Report PL-02-20, Appendix F2-additional public comments

Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: October-December 5th, 2019 Engagement Period

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS to Response Matrix for Submissions received during October-December 5th, 2019 engagement period

The table below contains two submissions, and the staff responses to them, that were mistakenly omitted from Appendix F2 of staff report PL-02-20.

Note: These additional public comments are formatted consistent with Appendix F2. Accordingly, it reproduces comments or excerpts of comments where appropriate for the purpose of summarizing and responding to the input received. Where possible, comments have been summarized; in other cases, excerpts of comments have been quoted verbatim. Individual submissions have been split up so that different comments from the same letter can be sorted into different categories. The same submissions and submission authors therefore appear in multiple tables. Where appropriate, staff have addressed certain comments under the "Staff Response" column. Some submissions did not require a response because they were clear and could be applied to the project team's work without the need for discussion; in these cases, only the words "comments noted" appear under the "Staff Response" column. Regardless of whether a response was provided under "Staff Response", the "Comment Informs" column indicates how the submission has been applied to the project.

For further clarification of how submissions have been reflected in this table, please refer to Appendix F2.

GENERAL COMMENTS						
Row #	**Date Received**	**From (Name/ Company/ Organization)**	**Stakeholder Comment**	**Theme**	**Staff Response**	**Comment informs**
G26	Dec 5, 2019	Peter Ward	Thanks for your reply. A few observations: (1) Both concepts propose a maximum potential above 300 ppl/ha (plus more when Old	Vision; Maintaining the	(1) As discussed in row P8 of Appendix F2 (PL-02-20), the objective of the work was to consider a planning horizon of 2031 and achieving a minimum 200 people	Concept; Policy

GENERAL COMMENTS						
Row #	**Date Received**	**From (Name/ Company/ Organization)**	**Stakeholder Comment**	**Theme**	**Staff Response**	**Comment informs**
		(email – follow-up to earlier correspondence presented in row P8 of Appendix F2)	Lakeshore included); beyond what's required for 2031. (2) There is no need to go beyond 200 ppl/ha with our plan. As you say, these are minimums. Let's keep to ***reasonable*** minimums not ***maximum*** minimums. We don't need to give away height with nothing in return. Further, going higher won't stop LPAT appeals – the 401-413 Brant Street LPAT appeal is proof of that. … (4) The concepts emphasize Quantity over Quality. The primary focus is on putting as many people as possible into the downtown. Numbers and density are where your concepts force the "conversation" to go. (5) Laudable principles like protecting heritage, adding parks, appropriate transitions to low rise neighbourhoods, protecting Village Square, etc., are not a priority. Further, several themes in your report were vitally altered from the themes produced in the Engagement sessions (6) There are many more options that represent good planning. Regrettably, none were put forward. I think the public would have been delighted and would love to have a "conversation" on different options that focused on: • The greening of our downtown	Character of the Downtown/ Heritage Preservation; Green Space/Open Space/ Parks; Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions; Preserving and Encouraging Places to Shop and Work.	and jobs per hectare density target, not 300 ppl/ha. Section 3.6 of the October 2019 SGL report "Themes, Principles, and Land Use Concepts" outlines that Concepts 1 and 2 model how much development could occur if every possible site developed, but this will not happen within the planning horizon because the amount of development that will occur by 2031 is market-dependent. (2) Please refer to section 5.3.2 of report PL-02-20 for discussion of minimum targets. (4) Please refer to section 5.3.2 of report PL-02-20 which explains the role minimum targets have played in the development of the preliminary preferred concept. In accordance with good planning principles and practices, numbers and density are not the only factors that have been considered. (5) Please refer to PL-02-20, Appendices D and E, which outline how the public engagement periods resulted in the themes presented in the reports prepared by SGL and the City. Section 5.1 of report PL-02-20 explains that some themes are not directly applicable to the development of the preliminary preferred concept but continue to be important considerations and will be addressed in greater detail during the development of detailed policies. (6) The greening of downtown has been considered in the development of the preliminary preferred concept and has informed the identification of an	

GENERAL COMMENTS						
Row #	**Date Received**	**From (Name/ Company/ Organization)**	**Stakeholder Comment**	**Theme**	**Staff Response**	**Comment informs**
			• A stronger more resilient downtown in the face of climate change • Encouraging vibrant retail and employment opportunities • Preserving the small town feel that recognizes Burlington's history … The planning discipline is a technical practice, not a science and involves subjective assumptions. The bottom line: there is no one, true path to achieve good planning. Ultimately, the best plan is one that successfully balances provincial requirements and 'legal defensibility' with the aspirations of the community, where the city works hard to develop consensus and a shared vision. Hopefully, by the spring our downtown plan will strike that balance and we'll achieve a shared vision.		interconnected network of new or improved parks. "Greening" will also be a consideration in policy development. Climate change resilience will be considered in policy development. Encouraging retail and employment opportunities has been a factor in the development of the preliminary preferred concept, which is reflected in a number of precincts that prioritize built form that facilitates the success of these uses (for example Downtown East, Brant Main Street, and Mid-Brant Precinct). Retail/employment opportunities will also be considered in policy development. Preserving the small-town feel has been considered in the development of the preliminary preferred concept and resulted in a proposed low-rise built form within 20 metres of the street in multiple precincts. Preserving character will also inform detailed policy development.	

DOWNTOWN EAST MIXED-USE PRECINCT						
Row #	**Date Received**	**From (Name/ Company/ Organization)**	**Stakeholder Comment**	**Theme**	**Staff Response**	**Comment informs**
E2	Nov 25, 2019	Karen Bennett of Glen Schnarr & Associates Ltd., for Pine Street Burlington Corp.	• Concern that boundary of Downtown East is irregular where it meets Apartment Neighbourhood Precinct in the area of Martha Street and Pine Street, and that this does not reflect the vision for downtown which otherwise illustrates a series of logical clusters; • Comment that delineation of precincts in Figure 5 of October 2019 SGL report does not exactly align with delineation of where different building heights are recognized as existing in Figure 7 or are proposed in Figures 10 and 11; • Concern that delineation of areas on Figures 10 and 11 of October 2019 SGL report appear to exclude the southeast quadrant of the block bounded by Pearl/Pine/Martha Street and Elgin Promenade from consideration of development with taller buildings in both Concepts 1 and 2. • Concern that Figure 7 of October 2019 SGL report appears to show the lands at 2085 Pine Street as "Low-Rise Existing Building" when the Figure should reflect the Council-approved zoning for a 6-storey development on these lands as part of the area's built-form context; • Request that Downtown East Mixed-Use Precinct be expanded to include all lands west of Martha Street, north of Pine, with Martha Street as the easterly boundary of the precinct, in the interest of presenting a consistent and logical boundary for this precinct; • Request for southeast quadrant of Pearl/Pine/Martha/Promenade block be included when considering lands where different building heights than the existing context may be considered;	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions; Vision.	Comments noted. Several modifications to precinct boundaries have been made, informed in part by public/stakeholder comments, and with a view to ensuring appropriate built form in distinct parts of the downtown, and appropriate transitions between different areas. In the case of the Pearl/Pine/Martha Street area south of the Elgin Promenade, a new precinct has been created ("Village Square Precinct") to reflect the distinct nature of this area of the downtown. This new precinct allows for low-rise development abutting Martha Street while allowing for mid-rise development (subject to performance standards such as angular planes) for the remainder of the lands east of Pearl Street, south of the Elgin Promenade. This addresses the concern about appropriate precinct boundaries and the concern that the lands known as 2085 Pine Street were not being considered for development at a scale beyond the existing low-rise building. The request for tall building permissions is not supported but the preliminary preferred concept does	Concept

DOWNTOWN EAST MIXED-USE PRECINCT						
Row #	**Date Received**	**From (Name/ Company/ Organization)**	**Stakeholder Comment**	**Theme**	**Staff Response**	**Comment informs**
			• Request that southeast quadrant of Pearl/Pine/Martha/Promenade block be considered for tall buildings, consistent with what Concept 2 proposes for remainder of this block.		allow for appropriately scaled mid-rise development.	

PROCESS				
Row #	**Date Received**	**From (Name/ Company/ Organization)**	**Stakeholder Comment**	**Staff Response**
P14	Dec 5, 2019	Peter Ward (email – follow-up to earlier correspondence presented in row P8 of Appendix F2)	(3) While you say the concepts is a modeling exercise "intended to start the conversation", the public would have been better served if we had genuinely different concepts to work with. What's provided is Overdevelopment Concept 1 and Overdevelopment Concept 2; both are only slight modifications of the other. It's unclear why you developed concepts that show 300 pp/ha; rather than some that are closer to the required 200 ppl/ha. (7) The concepts ignore the feedback from residents, notably what they said in the survey comments and ultimately what they expressed at the ballot box in the 2018 election. These concepts represent everything residents don't want for our downtown.	(3) Concepts 1 and 2 facilitated a discussion on the appropriateness of different types of built form for the downtown. The public discourse elicited by these concepts informed the development of the preliminary preferred concept, which considered public/stakeholder comments while also reflecting the existing built context, among other factors. Section 3.6 of the October 2019 SGL report "Themes, Principles, and Land Use Concepts" provides clarity on densities. Section 5.3.2 of report PL-02-20 reiterates that density numbers are not the only consideration that factored into the development of the preliminary preferred concept. (7) Feedback from residents and all other stakeholders have been documented and considered in the development of the preliminary preferred concept. This input will also be considered during policy development. Refer to report PL-02-20 and its appendices A, B, D, E, F1, and F2, for information on how public feedback has informed the project to date.