria in proposed policy 7.2.2 q) specifically related to consistency with the MTSA typology, requirements to preserve and protect trees; the facilitation of future pedestrian, cycling and/or private street connections; appropriate phasing of development where existing retail and service commercial uses are being 	<p>Impetus for the Study is to ensure that the City’s in force Official Plan provides guidance for planning around transit until the City’s new Official Plan and Halton Region Official Plan are updated and in-effect. Proposed amendment supports the achievement of the UGC’s density target of 200 people and jobs per hectare by 2031.</p> <p>Until the Province releases the regulations and transitional provisions surrounding parkland dedication, the existing approach to parkland dedication remains in effect. Staff notes that proposed policy 7.2.2 j) includes a variety of green spaces such as trees, landscaped areas, parks and open spaces which may include but are not limited to parkland dedication and privately-owned, publicly-accessible spaces.</p> <p>See policy modification regarding 7.2.2 p).</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington’s long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p>	See proposed policy modification to 7.2.2 p) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 6 regarding clarity on optimization of land.
----	------------------	--	---	---	--

			<p>redeveloped and demonstration that public service facilities and other neighbourhood conveniences are located within walking distance or accessible by transit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that proposed policy 7.2.2. r) requires development in the MTSA Special Planning Area to provide affordable housing elements, community space or public service facility space for major comprehensive development while there is an existing policy framework in the existing Official Plan for affordable housing and no justification in the land use study for this additional policy. • Concern over the timing of a major planning study for the Downtown MTSA as referenced in policy 7.2.4.2 a) 	<p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>Staff consider the Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan work that impacts the downtown area to constitute a major planning study as described in Section 7.2.4.2 a). The Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan study was initiated in Spring 2019. Please visit www.getinvolvedburlington.ca/official-plan-2019 for more information.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

23	January 13, 2020	Michael Hribljan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that there is not a recommendation to approach the Province to modify or remove the MTSA designation downtown • Concern that the existence of the MTSA has been used by the development industry to support taller buildings and intensification in the downtown beyond the Official Plan • Concern that the recommendations do not address the concerns for intensification in the downtown core • Concern about the public consultation process • Request to defer the report, extend the ICBL and provide more time for public feedback 	<p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton’s Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region’s current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p> <p>The ICBL Land Use Study statutory notice and release of materials was provided in December 2019 in accordance with the notice requirements of the Planning Act. A statutory public meeting was held on January 14, 2020 in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.</p>	No modifications proposed.
----	------------------	------------------	--	--	----------------------------

24	January 13, 2020	Goodmans LLP on behalf of Vrancorp Group (2020 Lakeshore Road)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over creating a hierarchy of MTSAs when the approach does not recognize the future potential of the Downtown Burlington MTSA • Concern that the densities in the Downtown Burlington MTSA would be below targets in the Growth Plan and negatively impact the downtown as the cultural and entertainment centre of the City • Concern that proposed policies in 7.2.1 and 7.2.2 place undue emphasis on office redevelopment in the Downtown Burlington MTSA and introduce new requirements related to public service facilities, green spaces and pedestrian, cycling and private street connections that are beyond the City's authority • Concern that OPA 119 will require a major planning study to be undertaken to ensure that the Downtown MTSA is planned to implement mixed-use transit-supportive development and, since the property has been the subject of extensive study, it should be exempted from any requirement for further study. 	<p>Impetus for the Study is to ensure that the City's in force Official Plan provides guidance for planning around transit until the new Official Plan and Halton Region Official Plan are updated and in effect. Proposed amendment supports the achievement of the UGC's density target of 200 people and jobs per hectare by 2031.</p> <p>Staff consider the Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan work that impacts the downtown area to constitute a major planning study as described in Section 7.2.4.2 a). The Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan study was initiated in Spring 2019. Please visit www.getinvolvedburlington.ca/official-plan-2019 for more information.</p>	No modifications proposed.
25	January 14, 2020	WeirFoulds LLP on behalf of Spruce Partners Inc. and Amico Properties Inc. (1161-1167 North Shore Boulevard)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear how the determination was made as to the limits of the new Urban Growth Centre boundary. • Concern that the policy reference to the guidelines is not appropriate as guidelines can be changed at any time without consultation. Suggestion that if this policy is to remain, it should require development applications to have <u>regard for</u> the guidelines given the manner in which they are approved. 	The City is proposing to amend the Urban Growth Centre boundary in the existing Official Plan to conform with the Urban Growth Centre boundary contained in the Region of Halton's Official Plan. Further, the Region of Halton has reviewed the proposed OPA and has provided a preliminary exemption of OPA 119, dated January 24, 2020, subject to the outcome of the January 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting.	See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv) contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 1 and 7 regarding Urban Design Guidelines.

	<p>January 20, 2020</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that proposed policy 7.2.2 j) goes beyond the City’s authority to require parkland and community benefits under the provisions of the Planning Act. <p>Additional comments received January 20, 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with Policy 7.2.1 (b) - concern this policy appears to de-emphasize the downtown bus depot and reduce density targets since it references the Transit Supportive Guidelines that are below the UGC • 7.2.2 c) - Concern that this proposed policy is creating a density target based on a dated 2012 provincial guidelines. • 7.2.2 p) - this policy does not conform to 2019 Growth Plan • 7.2.2 q) - concerns with various development criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Item iii) consistency with MTSA typology - this de-emphasizes the Downtown Bus Depot and applies a lower density target based on a dated provincial guideline ○ Item iv) applies test of consistency for the Urban Design Guidelines ○ Item vii) entirely ambiguous and impossible to measure • 7.2.2 r) - there is an existing policy framework in the existing OP for affordable housing and it is not clear what is meant by “affordable housing elements”. The proposed policy should define what a major comprehensive development is. • 7.2.4 and 7.2.4.2 a) - unclear what a major planning study entails and how that fits with the ICBL study process 	<p>See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv) regarding Urban Design Guidelines</p> <p>Until the Province releases the regulations and transitional provisions surrounding parkland dedication, the existing approach to parkland dedication remains in effect. Staff notes that proposed policy 7.2.2 j) includes a variety of green spaces such as trees, landscaped areas, parks and open spaces which may include but are not limited to parkland dedication and privately-owned, publicly-accessible spaces.</p> <p>Impetus for the Study is to ensure that the City’s in force Official Plan provides guidance for planning around transit until the new Official Plan and Halton Region Official Plan are updated and in effect. Proposed amendment supports the achievement of the UGC’s density target of 200 people and jobs per hectare by 2031.</p> <p>See policy modification regarding 7.2.2 p).</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington’s long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council</p>	<p>See proposed policy modification to 7.2.2 p) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 6 regarding clarity on optimization of land.</p>
--	-------------------------	--	---	---	---

				<p>adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>Staff consider the Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan work that impacts the downtown area to constitute a major planning study as described in Section 7.2.4.2 a). The Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan study was initiated in Spring 2019. Please visit www.getinvolvedburlington.ca/official-plan-2019 for more information.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

26	January 14, 2020	Oliver C. Pin-Harry (425 Locust St)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over lack of clarity and specifics regarding how the Proposed OP and ZBL amendments will affect the property at 425 Locust St • Concern that the amendments will adversely affect future development potential and therefore the value of the property • Concern over the steep, unacceptable and unreasonable rise of property taxes from 2011 to 2020 • Concern about the lack of congruency between the high property tax and current use of the land • Concern about lack of specifics as to how the MTSA could adversely affect future land use concerning the property 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>The proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments do not propose any site-specific policies which would apply to 425 Locust Street. The proposed Official Plan Amendments establish a policy framework related to Major Transit Station Areas and include development criteria for future development applications in the MTSA Special Planning Area.</p> <p>Concerns relating to property tax should be directed to MPAC and/or to City Council.</p>	No modifications proposed.
27	January 14, 2020	Michael von Teichman on behalf of Montik Management Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with downtown transit • It should be about the future bus function in the downtown and we should explore what can be done to improve the downtown bus terminal how to improve transit in the downtown, rather than lower density/change planning framework to enshrine a low level of transit service. This would align with strategic plan for environment/climate emergency. • Council is voting to downgrade the station and this will impact the City's ability to create a vibrant downtown. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>Planning, transportation and transit staff continue to be committed to supporting the Downtown MTSA through Transit's 5 Year Business Plan, the Integrated Mobility Plan and other initiatives.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 n) provides transit priority measures to be considered by the City in the MTSA Special Planning Area.</p> <p>The OPA does not preclude additional improvements stemming from future planning processes (such as the City-wide Integrated Mobility Plan, Region of Halton Transportation Master Plan, etc).</p>	No modifications proposed.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should be asking the province to help us invest in our bus terminal rather than signaling to them that our downtown transit is not a priority • Speaking as an owner of a downtown office property seeking tenants, identifies transit and transit-supportive densities as a key factor in attracting employers to downtown Burlington. Downtown transit matters. 		
28	January 14, 2020 (delegation and correspondence received)	Gary Scobie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaking in opposition to the section of the Land Use Report that deal with downtown planning and the downtown MTSA. • Disappointed that staff continue to plan as if the downtown is truly an MTSA. The downtown MTSA, the Anchor Mobility Hub and the Urban Growth Centre are the three cornerstones that legitimize the over intensification of our downtown. • The three designations (downtown MTSA, the Anchor Mobility Hub and the Urban Growth Centre) should be removed which would give us back control of the downtown's re-development future, with our own vision of reasonable height and retention of what we value. • Keep recommendations for the GO Station Mobility Hub intensification that make sense 	<p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton's Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region's current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	No modifications proposed.

29	January 14, 2020 (delegation; no correspondence received)	Suzanne Mammel, Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disappointed that the study elected to determine that a significant scope originally proposed is premature. The main reason given is that some mapping and changes in population, policies etc. may be made by the Region through their MCR OP Update. The fact that the Region is updating their own plans through the MCR process was known well before the ICBL was put in place. To put the scope in the terms of reference that it be reviewed, then for staff to elect that it is premature is a poor impression on the population and our industry suggests the city was not being transparent with its intentions from the outset. Has created delays and nothing in the report provides further direction in any permanent nature. Seems like staff have been selective about which policies in Dillon report to apply. In their opinion it is inappropriate to have new policies proposed through the OPA apply to applications/projects that had already been submitted. Would like confirmation that the OPA and policies will not affect lands outside of the study area. Strongly opposed to the elimination of Spencer Smith Park being removed from the mapping of the UGC. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>The MTSA typology applies to all 4 MTSAs in the city. Staff is of the opinion the associated policies within the MTSAs provide direction for the City's to complete secondary plans which are underway. See proposed policy modification regarding Part III, subsection 7.1.1 a) and Part III, subsection 7.1.2 a).</p> <p>The City is proposing to amend the Urban Growth Centre boundary in the existing Official Plan to conform with the Urban Growth Centre boundary contained in the Region of Halton's Official Plan. Further, the Region of Halton has reviewed the proposed OPA and has provided a preliminary exemption of OPA 119, dated January 24, 2020, subject to the outcome of the January 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting.</p>	See proposed policy modification to Part III, subsection 7.1.1 a) and Part III, subsection 7.1.2 a) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 3 and 4 regarding future studies and further planning for future development.
30	January 14, 2020 (delegation)	Lynn Crosby & Blair Smith, We Love Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about release of ICBL study and OP Reexamination reports at the same time – don't feel they had enough time to review and digest the reports. Feel under-engaged on the ICBL Study 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official</p>	No modifications proposed.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe the first order of business is for City to ask Province to remove UGC and MTSA. • Believe the proposed OPA will lock us into an over-intensification scenario. • Believe that the regional non-conformity issues of the adopted OP are present in the existing OP and not addressed in the OPA. • Asked Council to defer the decisions being asked of them 	<p>Plans. The Region of Halton’s Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region’s current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	
31	January 14, 2020 (delegation; no correspondence received)	Cindy Prince, Amico Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges there has been a revision to the Urban Growth Boundary and ask for rationale for the boundary change. • With regards to parks and open space policies – is that something that is still permissible based on Bill 108? • The OPA includes language regarding high quality of urban design standards. The proposed OPA seems to attempt to enshrine the urban design guideline as policy in the plan – trying to make it policy but still have it not require public consultation to amend/update the guidelines. Do we understand you correctly? • Application has been appealed to LPAT. 	<p>The City is proposing to amend the Urban Growth Centre boundary in the existing Official Plan to conform with the Urban Growth Centre boundary contained in the Region of Halton’s Official Plan. Further, the Region of Halton has reviewed the proposed OPA and has provided a preliminary exemption of OPA 119, dated January 24, 2020, subject to the outcome of the January 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting.</p> <p>Until the Province releases the regulations and transitional provisions surrounding parkland dedication, the existing approach to parkland dedication remains in effect. Staff notes that proposed policy 7.2.2 j) includes a variety of green spaces such as trees, landscaped areas, parks and open spaces which may include but are not limited to parkland dedication and privately-owned, publicly-accessible spaces.</p>	See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv) contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 1 and 7 regarding Urban Design Guidelines.

				See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv) regarding Urban Design Guidelines.	
32	January 14, 2020 (delegation; no correspondence received)	Glen Nicholson ECOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that Burlington GO zoning should have reasonable height limits and require commercial uses. Support for this part of the staff recommendation. • Do not support recommendations regarding Downtown MTSA. Should not be enshrining the Downtown MTSA designation in every city planning document when there is evidence that the bus terminal is not functioning as an MTSA. ECOB does not think the recommendation makes sense. • Cites MPP McKenna that it's up to city council to designate/undesignated the Mobility Hub. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton's Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region's current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	No modifications proposed.
33	January 14, 2020 (delegation; no correspondence received)	Samer El-Fashny & Nada Nisevic, representing Better Life Retirement Residence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The long term care facility at 441 Maple Ave. is nearing end of life cycle. They have applied for 11 storey apartment building on site and also proposing to move long term care to Palladium Way. Results of ICBL study have been completed and does not affect the development. Requesting exemption from ICBL. Concerned that the application will continue to be held up in the event of an appeal. 	Staff are not recommending any site-specific exemptions from the ICBL in advance of Council's consideration of the amendments.	No modifications proposed.

34	January 14, 2020 (delegation; no correspondence received)	Glen Wellings, Wellings Planning Consultants Inc. on behalf of Mattamy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with modification to the UGC Boundary • The report seems to accept status quo for the bus terminal rather than promoting updates to the terminal. This is not consistent with the UGC nor is it transit-supportive or reflective of the spirit and intent of a MTSA. It's not long-term planning. • Mattamy's applications have been under process for 2 years and were submitted under in-effect OP. Seeking clarification that City will not try to apply the ICBL's proposed OPA policies to this application. • If ICBL OPA and ZBA are appealed, how does that affect the new Adopted OP? 	<p>The City is proposing to amend the Urban Growth Centre boundary in the existing Official Plan to conform with the Urban Growth Centre boundary contained in the Region of Halton's Official Plan. Further, the Region of Halton has reviewed the proposed OPA and has provided a preliminary exemption of OPA 119, dated January 24, 2020, subject to the outcome of the January 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting.</p> <p>Planning, transportation and transit staff continue to be committed to supporting the Downtown MTSA through Transit's 5 Year Business Plan, the Integrated Mobility Plan and other initiatives.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 n) provides transit priority measures to be considered by the City in the MTSA Special Planning Area.</p> <p>The OPA does not preclude additional improvements stemming from future planning processes (such as the City-wide Integrated Mobility Plan, Region of Halton Transportation Master Plan, etc).</p> <p>The proposed Official Plan Amendment is to the existing in-force OP. Any appeals to the proposed OPA and ZBLA will not affect Regional approval of the adopted Official Plan.</p>	No modifications proposed.
----	---	--	---	---	----------------------------

35	January 14, 2020 (delegation; no correspondence received)	Anne & Dave Marsden - Community Health, Safety & Access Advocates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public engagement is important. Quotes Jane McKenna spring 2019 newsletter: Claims that according to this newsletter that there is only one MTSA. We're here today to defend our ability to appeal your decisions. We were denied the right to appeal the ICBL. We would have supported Molinaro in saying Burlington GO should be exempt from ICBL, we want growth there to save downtown. We will support anyone who appeals on the same basis as us which is that we were misled by our Council and in fact we can remove the Mobility Hub after all. Support ECoB about changing MTSA and UGC. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton's Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region's current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	No modifications proposed.
36	January 14, 2020 (delegation; correspondence received)	Jeremy Skinner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions provided are in order of occurrence in Appendix D. 7.2.2 q) (i) – suggestion to add sun/shadow and wind to the list of compatibility elements 7.2.2 q) (v) – suggestion to develop a set of tree guidelines as to preference in terms of tree species, such as native tree species, and to include location attributes which will enable mature tree growth recommended by city staff, such as 3 metre radius of soil with a depth of 3 metre. 7.2.3.2 h) (iv) – suggestions that city establish building heights based upon angular planes associated with objectives such as: bordering stable residential neighbourhood property lines; minimum of 5 hours of 	<p>Staff have noted these suggestions.</p> <p>Staff suggest that some of these specific recommendations could be incorporated into the Wind and Shadow Study project that is currently taking place or into future urban design guideline initiatives.</p> <p>Staff note that the existing definition of 'compatibility' in the Official Plan includes reference to sun-shadowing which would be applicable through the proposed development criteria policies.</p> <p>Staff will take the detailed suggestions regarding building heights under advisement during the secondary planning process.</p>	No modifications proposed.

			<p>sunlight along the north sidewalk of Plains Rd./Fairview St. etc. Suite principle rooms should have a minimum visibility of horizon and skylight from above such as a minimum of 45-degree horizontal arch of unobstructed view of horizon and/or 45-degree vertical arch of view of the sky above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.2.3.2 h) (vii) – suggestion that second and additional bedrooms shall be a minimum of 11 sq. metres excluding closet to permit the possibility of two children including 2 beds, 2 dressers and 2 desks. Also suggest that suites be designed with breakout panels between adjacent suites which would permit the integration of additional bedrooms between owned suites. • 7.2.3.2 (viii-xvii) – suggestion that the city establish building heights based upon angular planes associated with objectives such as bordering stable residential neighbourhood property lines; minimum of 5 hours of sunlight along the north sidewalk of Plain Rd./Fairview St. etc. Also suggests to assess whether the proposed building height of 19 storeys associated with Area B-2 North can be contained within a 45-degree angular plane as established on the track side of the stable residential properties on Fassel Avenue of the Glenwood Park stable residential neighbourhood. • 7.2.4 (Downtown MTSA Subsection) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggestion that the City include the vision for Brant St. between Lakeshore and Dundas St. as 	<p>The OPA does not preclude additional improvements stemming from future planning processes (such as the City-wide Integrated Mobility Plan, Region of Halton Transportation Master Plan, etc).</p> <p>The density targets for MTSAs will be established by the Region of Halton through their Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>described in the Big Move Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City should include the density targets associated with an MTSA and to compare with the density targets associated with an Urban Growth Centre ○ City should assess whether the current fine-grained grid street pattern in the Downtown be maintained for through vehicular traffic or whether some streets be repurposed as pedestrian walkways and public open spaces. Vehicular assess for building servicing would be restricted to after hours except in the event of emergencies. ○ The City should undertake the development of underground parking design considerations including those related to the integration of trees at ground level. This should include the integration of minimum underground parking floorplate size related to mid-rise and tall building guidelines. ○ The City should invest in an Inspire Burlington public meeting on the matter of Urban planning and transportation planning. 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

37	January 15, 2020	Tom Muir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Dillon report clearly writes that the downtown bus stop will never function as an MTSA and this designation should be removed, and this would be good planning. A concept plan is needed to illustrate what the downtown plan could look like with that policy removed from the planning frame. • The MTSA implications and options were never in the engagement process. The public requests to move towards removing the MTSA designation at least in the downtown has been ignored. The public vision, values and support for the downtown will not be met with the MTSA designation not removed. 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton’s Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region’s current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p>	No modifications proposed.
38	January 16, 2020	Mayor’s Millennial Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion that the space between future buildings is ideal for a vehicle-free walking path lined with trees and grass • The creek between the GO Station and car dealership to the east would be an ideal place to enhance and highlight the nature within the area • The proposed heights are not an issue and ideally the buildings will all have podiums • Traffic in the area will increase regardless, so public transit into the Go Station on both the North (Harvester) and South (Fairview) sides will be critical. • An underground walkway connecting the Burlington Go Station to the neighboring buildings would be ideal. 	<p>Comments specific to site design and transportation have been noted and will also be filed for consideration through future secondary planning.</p> <p>All lower-tier municipal Official Plans and Official Plan amendments are required to conform to upper-tier Official Plans. The Region of Halton’s Official Plan identifies Downtown Burlington as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>Any discussions with the Region of Halton regarding Provincial designations such as the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area would need to occur during the Region’s current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the Dillon report contains several transit improvement opportunities for delivering transit in the Downtown MTSA.</p> <p>The OPA does not preclude additional improvements stemming from future planning processes (such as the City-</p>	No modifications proposed.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The downtown MTSA should be downgraded to just a bus terminal and maintain and expand the stops with growing ridership. 	wide Integrated Mobility Plan, Region of Halton Transportation Master Plan, etc).	
39	January 21, 2020	Weirfoulds on behalf of Ayra Properties Ltd. – 1381 Lakeshore Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with both the ICBL Land Use Study recommendations and as well as the SGL Report and how recommendations will impact the site at 1381 Lakeshore Road. Overall concern with reducing densities in the UGC and de-emphasizing the Downtown Bus Terminal Proposed OPA must be revised to include policy directives for transit improvements along Brant St to enhance connectivity as per the RTP, Region’s DMTR Study and the Grow Plan Unclear as to the rationale for a revised UGC boundary 3.11.2 e) - policy reference to guidelines is not appropriate to enshrine in policy. This policy should require that development applications have <u>regard</u> for the guidelines given the manner in which they are approved. Policy 7.2.1 b) is contrary to the Growth Plan in that it seeks to reduce density targets within the UGC Policy 7.2.2 c) is creating a density target based on a dated 2012 provincial guideline. Policy 7.2.2 j) goes beyond the City’s authority to require parkland and community benefits, under the Planning Act Policy 7.2.2 p) does not conform to the 2019 Growth Plan concerns with various development criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item iii) consistency with MTSA typology - this de-emphasizes the Downtown Bus Depot and applies a lower density target based on a dated provincial guideline 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>Impetus for the Study is to ensure that the City’s in force Official Plan provides guidance for planning around transit until the new Official Plan and Halton Region Official Plan are updated and in effect. Proposed amendment supports the achievement of the UGC’s density target of 200 people and jobs per hectare by 2031.</p> <p>Planning, transportation and transit staff continue to be committed to supporting the Downtown MTSA through Transit’s 5 Year Business Plan, the Integrated Mobility Plan and other initiatives.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 n) provides transit priority measures to be considered by the City in the MTSA Special Planning Area.</p> <p>The OPA does not preclude additional improvements stemming from future planning processes (such as the City-wide Integrated Mobility Plan, Region of Halton Transportation Master Plan, etc).</p> <p>The City is proposing to amend the Urban Growth Centre boundary in the existing Official Plan to conform with the Urban Growth Centre boundary contained in the Region of Halton’s Official Plan. Further, the Region of Halton has reviewed the proposed OPA and has provided a preliminary exemption of OPA 119, dated January 24, 2020, subject to the outcome of the January 30, 2020 Special Council Meeting.</p>	<p>See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv) contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 1 and 7 regarding Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>See proposed policy modification to 7.2.2 p) contained in Appendix C-2, Row 6 regarding clarity on optimization of land.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Item iv) applies test of consistency for the Urban Design Guidelines ○ Item vii) entirely ambiguous and impossible to measure ● 7.2.2 r) - there is an existing policy framework in the existing OP for affordable housing and it is not clear what is meant by “affordable housing elements”. The proposed policy should define what a major comprehensive development is. ● 7.2.4 and 7.2.4.2 a) - unclear what a major planning study entails and how that fits with the ICBL study process 	<p>See proposed policy modification to Part II, subsection 3.11.2 e) and Part III, subsection 7.2.2 q) (iv) regarding Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>Until the Province releases the regulations and transitional provisions surrounding parkland dedication, the existing approach to parkland dedication remains in effect. Staff notes that proposed policy 7.2.2 j) includes a variety of green spaces such as trees, landscaped areas, parks and open spaces which may include but are not limited to parkland dedication and privately-owned, publicly-accessible spaces.</p> <p>See policy modification regarding 7.2.2 p).</p> <p>Development criteria policies and OPA criteria proposed in this OPA are based on an identified need to standardize and enhance the evaluation framework applied to site specific development applications. This approach ensures that the objectives and policies of the Official Plan are comprehensively assessed through every development application, ensuring that all new development contributes to Burlington’s long term vision. In the case of the OPA criteria specifically it acknowledges that at times refinements to the policies of the Plan may be appropriate. The criteria will be used to guide the development of recommendations and support decision making and approval processes of the City. A similar approach was taken through the 2018 Council adopted Official Plan policies which were subject to a comprehensive engagement program prior to the commencement of the ICBL Study.</p> <p>Proposed policy 7.2.2 r) clarifies that where a proponent is seeking an Official Plan amendment that includes residential uses the achievement of important community planning</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>objectives such as rental housing, affordable housing or the co-location of community space or public service facilities shall be considered as part of the Official Plan amendment. The OPA criteria are based on the Strategic Plan which establishes a mandate to actively city-build by using all of the tools available to City Council, working with community partners to actively shape the physical, social, economic and cultural fabric of the city as we grow. The Strategic Plan addresses the importance of intensification and identifies the role of intensification done well which includes, among other things, more affordable housing choices. This policy allows for the consideration, through a Planning Act approval process, of the incremental development of a more complete community with a full range of housing, and public service facilities.</p> <p>Staff consider the Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan work that impacts the downtown area to constitute a major planning study as described in Section 7.2.4.2 a). The Scoped Re-examination of the Official Plan study was initiated in Spring 2019. Please visit www.getinvolvedburlington.ca/official-plan-2019 for more information.</p>	
40	January 20, 2020	Mathieu Goetzke, Chief Planning Officer, Metrolinx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To capitalize on provincial investment in regional transit and benefits, Metrolinx is undertaking transit oriented development at and adjacent to its stations to increase ridership, improved customer experience and to offer more choice in modes of travel. Consistent with Growth Plan and 2041 RTP. Metrolinx requests: 	<p>Staff have noted these concerns.</p> <p>Proposed maximum heights for the lands bounded by Brant Street, Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor are proposed to be modified (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p> <p>The final delineation of the MTSA boundaries and minimum density target will be established by the Region of Halton</p>	See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III, Subsection 7.2.3 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 8 - 13 regarding the Burlington GO MTSA and the lands bounded by Brant Street,

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retain existing land use permissions and not approve the OPA and ZBLA for the study area at this time ○ Undertake additional analysis to demonstrate that proposed land use and height permissions, at a minimum support Growth Plan density target of 150 people and jobs per hectare for the Burlington GO MTSA ○ Consider greater densities within the MTSA to incentivize transit oriented development and support the massive investment in regional transit (GO expansion program) ○ Further engage affected stakeholders and landowners, including Metrolinx, in determining the proposed land use framework for the ICBL study area, prior to presenting a revised proposal for city council’s consideration ● Land Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern that the study effectively down-zones lands in the MTSA at a time when the Province is promoting transit oriented development ○ Analysis should be provided on the ability to achieve minimum density target of 150 people and jobs per hectare. Understand that exact boundary is still to be determined by Region through MCR process. ○ Encourages City to consider permitted densities above the minimum established in Growth Plan ○ Recommendations in Section 14.2 of Dillon Report and 7.2.3 of proposed OPA (specifically Special planning Area “A”) significantly 	<p>through the Municipal Comprehensive Review and will be implemented through a future Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Staff note that a draft precinct plan and associated draft key land use policy directions were presented in July 2018 for discussion and for community and Council feedback as input into the creation of a future Area Specific Plan (ASP) and it was noted at that time that the draft precinct plans were preliminary and subject to change.</p> <p>Staff is of the opinion that providing permeability and connectivity in the Burlington GO MTSA and to the GO Station is an important consideration and part of a complete community. Please see the proposed policy modifications to Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 regarding transportation connection. (See “Suggested Modification” column for more detail.)</p>	<p>Fairview Street, Drury Lane and the rail corridor.</p> <p>See proposed Zoning by-law amendment in Appendix G, item #4 regarding built form at street edge and item #6 regarding the removal of Diagram 5A.</p> <p>See proposed policy modifications to proposed policies in Part III 7.2.3.1, 7.3.2 h) (x) and Schedule M-1 contained in Appendix C-2, Rows 10, 13 and 14 regarding transportation connection.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

			<p>constrain feasible development on Metrolinx lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Draft outputs of on-hold Mobility Hubs Study did not not restrict development to 24 storeys. Until further consultation and analysis is completed, the existing height permissions should be retained ● Connectivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support conclusions relating to mobility and connectivity between downtown and Burlington GO ○ Do not support proposed road bisecting the existing bus loop at the Burlington GO Station. If proposed road was implemented, significant impacts to bus operations could be expected. ● Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anticipated future schedule of the Burlington GO Mobility Hub study should be included in the Appendix A timelines to understanding timing of forthcoming secondary plan. ○ Request to be included in Technical Advisory Committee and Landowners' group for secondary plan process ○ Request further consultation on delineation of MTSA boundary and identification of height permissions and density targets through secondary planning and Region MCR process. 		
--	--	--	---	--	--