

# Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: October-December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 Engagement Period

## Response Matrix for Submissions received during October-December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 engagement period

All submissions have been reviewed and considered by the project team for the Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown project (the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies in the Adopted Official Plan). This appendix reproduces comments or excerpts of comments where appropriate for the purpose of summarizing and responding to the input received.

Within the table below, under the “Stakeholder Comment” column, comments are reproduced for reference. 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. The following abbreviations are used in this column:

- “concept”: This comment has informed the evaluation of the two preliminary concepts and the development of the preliminary preferred concept;
- “policy”: This comment will inform the development of detailed policies after a concept is endorsed by Council
- “n/a”: The comment has been responded to but does not introduce new information to apply to concept or policy development within the scope of the Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown project (“the current project”)

Comments are organized into the following tables within this appendix:

- General Comments
- Brant Main Street Precinct Comments
- Lakeshore Mixed-Use Precinct Comments
- Mid-Brant Precinct Comments

- Downtown East Precinct Comments
- Upper Brant Precinct Comments
- Neighbourhood Mixed-Use Precinct
- Apartment Neighbourhoods Precinct Comments
- Process Comments
- Out of Scope Comments

The Process Comments table addresses submissions that commented on the process of the Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown project, rather than the content of the project. The Out of Scope Comments section identifies submissions that spoke to matters outside the scope of the Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown project and explains why these submissions could not be applied to the project. For more information on project scope and givens, refer to the [Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: Public Engagement Plan](#) and the SGL report “[Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: What You Need to Know](#)”.

GENERAL COMMENTS						
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
G1	Oct 17, 2019	Penny Hersh (email)	if the concepts do not meet the mandates set out by the Province then all the public engagement would be a waste of time. I hope that one of the concepts presented would be defensible at LPAT, if necessary. Residents need the truth on what to expect moving forward.	Vision	The two concepts and the recommended concept are consistent with provincial and regional policy and were developed with consideration for numerous inputs including public feedback, technical studies, existing context, and policy/legislative requirements.	Concept
G2	Oct 24, 2019	Ron Porter (email)	1) Massing & Scale - Massing is a Big concern of intensification of the Downtown. Concept 1 provided a much better mitigation of “ Built to the Street, Building Wind Tunnel Outcome “ Massing. The trade off of a setback after the first 3 Storeys of a MINIMUM of 20 metres for increased building tower height to 17 stories is the much preferred option. The 17 story towers with slender 750 metre floorplates would be visually much more appealing.	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;  Walkability, Cycling, Transit;	Comments noted.	Concept

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>- Concept 2 while lower building heights to 12 stories ONLY has a tiered set back from the street after 3 stories of 3 metres ( 10 feet ). This very small insignificant tiered 10 foot setback would create the feeling of a 12 story Block Wall hanging over the street.</p> <p>- Other Massing Mitigation suggestions – when you walk downtown Burlington Streets off of Lakeshore going north the most pedestrian friendly appealing street is Pearl St. And why is that ? It’s because Pearl Streets sidewalks and medians are much wider than Brant Sts and allows the opportunity , working from the road curb to the streets buildings, for grass medians, significant tree plantings and then the sidewalk and then the building.</p> <p>- Oakville is currently re-doing it’s downtown Lakeshore Street &amp; coincidentally being there last night what is very evident is Oakville is significantly expanding the width of its street pedestrian areas ( it looked to be at least doubled ) and there will be significant grass, tree &amp; plantings in the pedestrian walkways, plus very nice streetscape lighting. It looks like they are narrowing Lakeshore to get the required pedestrian space. I’m not sure we have that narrowing option on Brant St but if we were able to consistently “ Push “ the start of the buildings back on Brant St to capture significant space for grass medians and trees like on Pearl St that would be ideal.</p> <p>- Finally wrt Massing – The residence / small condo buildings on lower Pearl are tiered back on that illusive 45 degree angled plane all the Planners talk about but we’ve had so little success achieving in recent buildings ( Saxony – an 8 story wall built to the street , same for Carriage Gate at Caroline / John / Martha ). The tiered Pearl St buildings are maybe 6 story’s tall. Imagine those buildings with the Concept 1 recommended 20 metre setback after the first 3 floors. Would there be a problem with 17 story’s nice</p>	<p>Green Space/Open Space/Parks</p>		

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>design small floorplate tower here ? I don't think so. Now imagine a Concept 2 building here with a mere 10 foot setback after 3 story's and then 9 more floors of straight up building, like the Saxony. Would there be a Massing problem with row after row of building along Brant St or Lakeshore Rd like that ? I definitely think there would be a big Massing problem. It would be like a Block Wall.</p> <p>- The best example Downtown of a taller building with a substantial tiered set back , I think 15 stories , and a wider sidewalk with nicer tree plantings would be Harbourview, across from the parking garage and just west of a Buntons Wharf.</p> <p>2) Sense of Space – see my comments on Pearl St sidewalk , grass median &amp; tree planting area width. That should be the Vision.</p> <p>- The Concept 1 Plan for the area up by the top end of John St into the plaza and Rambo Creek was good , it again traded off some small floorplate building height for more ground level green space, trails and walkways.</p>			
G3	Oct 27, 2019	SD (email)	<p>Concern about losing small-town charm and sense of "Burlington" (becoming Toronto).</p> <p>Concern about traffic congestion and inability to provide adequate parking.</p> <p>Concern about loss of green spaces and impacts on climate.</p>	<p>Maintaining the Character of the Downtown/ Heritage Preservation ; Traffic Congestion; Parking; Green Space/Open Space/Parks</p>	Comments noted.	Concept; Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
G4	Oct 28, 2019	David Billings (email)	<p>-Burlington needs more north-south bike paths and the Hager Creek seems like an opportunity for this if ownership issues can be resolved. Other waterways may also provide opportunities. The Centennial Bikepath is a real hoot. It might be used more if north south routes were more available.</p> <p>-I generally like the idea of lots of six story buildings to skyscrapers. I also prefer stepped buildings like the Pepperwood café building.</p> <p>-It is important that we not lose any more grocery stores downtown.</p> <p>- I am not terribly interested in whether the buildings have glass or brick or architectural merit though I appreciate heritage and character.</p> <p>One other general note is that we should have specified objectives for growth such as low crime, personal financial a stability for the population, financial stability for the municipal corporation, a healthy cultural sector and prospects for young people.</p> <p>Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has recently stated publicly that Canada is the first globalized country. Opposition parties seem to agree that we will continue on this path. Since Burlington has been listed as a top prospect for this globalized growth, we have both a duty and an opportunity to study and publicize this process as it occurs.</p> <p>Too often, development seems to have the sole objective of earning financial profits for primarily anonymous and migrant developers before they leave town. This does nobody any good. We should at least state some sort of managerial objectives including monitoring the integrity of the money supply so that we can assess whether the development process was successful or not. Other objectives could include: lower commuting times, success of retailers, low crime rates, financial security of citizens, financial security of the municipal corporation, a genuinely heterogeneous culture, an active culture with a free press, environmentally</p>	<p>Walkability, Cycling, Transit;</p> <p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p> <p>Preserving and Encouraging Places to Shop and Work;</p> <p>Design;</p> <p>Vision;</p> <p>Arts, Culture, Events, People &amp; Amenities;</p> <p>Variety of Housing Options and Affordability ;</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Cycling Master Plan (currently in draft form) identifies opportunities for north-south cycling routes. The recommended concept plan incorporates the Cycling Master Plan network as well as other green connectors and off-street trails to represent the priority of identifying active transportation connections. Please see Figure 2 in Appendix A <i>Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: Preliminary Preferred Concept</i>.</p> <p>A Wind and Shadow Study is currently underway that will help assess how new developments in the City impact wind, sun, and shadows.</p> <p>The purpose of the Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown is to develop a framework to describe the vision that the City wants to achieve over the long term. Development applications in the future will be assessed against this</p>	Concept Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
			<p>responsible and financially successful industry, and an effective educational program.</p> <p>This is both for our own benefit, the benefit of future Burlingtonians and the benefit of other municipalities who will likely be forced to follow our example.</p> <p>As the tour ended Saturday I found that urban tunnelling of winds was surprisingly chilly. I enjoyed it though. The crowd was good to though I was disappointed to see so few of us were under the age of fifty. It is symptomatic of the problem of affordable housing for young people in Burlington.</p>		framework in relation to a specific application’s ability to contribute to the achievement of that overall vision.	
G5	Oct 31, 2019	Tom Eichenbaum (email)	<p>- While the majority of respondents /participants seem to voice a strong preference for minimizing the number of new High Rise Buildings for the Downtown area, it needs to be recognized that High Rises would contribute more development charges (increased funding ) for new infrastructure (widened intersections, wider sidewalks, improved access (pedestrian tunnels etc.) in the Mobility Hub areas of the City. In other words, by lowering the densities of development, there would be less revenue to build much needed Downtown area and Mobility Hub area infrastructure.</p> <p>- While the Feedback Report identifies the desire for “<u>improved Transit and improved Active Transportation</u>” ... there is no specific mention of the merits of a “jitney/shuttle” style transit service in and around the Downtown. This was discussed at our Action Labs session.... New “non-traditional” Transit vehicles (and foreseeing other envisioned transportation system changes such as charging stations for electric vehicles, automated self -driving vehicles etc.) need to be seriously considered for a new Vision for the Downtown...</p>	<p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p> <p>Walkability, Cycling, Transit;</p>	Comments noted. Public engagement on the Integrated Mobility Plan will occur in 2020 and will consider opportunities for improved or new mobility options.	Concept; Policy
G6	Nov 1, 2019	Jackie Lodder (email)	I feel so inadequate to really appreciate nuances between Concept 1 and 2. Last week I was sure Concept 1 was best but now I am leaning towards Concept 2. Less bulk overhead gives us more sky!	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood	Comments noted. The Official Plan, along with the Cycling Plan and Integrated Mobility Plan, will	Concept; Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>I don't have a problem with tall buildings but "they" say there is a sweet spot for people living in tall buildings; too tall and they don't connect with their community. I think it is 4-6 stories but I can see that is not an option for Burlington.</p> <p>Whether the buildings are tall or small what is happening on the street will play a bigger part in how vibrant our DT becomes.</p> <p>This summer I witness 4-5 teenager boys on bikes waffling, on the crowded sidewalk in front of Kelly's bake shop. They did not know what to do, they were intimidated by the busy road but too many people on the sidewalk to keep riding. It really wasn't safe for them to be on the sidewalk or on the road. I felt bad for them, but also for the pedestrians and the drivers.</p> <p>It is a good problem...too much busy on Brant street but Brant Street really isn't bursting with successful shops...so it seems to me that the traffic issues are kind of a big deal.</p> <p>Cant plan for more vehicles because we will just end up with more through traffic avoiding QEW and that kind of traffic is useless to the city, just adding to the congestion and pollution. ..so lets plan for less traffic/parking, so all those people in the towers can safely walk/cycle to their activities instead of driving.</p>	<p>ood Transitions;</p> <p>Walkability, Cycling, Transit;</p> <p>Safer, More Usable and Inclusive Public Spaces</p> <p>Traffic Congestion &amp; Parking</p>	<p>promote more options for people and goods to safely get around, with less dependence in future on the private automobile.</p>	
G7	Nov 2, 2019	Ken Rutter (email)	<p>Nothing on population expectations. What are the projections of how many people these areas can handle. Ie the maximum number. More people means more severe climate change. We have to stop over growth of population. An area can handle only so much.</p> <p>You think we have congestion now it will be worse in the future if we keep building.</p>	Traffic Congestion;	<p>200 people and jobs combined per hectare sets the expectation that there will be over 20,000 people and jobs within the Urban Growth Centre by 2031. The most recent assessment of the UGC was prepared in June and can be found here: <a href="#">link to the UGC analysis</a> (Appendix C to PB-19-19)</p>	Concept; Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
					<p>Population will continue to increase in Burlington just as it will on a broader scale throughout Halton, the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and Canada. In order to mitigate the environmental impacts and climate change implications of population growth, it is necessary to plan for intensification of existing built-up areas. This allows for more efficient use of resources and infrastructure, more environmentally-friendly transportation options, and more complete communities. Intensification is a lower-impact alternative to allowing urban sprawl to encroach on rural and agricultural lands.</p> <p>The Adopted Official Plan includes a Growth Framework (Schedule B-1) and associated policies to direct that intensification only occurs in strategic areas (including Downtown Burlington) where infrastructure, resources, and the local environment can accommodate the growth.</p>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
G8	Nov 7, 2019	WeLoveBurlington Executive: Lynn Crosby Blair Smith Josie Wagstaffe Deborah Ruse Dave Myers (letter)	<p>However, we feel that neither of the two concepts were acceptable to us and neither adequately addressed the most significant and unique feature of Burlington’s downtown, the waterfront.</p> <p>We believe that the people need to be heard; that ‘tall building’ development in Burlington should not occur in the downtown core and particularly not in proximity to the waterfront. WLB is not opposed to development in the interests of intensification but believes that this form of development should occur in areas other than the downtown core.</p> <p>We believe that the waterfront is a unique and irreplaceable public asset; that those interests, both public and private, that “own” waterfront property do so in stewardship and as a ‘public trust’; that such waterfront stewards must ensure that the waterfront is managed in the public’s best interests, as defined and expressed by the public.</p> <p>We believe that the OP should reflect what people want to see for Burlington’s downtown core, not what is considered to be “defensible” to a more distant and removed approval authority. WLB fought against the prospects of municipal amalgamation in order to preserve and protect ‘local voice’. The OP, if based on either of the developed planning concepts, effectively silences ‘local voice’.</p> <p>Attached below is a set of principles which WeLoveBurlington endorses and which we believe must be considered with respect to all development of the downtown and waterfront.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burlington’s downtown belongs to all the citizens of Burlington and should be developed as a vibrant, inclusive place for people to live, work, shop and entertain themselves.</li> <li>• Burlington’s downtown is the cradle of its waterfront – a natural asset belonging to all citizens and deserving of</li> </ul>	<p>Preservation of Connections to the Waterfront;</p> <p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p> <p>Vision;</p> <p>Preserving and Encouraging Places to Work and Shop;</p> <p>Safer, More Useable and Inclusive Public Spaces;</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The two preliminary concepts for downtown that were developed in fall 2019 were created as a starting point for discussion about development options and the pros, cons, and trade-offs of various options.</p> <p>The recommended concept will both reflect public input and conform to applicable regional and provincial policies/legislative requirements.</p> <p>View to the Lake: Planning is concerned with the preservation of significant views from the public realm only.</p> <p>In preparing the recommended concept the evaluation matrix discusses the key opportunities and limitations to addressing the maintenance of public views of the Lake. Please refer to Appendix A to the <i>Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: Preliminary Preferred Concept</i> for more details.</p>	Concept Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>completely open access, and careful, responsible stewardship.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to Burlington’s waterfront includes visual and line-of-sight approaches. It must neither be blocked from public entry nor blocked from a reasonably unobstructed view. What is or is not “reasonable” is a determination that must be made carefully and by fairly considering all affected parties and interests.</li> <li>• The height of buildings that border Burlington’s waterfront and core downtown areas must be carefully regulated to allow open access and appropriate sight lines to the waterfront and green spaces. Again, the degree of regulation must reflect the fair and careful consideration of all affected interests.</li> <li>• Optimization of provincial intensification objectives should not be accomplished solely or primarily through the construction of ‘tall’ buildings in the City’s downtown core. Alternate approaches and locations must be considered and “optimization” should not be considered to be synonymous with “maximization”.</li> </ul> <p>Provincially mandated intensification targets should not be open-ended. Population objectives should be based on sound planning principles and a transparent, defensible algorithm that establishes firm thresholds for both minimum requirements and reasonable growth projections. Without context, the terms “maximize” or “optimize” are not only meaningless but afford a ‘de facto’ rationale for over-intensification and inappropriate development.</p>			
G9	Nov 7, 2019	Anonymous (story on Get Involved)	I fear when zoning is the priority, as it seems to be in your ‘Taking a Closer Look’, our downtown charm will be lost. I worked in Mississauga in the mid-80’s when their core was mostly fields. And while Hazel was a master planner and financially prudent business-	Maintaining the Character of the	Comment noted. Upper Canada Place (460 Brant Street and 505-507 Locust Street) predates	Concept Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
		Burlington website)	<p>first politician, the end result is a people-unfriendly place that doesn't even come close to the top 20 places to live in Canada. Now unfortunately, we in Burlington, seem to have that Mississauga mindset where we are focusing on future building structures rather than making it a people friendly place.</p> <p>One reason, I love to live here, is our many festivals. Sound of Music brings in 250,000 over a weekend of fun. And while several temporary music venues are slapped together on Brant street with dangerous wires running everywhere...and such shoddy stuff as plastic tables and chair are setup for dining in front of The Queen's Head, I think we can do a whole lot better.</p> <p>I suggest our twenty year plan is to construct a downtown that can handle 500,000 to a million people over a weekend of music, rib-fest, or other festivals. Make the venues more permanent and professional along Brant Street. The Cogeco stage at city hall is a start...a blueprint of what's doable. But could be so much more.</p> <p>As to businesses, encourage more Kelly Bake shops, Centro Garden, Starbucks as they are filled during the festivals. Setback the first few floors of building towers, so that sidewalks can be widened, to encourage restaurant patio seating along Brant. Make it a people friendly destination. Not a concrete jungle like Upper Canada Place...that may be Zoned correctly...but is the least people place on Brant. And is just bad for business.</p>	<p>Downtown/ Heritage Preservation ;</p> <p>Arts, Culture, Events, People &amp; Amenities;</p> <p>Safer, More Useable and Inclusive Public Spaces;</p> <p>Preserving and Encouraging Places to Work and Shop;</p> <p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p> <p>Walkability, Cycling, Transit</p>	<p>current policies, zoning regulations, and design guidelines. New development will conform to the current policies, regulations, and guidelines which are intended to ensure sustainable development and a people-friendly public realm.</p> <p>It is important to note that planning events and festivals, the development of permanent venues and the programming of public or private spaces is out of scope of this project.</p>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
G10	Nov 14, 2019	Jeremy Skinner (email)	<p>Concern with ensuring appropriate transitions from established low-rise neighbourhoods to taller buildings;</p> <p>Concern with loss of views to waterfront and the escarpment, parks, or surrounding neighbourhoods (from perspective of people living in tall buildings);</p> <p>i. Policies could be enacted to ensure a minimum amount of unobstructed horizontal field of vision (perhaps expressed as a composition of arcs totaling a minimum of number of degrees of unobstructed view such as a composition arcs to achieve a minimum of 90 degrees out of a total 180 degree view), and a minimum amount of vertical field of sky view such as from 45 degrees as measured from the vertical with a goal of achieving a minimum of 5 hours of sunlight as measured during the spring and fall equinox. To accomplish may require the city consider leasing or out-right sale the ownership of designated side streets deemed redundant to permit the consolidation of smaller properties on either side of such streets into a larger site with which to redevelop.</p> <p>Concern about ensuring adequate transit service and parking to allow those who live outside the downtown to continue to visit and enjoy it;</p> <p>Concern with achieving a complete community and ensuring access to amenities; in cases where certain public services/facilities cannot be located within the downtown, they must be connected/accessible by various modes of travel: walking, cycling, mobility scooters, public transit, personal vehicle, taxi;</p> <p>Important amenities include grocery store, restaurants, schools, community centres, etc.;</p>	<p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p> <p>Arts, Culture, Events, People &amp; Amenities;</p> <p>Walkability, Cycling, Transit;</p> <p>Preserving and Encouraging Places to Work and Shop;</p>	<p>Comments noted. Transitions have been considered in the development of the recommended concept; detailed policies will be developed to ensure appropriate transitions within and between precincts.</p> <p>Planning is concerned with the preservation of significant views from the public realm only.</p> <p>The Official Plan and Integrated Mobility Plan will both promote a variety of transportation options.</p>	<p>Concept; Policy</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
G11	Nov 14, 2019	Georgina Craig (email)	<p>I walk with my dog and drive all these streets, 3-4 times a day. There are entire sections I currently avoid because there is no grass for my dog and they are generally displeasing for me to walk along. (construction, traffic congestion, decrepit vacant buildings and lots awaiting development, etc.) As well, in the summer the concrete is so hot for my dog's feet and in winter the salt is very painful. We know the significant increase in population to the core area will add even more pedestrian and pet traffic than we see now. With all the new developments perhaps the city could look to make life for pets and pet owners more agreeable.</p> <p>Is it too late to look at the old concept of a "Boulevard" where one casually walks enjoying trees, flowers and grass? Where the sky is visible and a breeze can move around you – without breathing in car exhaust or feeling oppressive shadows and heat from the high rises. This would be my wish for the core of Burlington.</p>	<p>Green Space/Open Space/Parks;</p> <p>Walkability, Cycling, Transit;</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Downtown Streetscape Design Guidelines (recently approved in September 2019) identify designs for different types of streets in Downtown, with options for soft paving (grass, mulch, sod) in the furnishing zone of residential districts.</p>	Concept; Policy
G12	Nov 18, 2019	Burlington Seniors' Advisory Committee (BSAC) (letter)	<p>Preservation of natural areas and connection to the lake and waterfront is a priority. This is a prime feature of Burlington's beautiful natural resources available to all residents and visitors. Once it is gone with development it is gone forever.</p> <p>Address the need for truly affordable rental housing related to income criteria, based on the city's need for all-age 'missing middle' housing and in support of mixed/diversified communities.</p>	<p>Green Space/Open Space/Parks;</p> <p>Preservation of Connections to the Waterfront;</p> <p>Variety of Housing Options and Affordability</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	Concept; Policy
G13	Nov 19, 2019	Carriage Gate Homes (Mark Bales)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed options for the downtown are flawed and unrealistic</li> </ul>	<p>Vision;</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>A variety of housing types and built forms, in accordance</p>	Concept; Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
		(letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The promotion of predominantly mid-rise buildings will not facilitate affordable housing and is contrary to the Province’s Housing Action Plan</li> </ul>	Variety of Housing Options and Affordability	<p>with provincial policy and the community vision will be permitted and encouraged. This includes a mix of low-rise, mid-rise, and tall building forms.</p> <p>Policies related to a variety of housing options and affordability will be developed for the Downtown.</p>	
G14	Nov 19, 2019	Bob Osborne (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term storey is used throughout this and other planning documents. It would be easier to comprehend the scale of buildings if a measure in metres per storey was included. Waiting for a definition in a zoning by-law does not help us now.</li> <li>“Principle 15: Provide appropriate transition to low rise residential neighbourhoods”. Some of the measures are difficult to visualize. Detail, like the detail provided for “Ability to Respect Physical Character”, is required for all measures. The set of measures presented seems to be biased toward the built environment. Impact on use and enjoyment of property needs more attention – it could be added as a third criterion. Traffic, overshadowing, impact on privacy, etc. could be added as measures. The application of Principle 15 in the downtown is inconsistent. There are examples of low rise, mid-rise, and tall buildings abutting low-rise residential neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	Comments noted. Built form is guided by a combination of policies, zoning regulations, and design guidelines which collectively ensure appropriate transitions through a number of measures including height in storeys, height in metres, and height relative to site-specific context such as right-of-way width.	Concept; Policy
G15	Nov 20, 2019	Claudette Mancini (email)	<p>I don’t like either proposal, and would prefer a third.            Concern with ensuring housing for all income levels and age groups;            Concern with achieving a complete community where people can live and work and study;            Concern with ensuring adequate transit service;</p>	Variety of Housing Options and Affordability ;	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>While new parks or open spaces are not identified in the vision for the Apartment Neighbourhood area an</p>	Concept; Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>Concern with ensuring access to the downtown and waterfront for everyone – do not want visual or other barriers to the waterfront;                      Want to see park space on north side of North Shore Blvd E, west of Maple Ave, and/or more comfortable walking/scootering access from hospital and apartments to Spencer Smith Park;                      Desire for additional green space in west end of downtown to mitigate existing and future sounds and smells from QEW on west end of downtown;                      Concern with added traffic congestion (and noise/air quality impacts from traffic) from future development;</p>	<p>Arts, Culture, Events, People &amp; Amenities;                       Walkability, Cycling, Transit;                       Preservation of Connections to the Waterfront;                       Green Space/Open Space/Parks;                       Traffic Congestion</p>	<p>emphasis on the existing and future trails and green connections to existing parks are emphasized in the vision for the Downtown as a whole.</p>	
G16	Nov 25, 2019	Sustainable Development Committee (email)	<p>1. Principle 1 on page 38 of the SGL report is “Create additional parks, trails and open spaces”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Downtown is the living heart of any city and there seems to be little thought in the concepts to truly creating more green or open space. The green and open space that is recommended is fragmented and small. Rambo Creek</li> </ul>	<p>Green Space/Open Space/Parks;                       Safer, More Useable and Inclusive Public Spaces;</p>	<p>Comments noted. Both preliminary concepts and the recommended concept show enhancements to Rambo Creek in the Mid Brant Precinct. Rambo Creek south of the bike path has been identified as part of the Natural Heritage System.</p>	Concept Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>runs through the downtown area and no thought has been given in the concepts to supporting it back to health, to make it part of the green space and day light the buried sections, and allow it to do its function as a form of water retention and an environmental feature. There is one small line in the concepts that identifies a walking path adjacent to Rambo Creek in one precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Burlington to be a “great” City it needs to create a “great” space where people can congregate, where fauna can flourish – a place that all residents of Burlington can be proud of. While Spencer Park provides some of this, the downtown plan would be stronger with the creation of this space.</li> <li>• Each new development should include open/green space for residents.</li> <li>• There should be a target percentage of public green space in the downtown.</li> </ul> <p>2. Principle 2 on page 38 of the SGL report is “Provide opportunities to enhance the urban forest. No evaluation – informs policy.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SDC is in favour of incorporating significant landscaping with trees into <i>each</i> new development, even when it means reducing the footprint of the building. It is not sufficient to take “cash in lieu” as trees are needed downtown to reduce pollutants, reduce the urban heat island effect, provide shade and provide health and wellness benefits to downtown residents.</li> </ul>	<p>Design;</p> <p>Walkability, Cycling, Transit;</p> <p>Parking;</p> <p>Preserving and Encouraging Places to Shop and Work;</p> <p>Variety of Housing Options and Affordability ;</p>	<p>Daylighting of buried sections of the creek has not been recommended as the majority of the buried portion runs under streets and private properties that are not expected to redevelop.</p> <p>Underground parking is recommended as the preferred way to accommodate vehicle parking in an urban environment, rather than surface parking or above-ground structures. In the long term (beyond the current planning horizon) if parking is no longer needed then the need for those parking spaces can be re-evaluated through study and appropriate policy/zoning changes.</p> <p>Two key pedestrian priority streets (Brant Street and Lakeshore Road) have been identified. This means that policies will be developed to encourage pedestrian use of the space by making walking the easiest form of transportation. In addition,</p>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a default, a setback around all new developments should be designed for the replacement of removed vegetation and the planting of new trees.</li> <li>• Trees and other vegetation could also be added to amenity areas (e.g. tops of podiums and roofs). Note that greening shouldn't be exclusive to amenity areas as these are only accessible to residents and not the general public.</li> <li>• The SDC recommends adding criteria and measure(s) for the urban tree population.</li> </ul> <p>3. Principle 7 on page 39 of the SGL report is "Ensure availability of parking"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vision of the downtown core offering residential employment and retail services relies on the efficient movement of people in and out of the downtown core. Current retail and commercial opportunities in the downtown core suffer from a lack of parking. Recent development plans target residential parking spaces to one per unit. Commercial parking spaces in new developments are minimized. Active transport practices are insufficient to make retail services practical. As an alternative, an efficient public transportation system servicing the downtown core would allow residents to travel out of the downtown core without need for the automobile. More importantly such a system would allow movement of people from greater distances to travel into the downtown core for employment or retail</li> </ul>		<p>consistent with the policies of the adopted Official Plan the direction to consider Brant Street from Caroline to Pine as the preferred location for a <i>flex street</i> will be retained. For the definition of a flex street please refer to the <a href="#">definitions section of the adopted Official Plan</a>. Through policy development other modifications could also be considered.</p> <p>At the current time, the <a href="#">Downtown Streetscape Design Guidelines</a> (approved September 2019) contain provisions in section 3.3.4 for Flex/Shared Streets.</p> <p>Permanent closure of street segments to vehicle traffic to create pedestrian-only streets is not recommended at this time. Brant Street is recognized as an arterial street. Any future consideration of a permanent or seasonal closure of segments of Brant Street would require an Environmental Assessment including an operational</p>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>services. This efficient public transportation service is not currently provided to the downtown core. Easements and provisions for a more substantial transportation system should be considered in plans for the downtown core. In addition, until such transportation system becomes operational, medium term (i.e. 10-20 years) parking options should be considered (i.e. not underground parking).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking facilities constructed should have sufficient EV charging (or be EV ready).</li> <li>• There should be parking space for car share vehicles.</li> <li>• There should be space for ride share pick up and drop off (this needs to be considered with respect to the footprint of new buildings).</li> <li>• The City should consider making a portion of Brant St. as far south as the north side of Lakeshore Rd. pedestrian only.</li> <li>• There should be sufficient space for bicycle parking (short and long-term) outside of buildings.</li> </ul> <p>4. Principles 8 and 9 on pages 39 and 40 of the SGL report refer to enhancing retail and providing a range of employment opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SDC is strongly supportive of “complete neighbourhoods”. New residential buildings should have one or more floors of commercial space on street level.</li> </ul>		<p>review as well as a public engagement process to hear from the downtown business community, downtown residents, and the broader public about the pros, cons, and trade-offs of any such closure.</p> <p>“Review and Update the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines” is identified as a Key Action in Vision to Focus (2018-2022 Strategic Plan).</p>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>High quality commercial/office space is needed to create well paying jobs downtown so that people can walk or cycle to work.</p> <p>5. Principle 18 on page 42 of the SGL report is “Provide opportunities for a variety of housing options”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SDC is supportive of Halton Region’s Comprehensive Housing Strategy and with the housing objective 86(26) of the Halton Region Official Plan: “Seek development opportunities for Assisted and Affordable Housing in Intensification Areas where public transit, retail and other facilities are readily accessible.”</li> <li>• Residential buildings should include units built using principles of universal design to optimize accessibility and to promote aging in place.</li> <li>• The SDC would support an increase in height permissions if it would allow for more assisted, affordable and accessible housing downtown.</li> </ul> <p>6. Principle 19 on page 42 of the SGL report is “Land use vision provides for cohesive long-term plan”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria and measure(s) need to be added to make this principle a reality.</li> </ul> <p>7. Principle 22 on page 42 of the SGL report is “Encourage sustainable building design. No evaluation – informs basis for design guidelines.”</p>			

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is difficult for taller buildings to meet their own electrical load from solar. All new buildings should incorporate passive design elements and have a very efficient envelope. Construction using a lot of glass tends to have poorer energy performance. Clusters of buildings may be able to share a district heating system.</li> <li>Principle 22 should be strengthened to “Require sustainable building design.” Criteria and measures should be added to this principle.</li> <li>The Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines should be enhanced and made mandatory.</li> </ul>			
G17	Nov 27, 2019	Craig Brown (email)	<p>Supports priority being given to making downtown a walkable, safe place for pedestrians. Concern with ensuring a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment in downtown.</p>	Walkability, Cycling, Transit;	Comments noted.	Concept; Policy
G18	Nov 27, 2019	Gary Care, Sylvia Christie, Jim Shaw, Beth Shaw, Joe Donnell, Josh Lindsay, Don Wilson, Liz Wilson (letter)	<p>Desire for the “South Martha Pine St Corridor” (Martha Street between Elgin Promenade and Lakeshore Road excluding ADI Nautique site; Pine Street from Martha to Pearl) to be redesignated from Downtown East and Apartment Neighbourhoods to Neighbourhood Mixed Use Precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>South Martha Pine Street Corridor Description</b></li> <li>The South Martha Pine St corridor is unique, in that, it is a community that combines a blend of low residential homes mixed with both commercial and retail businesses (See attached map).</li> <li>The South Martha Pine Street Corridor has a constant flow of residents from the east and north east. They naturally travel down Martha St from the Elgin Promenade, New St. and north Martha St to access the Lakefront Spencer Smith</li> </ul>	<p>Maintaining the Character of the Downtown/ Heritage Preservation ;</p> <p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>A new precinct was developed to acknowledge the unique nature of this area. The new precinct acknowledges the variety of existing or approved built form in the area while providing transition to the generally low-rise built form along Martha Street.</p>	Concept; Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>Park area. These residents who either walk or cycle down Martha and then along Pine St and are expected to continue this pattern even after the completion of the Elgin St Promenade as people, desiring to reach their lakefront destination, are frustrated or intimidated by journeying into the traffic congested Brant St area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The South Martha Pine Street Corridor area currently includes a substantial 3 storey condo townhome complex containing residential living on the top two floors with commercial and retail at street level. This complex of approximately 32 condos and 32 businesses occupies upwards of 75% of an entire large city square block that begins slightly north of Lakeshore on the west side of Martha (adjacent to the ADI condo project) north to Pine, and continuing along Pine to Pearl St and extending south down Pearl close to Lakeshore.</li> <li>• As you proceed down the tree lined Pine St from Martha, across from previously mentioned mixed use townhomes and commercial/retail businesses on the south side, you pass a property on the north side (2085 Pine) approved two years ago for 5 storey condos, which includes as part of the development, the permanent retention of the Historic Heritage Home <i>Nelson Ogg-Jabez Clark House</i> built in 1847.</li> <li>• Just beyond the <i>Nelson Ogg-Jabez Clark House</i> you then pass by a single storey community centre that is a hub for community events. This is owned by the adjacent and very beautiful <i>Ukrainian Church</i> located at Pine and Pearl directly across the road from Village Square.</li> <li>• At the Martha and Pine Street corner (across from the above-mentioned condo complex) and running north on the west side of Martha are 3-storey townhomes. Proceeding North and beyond the townhomes, is a low-rise hydro building including parking and then a parking lot abutting the Elgin St Promenade. Then there are a number</li> </ul>			

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>of single detached homes across the road on the east side of Martha St just south of the Elgin St Promenade with Rambo Creek at the rear and which is located on the furthest eastern edge of the Downtown Urban Growth Centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also included in this area is a 12 storey apartment building housing primarily senior tenants. This particular structure, located on Martha south of Pine, while not in keeping with the general character of the area, does not seem intrusive due to its significant setback from the street and distance to the adjacent home to the north. Just south of this apartment building is a 5 storey Seniors residence at Martha and Lakeshore.</li> <li>• In summary, the majority of South Martha Pine Street Corridor is a Neighbourhood Mixed Use Precinct. Thus, maintaining the existing low-rise house form character along the edge of the Downtown Urban Growth Centre. This area provides a transition to the Low-Rise Neighbourhood Precincts to the west by maintaining the existing low-rise built form. It is an area of transition that lies between the potential highrise areas to the north along James St and south along Lakeshore.</li> <li>• The South Martha Pine Street Corridor with its village like feel is a natural extension to the Village Square and the corridor through City streets to the restaurants, Lakeshore and Brant, and Spencer Smith Park locations.</li> <li>• As stated in the Official Plan "compatibility is achieved with the existing neighbourhood character in terms of scale, massing, height, siting, setbacks, coverage, parking and amenity area so that a transition between existing and proposed buildings is provided."</li> </ul>			

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
G19	Dec 2, 2019	Cycling Advisory Committee (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on DT only – ignores interrelationship between DT and other parts of the city. Needs to be complementary to whole city OP. Consider relationship with Prosperity Corridor employment areas and Mobility Hubs, especially as pertains to transportation. It is our recommendation that Active Transportation and Transit be the prioritized modes of connection between these areas and Downtown Burlington in order to support the mode split goals of Vision to Focus. Corridors should be identified and prioritized in the Official Plan.</li> <li>Principles: Many of these principles preclude or impact other principles (e.g. Principle #5 - enhancing pedestrian priority areas may increase traffic congestion which Principle #6 seeks to reduce. If possible, clearly establish how principles are to be weighted in decision-making for the Official Plan.</li> <li>Principles do not speak to degree and can be broadly interpreted. For example, Principle #7: "Ensure availability of parking" It is not clear whether the goal is to increase the amount of parking provided, or if less parking than present will be acceptable in future as transportation modes shift? In a limited geographic area, increasing the amount of space dedicated to parking, particularly on-street parking as exists on Brant Street reduces the City's ability to encourage walkability/cycling and provide a more vibrant streetscape for businesses.</li> <li>Principle #4: Create spaces for year-round activities and festivals. Civic Square, Spencer Smith Park, Central Park and Village Square are existing facilities that are well-utilized for these activities. Can we be more specific about what additional spaces / activities we want to add Downtown and whether or not the existing spaces are sufficient to serve these needs?</li> </ul>	Walkability, Cycling, Transit; Vision; Safer, More Useable, and Inclusive Public Spaces; Parking; Preserving and Encouraging Places to Shop and Work;	<p>Comments Noted. Downtown has been studied in the context of the Adopted Official Plan. Cycling routes are identified in Schedule P of the Adopted Official Plan. The Cycling Master Plan and Integrated Mobility Plan will build on and advance the transportation objectives of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Additional parks/open spaces will be needed to accommodate future growth. New parks have been identified in Upper Brant and Mid Brant Precincts; an enhanced public space is identified in Brant Main Street Precinct.</p> <p>The park at Maria and Pearl Street is identified in the preliminary concepts and recommended concept as an existing park on land that is currently privately owned.</p> <p>Existing buildings have been considered as part of the existing context of the Downtown, which informs the appropriate future built form</p>	Concept; Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "New" park at Maria/Pearl? This appears to be the location of the existing Lions Club Park.</li> <li>• An official plan where the buildings that are currently there or approved would not be able to meet the requirements under the new plan will be very difficult to defend at the Province/LPAT. Recommend planning for the unexpected – for example if ADI or Carriage Gate do not get built, ensure that any potential successor is able to comply with the plan and does not get carte blanche to ignore it.</li> <li>• Evaluation criteria needs work. For example, evaluation criteria for Principle 6: Provide a road network that allows for efficient and safe travel through Downtown Burlington: the measured capacity of the roads and intersections. This measure ignores the aspect of safety and only focuses on throughput. Vision Zero (included in the City's Vision to Focus statement of priorities) mandates that safety be the primary consideration when it comes to network design. Given that the purpose of a downtown is not to facilitate cars moving through, but to meet the needs of people who live, play, shop and work downtown, this measure is not relevant.</li> <li>• Evaluation criteria for urban forest – consider utilizing inventory of street trees and forest covered area as criteria.</li> <li>• No evaluation criteria for parking – we believe that parking space utilization and demand can and should be measured with the technologies in place to monitor and administer access to city-owned parking spaces.</li> <li>• Evaluation criteria for retail space should also include occupancy of those spaces. Very often in newly built mixed use areas, retail space carries considerable premium relative to other nearby destinations and attracting suitable retailers can be challenging, especially in the short run.</li> </ul>		<p>in the vicinity of those existing buildings. Where necessary, nuanced permissions will be established in policy. However, it is out of scope of this project to revoke previous development approvals.</p> <p>The recommended concept will promote a variety of transportation options to reduce reliance on the private automobile, including promotion of a safer and more comfortable environment for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users.</p> <p>Evaluation Criteria in the October 2019 SGL report “Themes, Principles, and Land Use Concepts” are identified for the purpose of evaluating Concept 1 relative to Concept 2. Some principles, such as Principle 7 “Ensure availability of parking”, are not evaluated as both Concepts can equally achieve the principle. These Principles will be applied at the policy development stage after a single concept has been endorsed by Council.</p>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
G20	Dec 2, 2019	Diana and Paul Marchand (email)	<p>We attended a meeting workshop which displayed two concepts for the downtown core both of which showed complete disregard for what I believe local residents desire. "No more high-rises period." We believe it is time to take a step back and consider what we really want for our downtown core. We would respectfully suggest that what we would like to see is a plan where a maximum of 6 stories would be envisaged for downtown areas and these would be subject to appropriate infrastructure considerations and ensuring historical properties are protected. i.e restore class B and Class C properties to being fully protected and not just class A. I fully understand there are 4 high-rises that are fully approved for development and will proceed. However when these are completed together with the major waterfront project close to completion on the Lakeshore I am convinced that our existing infrastructure (naming just two issues) will not be able to handle the increased traffic flow/parking and an increased population of children (both the Protestant and Catholic school Boards are suggesting relative to the new tower being built on Brant with notices posted on the safety fences that children ultimately living in the new tower will not be guaranteed spaces in area schools).</p> <p>We keep hearing that a max 6 story guideline going forward cannot be accomplished because of current provincial guidelines but I believe other municipalities have done so. Keep high rise development near real transportation hubs (not the "bus shelter" downtown). Burlington is blessed with three major rail stations all of which could have substantive development to achieve density goals. Our real vision should not be either of the two concepts but one which truly limits further high rise growth. How we get to that vision should be the plan that we should be developing. It is not an issue of citizens fighting City Hall but one of City Hall fighting the Province to get what the citizens of Burlington really want and deserve.</p>	<p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p> <p>Maintaining the Character of the Downtown/ Heritage Preservation ;</p> <p>Traffic Congestion;</p> <p>Parking;</p> <p>Arts, Culture, Events, People &amp; Amenities;</p> <p>Vision;</p>	<p>Comments noted. See row O7 in "Out of Scope" section below for response to comment on protection of specific heritage properties.</p> <p>The Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown project is informed by technical studies including an Area Servicing Report and transportation analysis to ensure planned growth is within capacity of existing and planned infrastructure and transportation network.</p> <p>School Board disclaimers on new development sites warning purchasers that students may not be accommodated at the nearest school are standard notices for new developments and do not necessarily reflect the capacity of a specific school at a specific time.</p> <p>The Adopted Official Plan contains a Growth Framework (Schedule B-1) and associated policies which identify priority intensification areas including the three GO station areas as</p>	Concept Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
					<p>well as the Downtown and Uptown.</p> <p>Appropriate built form (tall buildings, mid-rise, low-rise, etc) is determined with consideration for the existing context of the specific area; the recommended built form for Downtown will respond to existing context in Downtown and will differ from other intensification areas.</p>	
G21	Dec. 5, 2019	Serge Langevin (spoken delegation)	<p>Concern with number of storeys being used as the metric to limit building height due to the variability in the height of a storey; feels that a linear height measured in metres is a more appropriate metric for controlling building height.</p> <p>Recommends that downtown should conform as required to the minimum target density of 200 people and jobs per hectare outlined in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe but should also have a maximum density of 300 people and jobs per hectare.</p>	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	<p>See row G14 above for response to comment on different metrics for building height.</p> <p>The Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe identify minimum density targets for Urban Growth Centres, but not maximums. Provincial policy encourages municipalities to go beyond these minimum targets, where appropriate, except where doing so would conflict with any policy of the Growth Plan, the PPS or any other provincial plan.</p>	Concept Policy

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
G22	Dec. 5, 2019	Gary Scobie (spoken delegation)	Downtown should be kept at a human scale with two storeys in certain areas and individual character/facades.	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions; Maintaining the Character of the Downtown/ Heritage Preservation ;	Comment noted. Public feedback and existing built form have informed the identification of distinct areas within the downtown so that contextually appropriate built form can be planned for each area.	Concept Policy
G23	Dec 5, 2019	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate Homes (spoken delegation)	Considers the approval of Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) 38 to have been a confirmation that Downtown Burlington has adequate infrastructure to support a density of 200 people and jobs per hectare.	Vision;	Comment noted.	n/a
G24	Dec. 5, 2019	David Barker (spoken delegation)	Agrees with walkability and accessibility being included in vision for downtown. Finds that currently the Lakeshore Precinct is not sufficiently pedestrian-oriented. Not preoccupied with Built Form; rather, concerned with focusing on accommodating traffic, parking, transit, and other infrastructure as downtown grows. Recommends closing portions of Brant Street and Lakeshore Road to vehicles and making them pedestrian-only, with low-cost transit to off-site parking in satellite locations outside downtown. Feels this would connect the downtown to the waterfront in a walkable way.	Walkability, Cycling, Transit; Traffic Congestion; Parking; Preservation of Connections to the Waterfront;	Comments noted. See G16 above for response to comment about pedestrian-only street segments.	Concept Policy
G25	Dec. 5, 2019	Bryne Emeneau (spoken delegation)	Concerned with safety of developing in proximity to Trans-Northern pipeline	Vision	Comment noted. All pipelines are required to comply with National Energy Board emergency management legislation and	n/a

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
					<p>have audits conducted annually. The City of Burlington Fire Department is involved in NEB audits. TransNorthern is mandated to provide information on their emergency response plan including their response mechanisms to most likely emergency scenarios on their website <a href="https://tnpi.ca/">https://tnpi.ca/</a>. Public safety is a top concern in Planning for the future of Burlington; pipeline safety requirements will be adhered to in all development approvals.</p>	

**BRANT MAIN STREET PRECINCT**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/Company/Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
B1	Nov 28, 2019	Don and Liz Wilson (email)	<p><b>BRANT MAIN STREET PRECINCT</b></p> <p>The initial response to this area is to maintain the “Small Town Downtown” core area setting that fronts Brant Street. Then vary the heights back to John Street and Locust. These heights could vary between 4-6 Storeys along with very limited number of 11 Storeys. Dependent on location and relationship to surrounding built structure.</p> <p>Focus on establishing a lower profile corridor from John Street between the building heights along Lakeshore and James Streets would provide a nice walkable and living area. and would include the Elgin Street promenade and Village Square and the low-rise areas to the East. This would provide an area for all Burlington residence to continue enjoying the Downtown Core area.</p>	Built Form, Heights, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	Comment noted. John Street is a transition from Brant Main Street Precinct to Downtown East Precinct and the recommended concept will include provisions for an appropriate built form on John Street.	Concept

LAKESHORE MIXED-USE PRECINCT						
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
L1	Oct 28, 2019	David Billings (email)	-The site where the old Odeon Theatre [2007-2011 Lakeshore Road, in block at North-east corner of Brant and Lakeshore, currently location of Lakeshore Coffee House] used to be at the base of Brant Street would seem to require substantial underground parking to be viable.	Parking	Comment noted.	n/a
L2	Nov 28, 2019	Don and Liz Wilson (email)	<p><b>LAKESHORE MIXED USE PRECINCT</b></p> <p>The lower profile (7-11) with sufficient upper level step backs would be beneficial to maintain an openness along Lakeshore especially this area with its proximity to Spencer Smith Park and the number of cultural events in the area that attract Burlington residents and visitors from outside the area.</p> <p><b>Lakeshore Road</b></p> <p>The only consideration in this area is the proposal at the corner of Lakeshore and Pearl Street (29 Storeys) which would be too much but something of mixed heights would create a more workable prospect for that corner development. The Adopted Official plan had an upward limit of 18 storeys.</p>	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The development application for the north-east corner of Lakeshore Road and Pearl Street will be reviewed against the policies that are in effect at the time of review.</p>	Concept
L3	Dec 4, 2019	Ed Fothergill on behalf of Molinaro Group (letter)	<p>The two options for the Lakeshore District significantly reduce development density on the Molinaro properties and other properties in the downtown area beyond the limits established in both the approved and adopted Official Plans. This new change in direction is not consistent with the intent of the Provincial Growth Plan which is designed to focus new development in Transit Station Areas and in the downtown core. One of the implications of the proper implementation of the Growth Plan is that tall buildings are anticipated in the downtown. This principle applies to other precincts within the downtown area as well.</p> <p>The evolution of development in downtown Burlington over the past decade has proceeded in a direction which is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and the 2017 Growth Plan and includes a recent emergence of high rise buildings and approvals of new tall buildings yet to be</p>	<p>Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;</p> <p>Variety of Housing Options and Affordability;</p> <p>Preserving and Encouraging Places to Shop and Work;</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The recommended concept will comply with provincial and regional policies which identify Downtown Burlington as a strategic growth area (Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Area) and Mobility Hub.</p> <p>These policies do not specifically require local municipalities to permit the construction of tall buildings</p>	Concept Policy

LAKESHORE MIXED-USE PRECINCT

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>constructed. While understandably generating some reservations for those who would prefer to maintain the small character of the downtown, this direction is a natural, logical and inevitable outcome of the implementation of Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan policies.</p> <p>The report appears to suggest that there may be options to retain the small town character of the downtown area in revised official plan policies. For example, Principle 12 is to enhance and retain the “small town” identity of the Brant Main Street Precinct. This is an unrealistic expectation which is contrary to the intent of the provisions of the Growth Plan, the Regional Official Plan, and both the approved and adopted Official Plans for the City of Burlington. As an Urban Growth Centre, as defined in the Growth Plan, it is simply not possible to design a plan that will maintain the small town character of the downtown which already changed and will need to continue to evolve in this direction to achieve intensification targets.</p> <p>Similarly, the suggestion that tall buildings on Lakeshore Road be limited is not supported by existing public planning policy. The Growth Plan encourages most intensification to occur in Major Transit Station Areas and Urban Growth Centres which include the downtown area, which itself includes a Major Transit Station. The plan sets minimum density targets of 160 residents and jobs per hectare in areas that are served by light rail transit or bus transit while Urban Growth Centres, such as downtown Burlington, must be planned to achieve by 2031 a minimum density target of 200 residents and jobs combined per hectare. The Provincial direction is to ensure that these objectives are met and that the focus of urban intensification should be in the downtown core. Any policy directive which would significantly limit development potential beyond existing planning policies that were established in the approved and adopted Official Plans cannot be supported.</p>		<p>throughout the strategic growth area.</p> <p>The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe requires the conservation of cultural heritage resources “to foster a sense of place and benefit communities, particularly in strategic growth areas” (4.2.7). Conserving the existing “small town” feel of Downtown Burlington, as identified by public feedback, will be an objective of the Official Plan within the parameters of provincial and regional policy.</p> <p>Technical Studies informing the development of the recommended concept and subsequent policy development include a Market Analysis, Illustrative Economic Analysis, (the above studies are available on Get Involved Burlington) and a future Fiscal Impact Analysis.</p>	

LAKESHORE MIXED-USE PRECINCT						
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>Further, the limitation or prohibition of tall buildings in the downtown area would be inconsistent with the development pattern that has emerged over the past decade. This development pattern will continue with new projects which have already received approval but have not yet been constructed. The direction proposed by the SGL report would lead to an inconsistent development pattern of building heights within the downtown and has the potential to significantly increase issues of compatibility between individual sites.</p> <p>While the report suggests that podium buildings may be able to be set back 20 metres from the street, this depth is not appropriate for many of the sites in the downtown and will not allow an appropriate built form of tall buildings to be constructed.</p> <p>The report does not speak to the trade off between number of competing factors that must be considered in establishing a balanced form of development in an Urban Growth Centre. For example, the limitations in size and scale proposed in the plan have not been assessed in terms of housing affordability or feasibility of maintaining a strong retail presence in the downtown area. In order to be successful, commercial market rates have to be competitive and sustainable. It is unclear as to the extent to which the market analysis that was completed by the City has investigated these matters.</p>			
L4	Dec 5, 2019	Don Fletcher, Plan B (spoken delegation)	<p>Concern with North-east corner of Brant St and Lakeshore Rd being in Lakeshore Mixed Use Precinct – feels it should be in Brant Main St Precinct. This property is more impactful for Brant Street. Brant Street stops at Lakeshore Rd; Lakeshore Rd doesn't stop at Brant St. Prefers mid-rise height rather than tall buildings.</p> <p>Concern with gas station property (NW corner of Locust and Lakeshore) being in the Lakeshore Mixed Use Precinct; feels it should be in Apartment Neighbourhood Precinct.</p>	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The north east corner of Brant and Lakeshore has been proposed to be included in the Brant Main Street Precinct. For further details please refer to Appendix A to staff report PL-02-20: <i>Taking</i></p>	Concept

LAKESHORE MIXED-USE PRECINCT

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
					<p><i>a Closer Look at the Downtown: Preliminary Preferred Concept.</i></p> <p>Specific direction on height and built form have been developed for the site at the northwest corner of Locust Street and Lakeshore Road. For further details please refer to Appendix A to staff report PL-02-20: <i>Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: Preliminary Preferred Concept.</i></p>	

MID-BRANT MIXED-USE PRECINCT						
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
M1	Oct 28, 2019	David Billings (email)	Underground parking at No Frills seems like a novel idea if it is commercially viable.	Parking	Comment noted.	n/a
M2	Nov 25, 2019	Sustainable Development Committee (email)	The SDC supports the development of a park adjacent to Rambo Creek in the redevelopment of the Mid Brant precinct.	Green Space/Open Space/Parks	Comment noted.	Concept
M3	Nov 28, 2019	Don and Liz Wilson (email)	<b>MID BRANT DISTRICT PRECINCT</b> The two concepts for this area using the 3D model create a substantial block of buildings along the East Side of Brant Street. However, the lower profile of 3 storeys abutting Brant Street would create an extension from lower Brant Street providing a more open experience for walking and cycling. Limited height above 12 storeys dependent on built structure like step backs etc.	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	Comment noted.	Concept
M4	Dec 4, 2019	Martin Quarcoopome, Weston Consulting (letter)	Weston and Victoria Brant Ltd have reviewed SGL's October 2019 report and the corresponding concept. While we generally support the direction and visions illustrated, it is our position that the subject property provides the City a unique opportunity that isn't found in the Downtown and can yield more than what is illustrated. The Brant Plaza land is the largest congruent property and holds the Downtown's only food store. It is our opinion that given the size of the lands, it can be redeveloped with mid and high-rise mixed use buildings that will incorporate new residential dwellings in addition to new retail space. It is our intention to preserve the existing grocery store long term to serve the needs to the Downtown. We agree with the proposed John Street extension and linear Rambo Creek park as these elements are important to creating complete communities as the Downtown grows. However, there is concern with some of the massing elements proposed with each Concept. Concept 1 is preferred as it allows the potential for tall buildings along the centre of the site, however it limits heights on the peripheral to 3 storeys. We agree that a pedestrian-friendly environment must be maintained along Brant Street, however these podiums can transition from the City's proposed three-storey maximum to potentially 6 storeys as illustrated in the City's tall building guidelines. Further, it is our opinion that there is no need to limit heights along Rambo Creek. Future redevelopment will be required to respect standard design	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;  Preserving and Encouraging Places to Shop and Work;  Green Space/Open Space/Parks;  Walkability, Cycling, Transit;	Comments noted.	Concept; Policy

**MID-BRANT MIXED-USE PRECINCT**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>principles such as angular planes and appropriate terracing. In the case of the Brant Plaza lands, there is also a significant tree line along the Creek to screen and buffer new development from the adjacent stable neighbourhood to the east. Concept 2 is not the preferred design as it limits the subject property's potential unnecessarily. While it does accommodate taller heights along Brant Street compared to Concept 1, it restricts height internally to 11 storeys. As noted above, the subject property is one of the largest individual landholdings in the Downtown; any attempts to realize Concept 2 will require some form of land assembly which may never be achieved.</p> <p>In an attempt to assist the City with refining their concepts, Weston and Victoria Brant Ltd have prepared a high-level concept plan for the Brant Plaza lands. Brant Plaza's concept is a variation of the City's concept 1. It includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A 12m+ linear park along the Rambo Creek. The SGL report identifies this area for an increased buffer, however it is our opinion that there is an opportunity to use this space for a pedestrian trail that could connect to a future park at John Street. This will also provide increased additional separation from the residential homes east of Rambo Creek.</li> <li>2. An extension of John Street to Victoria Street is proposed mid-block. This extension is proposed as a private road that will be open to the public. A vehicular connection to Brant Street is also proposed to ensure adequate circulation throughout the site. These connections, including Brant and Victoria Streets, will adhere to the emerging draft Downtown Streetscape Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Preservation of existing food store (No Frills) which could be relocated to Brant Street as part of the second phase to enhance visibility and pedestrian access. The relocation will accommodate the existing GFA of the grocery store.</li> <li>4. The majority of existing retail GFA will be preserved and redistributed through the podiums of the various phases. There is also the potential of public parking within the underground garage which is not currently found in the north area of the Downtown to serve local residents.</li> <li>5. Two 19 storey towers along Brant Street which focus the majority of the site's massing away from the stable residential east of the site. Two 11</li> </ol>	Design;		

**MID-BRANT MIXED-USE PRECINCT**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>storey mid-rises are proposed at the rear of the site that would meet a 45-degree angular plane from rear property line.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proceed with a modified version of Concept 1;</li> <li>• Allow for proper transitioning along Brant Street and not limit building podiums to 3 storeys within the first 20m;</li> <li>• Replace height maximums on east side of property with Mid-Rise 7 to 11 storey permissions as long as angular plane standard is maintained.</li> </ul> <p>While Weston and Victoria Brant Ltd generally support Concept 1, we believe the subject lands are unique and require site-specific design standards to realize not only the landowner's objectives but those of the immediate community.</p>			

DOWNTOWN EAST MIXED-USE PRECINCT						
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
E1	Nov 28, 2019	Don and Liz Wilson (email)	<p><b>DOWNTOWN EAST PRECINCT</b></p> <p><b>James Street from Martha to John Street</b></p> <p>The initial insight for this transition area in the concept models is intense development and the 3D model showing some heights in excess of 12 Storeys. This entrance corridor should be limited to both represent the built structure to the East and the entrance to the Downtown area. Similar to adopted Official Plan.</p> <p>In particular its location in relation to Lions Club building and the adjacent park.</p> <p>Plus, a 4-6 storey rental apartment unit exist at the corner of James and Pearl now and nothing in excess of 6 storeys exist south side of James Street to Brant Street.</p> <p><b>Martha Street Corridor south of Elgin Promenade along Pine Street to Pearl Street</b></p> <p>The majority of South Martha Pine Street Corridor is a Neighbourhood Mixed Use Precinct. Thus, maintaining the existing low-rise house form character along the edge of the Downtown Urban Growth Centre. This area provides a transition to the Low-Rise Neighbourhood Precincts to the west by maintaining the existing low-rise built form. It is an area of transition that lies between the potential Highrise areas to the north along James St and south along Lakeshore.</p> <p>The South Martha Pine Street Corridor with its village like feel is a natural extension to the Village Square and the corridor through City streets to the restaurants, Lakeshore and Brant, and Spencer Smith Park locations.</p> <p>As stated in the Official Plan "Compatibility is achieved with the existing neighborhood character in terms of scale, massing, height, siting, setbacks, coverage, parking and amenity area so that a transition between existing and proposed buildings is provided."</p> <p><b>John Street and Elizabeth St. Corridor - Caroline St. to James Street</b></p> <p>The 2 concepts give the impression of a continuation of the 18 Storey Berkley Building down John Street and Elizabeth St. The Berkley Building is a curb to curb development on small residential style streets that is over bearing in relation to sidewalks, streetscapes and surrounding built structures. (Balconies create the feeling they hang over the property lines)</p>	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>For all development in the Downtown East designation a requirement to develop 2 storeys of office will be established. For more details please refer to Appendix A to staff report PL-02-20: <i>Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: Preliminary Preferred Concept.</i></p> <p>For Martha Street Corridor a new precinct has been proposed. Please see comment G18.</p>	Concept; Policy

**DOWNTOWN EAST MIXED-USE PRECINCT**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Theme	Staff Response	Comment informs
			<p>.So to continue down this corridor with the same concept would be a detriment to the visual and street level experience on John and Elizabeth Street. Modifications to street setbacks and built form of future developments on the tract of lands would alleviate the development of a column of similar buildings</p> <p><b>Corner James and Pearl Street</b></p> <p>The corner reflects structures above 12 storeys North and South. This would be out of character with the two 4-6 condo structures in the area south of James Street that will exist long into the future.</p> <p>The North Side of James Street contains a number of townhouse structures so again the height and built form will be imperative to maintain a livable and vibrant mixed-use area.</p>			

**UPPER BRANT MIXED-USE PRECINCT**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
U1	Nov 19, 2019	Bob Osborne (letter)	<p>Upper Brant Precinct: we object to the inclusion of the west side of Brant from Central School to Olga in the Upper Brant Precinct with permission for tall buildings. Depending on profile and orientation, a tall building on this site could have a significant effect on the neighbourhoods to the east and west of Brant Street. To the west tall buildings would be a few metres from the back yards of homes on Alfred Crescent. In our case to the east, there could be a significant shadow impact. A 17 storey building could block sunlight in our area from sometime in October until March.</p> <p>Location of tall buildings in this area seems to be counter to Principle 14 "Maintain low to medium built form on Brant Street" and fails to satisfy Principle 15 "Provide appropriate transition to low rise neighbourhoods".</p>	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions	Comments noted. A Wind and Shadow Study is currently underway that will help assess how new developments in the City impact wind, sun, and shadows.	Concept
U2	Nov 25, 2019	Sustainable Development Committee (email)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SDC also supports a park/city square in the Upper Brant precinct development. However, it is recommended that this park not be built at the Brant-Ghent Street intersection. Centering this facility on Brant Street would further congest the only north-south access into the downtown core. Development of a city park/square on Grahams Lane would be a better option.</li> </ul>		Comments noted. Exact location and design of new parks will not be determined in the scope of the current project.	Concept Policy

**NEIGHBOURHOOD MIXED-USE PRECINCT**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
N1	Nov 19, 2019	Bob Osborne (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood Mixed Use Precinct: we fully support the inclusion of [east side of Brant between Blairholm and a point near Ghent Ave] in the Neighbourhood Mixed Use Precinct in the Official Plan. This designation maintains the current house form buildings and limits any development to three stories.</li> </ul>	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions;	Comment noted.	Concept

**APARTMENT NEIGHBOURHOOD PRECINCTS**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/Company/Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Comment informs</b>
A1	Nov 26, 2019	Marnie Hamilton (email)	I am opposed to building apartments around intersection of Burlington Ave and Lakeshore Rd (concern with appropriate transition to low-rise neighbourhood to the north, and preserving connection to the waterfront)	Built Form, Height, and Neighbourhood Transitions; Preserving Connections to the Waterfront	Comment noted.	Concept

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
P1	Oct 24, 2019	Ron Porter (email)	<p>3) 3 D Visualizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Your Workshop Booklet 3 D Visualizations were good. Most people are “ Visual “ and these 3 D Visualizations of what Concept 1 &amp; 2 would look like made it easy for the viewer to get a real feel for what the final built out outcome would look like.</li> </ul> <p>SUGGESTION TO TAKE YOUR 3D PRESENTATIONS TO THE NEXT LEVEL :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I was at the Molinaro Illuminata Building Launch presentation at their Preview Sales Office Site beside Walmart on Fairview.</li> <li>- They have a Television 3D touchscreen model of their Illuminata Building on Brock St that you can rotate and turn with your fingers and look out South over Spencer Smith Park, the Arts Centre to the Lake, East over Lakeshore &amp; Downtown, West to the Skyway &amp; Bay and North to the escarpment.</li> <li>- It’s very impressive and gives the viewer a very, very clear Visualization of the final build out end state of the building and what their units views would be.</li> <li>- I’m not sure who developed the software, but I’m sure the Molinaro’s would be happy to provide this information.</li> <li>- A simplified version of this 3D Touchscreen Television Visual tool would be very, very beneficial to the Planning Dept, Mayor &amp; City Council and Citizens providing input.</li> <li>- From a cost and financial statement perspective as we’re looking at a Downtown Development timeframe of probably 15 years a strong case could be made for amortizing the development costs for this 3D tool over a 15 year timeframe. This 15 year timeframe &amp; cost amortization should make the costs supportable.</li> <li>- I strongly suggest you and your colleagues go over to the Illuminata Sales Office on Fairview St and have a look at the 3D touchscreen television sales tool to get a first hand feel. I’m sure you’ll find it very interesting.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>3-D modeling is a new tool being used by the City in Planning projects. Staff will seek to continuously improve the application of this technology for illustrative and public engagement purposes.</p>
P2	Oct 28, 2019	David Billings (email)	<p>The tour Saturday afternoon was very interesting. One thing it really highlighted was our need for publication of both Burlington’s plans and the urban planning process in general. Most people get their information from</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Walking Tour provided an opportunity for face-to-face, on-site discussion that was beneficial</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			the established media which is generally obsessed with visually appealing topics. It generally ignores crucial issues such as urban planning procedures as well as the pivotal role cities like Burlington play in the phenomena of globalization. Tours and events such as yours fill the gap.	for both staff and members of the public who attended.
P3	Nov 2, 2019	Ken Rutter (email)	This survey did not give enough characters to answer some of the questions	Comment noted.  In response to public feedback, the survey was updated with an additional field for open-text comments to allow participants to elaborate on their answers to earlier questions.
P4	Nov 7, 2019	WeLove Burlington Executive: Lynn Crosby Blair Smith Josie Wagstaffe Deborah Ruse Dave Myers (letter)	<p>We attended the Action Lab at Mountainside Arena on Saturday, November 2. We attempted to do the online survey to provide our comments, but do not feel the format gives a clear way to get them across. Therefore, please accept the following as our comments and please include them with all of the other feedback you have received from the public when you are considering what to present to council regarding the plan for the downtown.</p> <p>First, we would like to say that we felt the planning staff did an excellent job at the Action Lab and were respectful of citizens and personable and knowledgeable.</p> <p>The two concepts (and the mention of a possible third melded concept) presented were based on the existence of the same three factors or planning constraints: the urban growth centre, the mobility hub and the major transit gateway. No consideration was given to any concept that was not predicated and framed by these constraints; if these constraints change, then the concepts need to change. Indeed, if Burlington is successful in removing the classification of the urban growth centre or moving the location of the mobility hub further north, then most of the principles underlying the two concepts become irrelevant. It was confirmed at the November 5 council meeting that in fact Council is working on these items and must await the conclusion of the ICBL.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Action Lab and survey participants were not asked to select their preferred concept. Rather, participants were asked to comment on what they liked and disliked about each concept.</p> <p>The Action Labs and survey did include some questions asking participants to assign a score quantifying their satisfaction with that concept and how well they felt each concept achieved the land use vision; however, these responses were considered alongside the participants' more detailed comments.</p> <p>The recommended concept is a new concept that has been developed with consideration to relevant public feedback provided through various engagement techniques as well as a number of key inputs.</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>Participants were told that the two concepts presented were developed because they were defensible; in other words, they would satisfy the requirements of the Region as sole approval authority. Participants were told that any concept that involved 'no more tall buildings' was not defensible and thus could not be included. Accordingly, when choosing a concept, participants selected the concept that was least offensive rather than that which actually reflected what they wanted to see.</p> <p>Most participants (straw poll and certainly not scientific) felt that neither concept was what was desired for downtown, particularly in those precincts adjacent to the waterfront. Many felt that they were voting for the one that was 'the best of a bad lot' rather than one that actually reflected what they wanted. This means any results from the polls and selections made by attendees are skewed.</p> <p>Many participants voiced an identical concern/comment to the planning staff – that they had not been heard; that they have been voicing the same concern since October 22<sup>nd</sup> of last year (and before) and they still were not being heeded.</p>	
P5	Nov 14, 2019	Jeremy Skinner (email)	<p>Need to move discussion away from NIMBYism; to do that we need to understand the varying perspectives of different residents;</p> <p>i. City policies should already exist with regards to transitions to bordering stable residential neighbourhoods. However, it is not common knowledge as to how or when these transition guidelines are either applied or enforced (such as through LPAT decisions) during the Development Application Approval process and/or the Committee of Adjustment process. Moreover, there is a lack of understanding as to what options are available to the resident should suitable transition be compromised?</p> <p>3. How and when will the residents who live either within or border the proposed Official Plan areas for intensification be informed as to the impact of height, massing and density on their properties so that these residents may make informed decisions as to whether to remain or to sell their</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In response to public feedback, the City has developed <a href="#">a new webpage</a> to help the public understand the Development Application process.</p> <p>Parties interested in and affected by the adopted Official Plan can sign up to receive notification of progress with the re-examination of the downtown policies. They can also visit the City's project webpage where staff continuously post status updates, engagement opportunities, and relevant background reference material.</p> <p>The City will also provide notice of statutory public meetings and Council decisions in accordance with the Planning Act.</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>properties and that any follow-on interested parties for the acquisition of the same property be informed as to the future development vision affecting the property?</p> <p>4. If the City were to offer the resident a fair market value for expropriation of their property at a time of their choosing to enable the City to create or expand a park, green space or public open space to be created to restore a reasonable transition exists between the downtown and the remainder of the bordering residential neighbourhood, would the resident consider this?</p> <p>5. Is the resident prepared to accept any redevelopment of such bordering development lands? If so under what conditions?</p> <p>a. This may require a discussion as to the economic consequences of not cooperating. Canadian Census data suggests that as we age, we use less retail and commercial services which may hamper our goal to achieve complete communities.</p> <p>i. The Burlington Economic Development Corporation may be a valuable resource to assist in the creation of a discussion paper or infographic suitable for resident consumption.</p> <p>In terms of the recent City hosted survey which closes on November 15<sup>th</sup>, I raise the following concerns which I believe could not have been adequately satisfied due to the lack of time. I believe that the questions posed were valid considerations to survey. However, I believe that the survey lacked the presentation of the required context to answer these specific questions and as a result, I suspect that any responses received to these specific points may be suspect without further clarification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was not clear to me as to the anticipated density in terms of the number of workers, residents, vehicle parking etc. to be accommodated with either of the two companion visions for each of the three study areas.</li> </ul>	

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>O I was left to assume that the proposed density would be the same in both the tall building vision and the mid-rise building vision for each of the three areas of interest (Brant between Victoria and James, Brant south of James to Lakeshore, Lakeshore east of Brant).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was not clear to me as to the anticipated impact to surrounding residential neighbourhoods as each vision was depicted the impact from either Brant St or Lakeshore street perspectives.</li> </ul> <p>O As a result, the bordering residential neighbourhoods were not shown with exception of west of Brant associated with Brant between Victoria and James area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the pedestrian scale at street level between the podium of a tall tower or base of a mid-rise building were depicted in the visions, it was not clear to me as to the anticipated sky view afforded by a tower component above the podium when contrasted with that associated with a mid-rise building.</li> </ul> <p>O For example, most people were unable to discern the step back afforded with tall towers in one vision associated with the Lakeshore versus the lack of step backs associated with mid-rise in the second vision. This is because the building faces on the North-side of Lakeshore created a curved curtain effect which made it difficult to discern what was the top of a podium versus what was a vertical building face. Both had the same colour and no attempt was made differentiate such as by use of building cast shading. The inclusion of a tree or sunshade umbrella graphic on the top of each tall building podium roof-top could have been used to distinguish what was a horizontal roof top surface versus what was a vertical building face surface.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it was not made clear to me as to the anticipated retail supply with each vision pair related to each of the three study areas.</li> </ul>	

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>O I suspect that the opportunities to support retail would likely be equivalent across both visions as retail would likely occupy the ground floor of a tall tower's podium or a mid-rise building which would likely have the same ground floor plate dimensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was not made clear to me as to the anticipated office supply in each of the two companion visions related to each of the three areas of concern.</li> </ul> <p>O I suspect that the supply of offices would be equivalent above the supply of retail if retail or commencing from the ground level if no retail is accommodated regardless as to mid-rise or the podium of the tall tower building.</p> <p>I respect the fact that we are likely all caught up with the time-boxed challenges in determining what the residents of Burlington perceive as important when responding to the development challenges facing the City and how the City should govern them to ensure repeatable outcomes.</p> <p>With the time remaining, may I suggest that we need a concerted effort to discuss how the proposed OP changes will likely impact the residents' properties and their way of life. This implies that we are able to get beyond the NIMBY mantra. It is of my opinion that many of Burlington residents do not understand what the impact of our aging demographic will have on maintaining the current neighbourhood achievement of complete community and what would need to be done to enhance the neighbourhood to achieve a higher level of complete community. Please let me know if I can assist you in any way on this matter.</p> <p>I am prepared to make delegation/presentation to Committee or to Council to permit questions and answers on this note in public forum and/or to discuss any concerns you or City Staff via email and/or in-person meetings. Again, I wish to thank those associated with Taking a Closer Look at the</p>	

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>Downtown for all of their efforts for permitting me and members of the public with an opportunity to provide feedback.</p> <p>P.S. For a Burlington Institution. Have you considered developing secondary school infrastructure to facilitate foreign student residences associated with Burlington Central High School which includes the foreign student desired International Baccalaureate curriculum. Another possible campus idea could be created to developing the skills necessary with which to provide in-home elderly care given the propensity for Burlington residents to age at home.</p>	
P6	Nov 14, 2019	Georgina Craig (email)	I did not see how parking was to be addressed. Was this shown and I missed it? Nor did I comprehend where the new green spaces were- is the creek behind Martha St being developed into a walking path? It was hilited in green.	<p>The framework for evaluating the two concepts did not include criteria for measuring for parking, as both concepts were equally able to accommodate the appropriate amount of parking.</p> <p>No walking path is proposed along the creek east of Martha Street; however, a trail alongside the same creek in the Mid-Brant area is proposed.</p>
P7	Nov 19, 2019	Carriage Gate Homes (Mark Bales) (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are of the opinion that the process being followed to implement the scoped re-examination of the City's Official Plan is rushed and is in many respects more challenging and exclusive than the process leading to the adoption of the new Official Plan in 2018</li> <li>We have provided comments, provided written submissions and delegated for over three years in response to the City's efforts to develop a new Official Plan and appropriate policies for the City's primary intensification area – the downtown</li> <li>None of the submissions and comments we have provided to date have been recognized or addressed</li> <li>The City has failed to be transparent as background studies have been and continue to be withheld</li> <li>The land use study being completed by Dillon Consulting (Dillon) as part of the interim control by-law (ICBL) review is independent of the work being undertaken by SGL and there has been no</li> </ul>	<p>Comments on the process of previous planning projects cannot be addressed through the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies. For responses to submissions that informed the adoption of the new Official Plan, refer to Appendix P of staff report <a href="#">PB-04-18</a>, Appendix E of <a href="#">PB-14-18</a>, and Appendices E, F, G of <a href="#">PB-50-17</a>.</p> <p>For information on technical studies that informed the adoption of the Official Plan in 2018, refer to report PB-04-18.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the timeline of the current project is tight, which is necessary to avoid delaying Halton Region's review of the Adopted Official Plan. The opportunity to re-examine the</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>engagement with the building industry regarding this work and the linkages and interrelationships between the two (2) studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed options for the downtown are flawed and unrealistic</li> <li>• It is premature to consider options for the Urban Growth Centre until such time as the City is prepared to respond with plans, policies, and options that will conform with the policies and requirements of both the Region of Halton and the Province of Ontario and it has engaged with the building industry</li> <li>• The City of Burlington should not proceed to conclude its review and prepare staff reports and recommendations until the requested information is provided to us and the building industry. We require sufficient time to review and consider this information and opportunities should be provided to us to review our concerns with City Planning staff.</li> </ul> <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and redevelopment options for the Urban Growth Centre should not be prepared until such time as the land use has been determined</li> <li>• The boundary of the Urban Growth Centre being used by the City and its consultants is inconsistent with Provincial policy, resulting in a total area that is approximately 11% less than it should be. The reduced area of the Urban Growth Centre artificially increases the existing density calculations used by the City and its consultants to determine how many new residential units and jobs are required to be accommodated within the Urban Growth Centre by 2031 and beyond.</li> <li>• The suggestion made by SGL at the Open Houses that only 20% of the new buildings shown on the two (2) options need to be occupied by 2031 to enable the City to reach the minimum density target for the Urban Growth Centre is incorrect. We disagree with this conclusion. Assuming that the consultant's assumption of the amount of growth required to be realized in the Urban Growth</li> </ul>	<p>downtown policies of the Adopted Official Plan is an opportunity that was created when Halton Region paused its review as indicated in the Region's December 2018 memo attached to their Dec 4, 2018 "Notice of Statement of Opinion of Non-Conformity With the Regional Official Plan" (refer to City of Burlington <a href="#">Council Information Package dated December 14, 2018</a>).</p> <p>It is important to note that the Re-examination project is not starting from scratch: it relies on technical studies that were already commenced or completed under the previous Area-Specific Planning exercise, and is intended to result in modifications to the Adopted Official Plan policies, rather than a full suite of brand new policies. Technical studies informing the Re-examination project are available at the <a href="#">Get Involved Burlington website</a>.</p> <p>Information on the connections between the Interim Control By-law Study and the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies of the Adopted Official Plan has been conveyed to the building industry through written notifications, media releases, and in-person discussion including the Dec 4, 2019 meeting of Halton Developers Liaison Committee (HDLC).</p> <p>Modifications to the Adopted OP resulting from the Re-examination project will conform to provincial and regional policy, including UGC requirements and boundaries.</p> <p>The City and SGL Planning &amp; Design have considered all submissions received throughout</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>Centre is correct (which we do not), more new buildings and units are required to accommodate more people and jobs. Based on a simple analysis of other buildings of a similar scale and magnitude to those being identified in the options, we calculate that approximately 17 of the new buildings identified by the City's consultant will be required to be built between now and 2031. This is a far greater number of buildings than the 20% of the buildings identified by SGL in either option. The feasibility and practicality of this number of buildings being constructed currently and widely across the Urban Growth Centre over the next ten (10) years is questionable at best.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The challenges of land assembly and the impacts of land costs are ignored</li> <li>• It is unreasonable to assume that seventeen (17) new buildings (as noted above) will be constructed and occupied within the Urban Growth Centre within the next ten (10) years – an area that has been growing at a rate of approximately 59 units per year for the last ten (10) years</li> <li>• We note that “Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown: Themes, Principles, and Land Use Concepts Report (October 2019)” prepared by SGL provides a summary of input received from various other consultants that are part of the SGL team. Section 5 of this report includes a brief summary of a “Market Analysis” completed by NBLC. The financial viability of low and mid-rise mixed-use redevelopment in the Urban Growth Centre is noted as questionable.</li> <li>• Due to the lack of coordination between the land use study (Dillon) and the planning policy studies (SGL), the lack of engagement with the building industry and the fact that the implications of the Region's Integrated Growth Management Study (41,000 more people to be accommodated in Burlington between now and 2041 – as identified in the Future Growth study that was prepared for the City by Dillon) have not been</li> </ul>	<p>the Re-examination project and will continue to incorporate the feedback of all interested and affected parties as the project progresses through to the development of policy modifications.</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>considered, we have no confidence that the options prepared by SGL are valid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There appears to be an ongoing and frustrating trend to ignore and fail to respond to and include the building industry in this process. Detailed comments and requests for information and background studies during the “adopted” Official Plan process were and continue to be ignored. This is unacceptable to us, not only as members of the building industry but as a local tax paying business</li> <li>• The building industry is a major component of the regional economy that should not be marginalized</li> </ul>	
P8	Nov 21, 2019	Peter Ward (email)	<p>I compared the Watson Associate numbers with the staff report, PB-62-17, which has more detail for how population counts are calculated based on People Per Unit and Jobs Per sqm rates as well as where we’re presently at based on approved and completed development since 2016. The population counts to date between the staff report and the Watson Associate are very close, ranging between 19,515 and 19,672. The PB-62-17 report counts are based on 2016 actual counts and construction completed or approved since then, as outlined in the table below. Watson Associates estimates 1,280 units and 570 jobs will be created from now until 2031. This would provide another 2,464 people, assuming the additional units are at the high density PPU rate of 1.48. With a target is 20,920 people (i.e. 200 ppl/ha and 105 ha), the Watson estimate exceeds the target by 1,216 people, reaching 212 ppl/ha by 2031.</p> <p><b>Potential Population Counts by Concept</b></p> <p>Watson Associates estimates that Concept 1 has the potential to deliver 2,850 jobs and 5,750 units. Concept 2 has the potential to deliver 3,155 jobs and 5,855 units. Assuming the unit count is based on a high density PPU of 1.48, total people and jobs is 11,360 and 11,820 respectively. Adding these estimates to the population count to date, both concepts exceed 31,000 people and jobs with the ppl/ha reaching 297 ppl/ha and 301 ppl/ha respectively. Watson assumes 570 jobs and 1,894 units will be added between now and 2031. If the average jobs and units per year over the next 12 years is</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes. To update your calculations, it is important to rely on the <a href="#">June 2019 UGC update work</a> as that is what the SGL/Watson work relied upon. This is important because the UGC work is always a snapshot in time and evolves as new information becomes available. Your 2016 assumptions related to existing people and jobs are consistent with the June 2019 UGC update work; however, there are a number of issues that are difficult to capture without going over your calculations together. If it would be helpful staff would be happy to sit down to discuss the issues with the calculations and assumptions.</li> <li>2. The objective of the work was to consider a planning horizon of 2031 and achieving a minimum 200 people and jobs per hectare density target, not 300</li> </ol>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>applied against the total potential jobs and units for each concept, it would take over 60 years to achieve the full potential job count and over 36 years to achieve the full potential unit count.</p> <p><b>My questions to you are as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do any figures (calculations or rate assumptions) in my tables need to be adjusted?</li> <li>2. What is the rationale for developing concepts with the maximum potential of 300 ppl/ha in our downtown, which is well above the current requirement of 200 ppl/ha?</li> <li>3. What is the upper end of population density the Planning team believes is sustainable and appropriate for our downtown?</li> <li>4. If there is an upper end, would the Planning team consider recommending the UGC designation be re-assigned to another part of Burlington like our mobility hubs?</li> <li>5. The concepts assume the downtown continues with the MTSA designation. With a vastly increased downtown population, the current transit station is inadequate and not worthy of the mobility hub designation. How then is the scaled-up transit infrastructure accounted for in your concepts, including an improved transit hub?</li> <li>6. Principle 1 calls for the creation of additional parks, trails and open spaces. The only proposed addition is an urban park in the mid-Brant precinct. Yet both concepts show tall or mid-rise buildings where the park is also shown to be. How can both buildings and a park exist in the same location?</li> <li>7. Further, how do you reconcile the negligible addition of parks and open space with Principle 1?</li> <li>8. Principle 11 calls for the protection and integration of heritage buildings, yet your concepts put tall buildings in the block between John, Elizabeth, Maria and James Streets where important</li> </ol>	<p>ppl/ha. The City cannot control or anticipate what sites may or may not come forward for development over that time period or how various constraints may impact development of any particular site. For these reasons, a comprehensive look at overall development potential is visually presented in the modelling of each of the concepts. The modelling exercise is only a conceptual visualization of built form and heights. It was intended to start the conversation around possible future built form in the Downtown.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The objective of this work is to consider development to 2031, in conformity with the Regional Official Plan. This work does not include technical studies to determine ultimate capacity for development in the Downtown.</li> <li>4. Staff have been directed to consider this question after the completion of this scoped re-examination of the OP and the Interim Control By-law land use study.</li> <li>5. The findings from the Interim Control By-law land use study will include recommendations regarding transit in the downtown and the role of the MTSA. The "Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown" Project will be informed by the findings of</li> </ol>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>heritage buildings currently exist. How do you reconcile the concepts with this principle?</p> <p>9. Page 6 of your report says the “the overall vision for the Downtown was confirmed and visions for each present (sic) were updated or confirmed.” Who confirmed the vision for the downtown and the precincts and how formalized was the confirmation process?</p> <p>Were the visions for the downtown and precincts formally presented to council for “confirmation”?</p> <p>ADDITIONAL QUESTION: Does the Watson Associates’ potential jobs and unit count projections for both concepts include the Old Lakeshore Road area, the 409 Brant Street proposal that is under the LPAT appeal, or the re-development of the Waterfront Hotel? In other words, are the potential downtown jobs and units counts higher if they’re added in, or has Watson Associates already included them in their numbers?</p>	<p>the Interim Control By-law as well as by technical studies, including a Traffic Overview and a micro-level transportation operations review for the preferred scenario. The findings of that study will inform the development of policies related to emphasizing multi-modal transportation.</p> <p>6. There is also a new park anticipated in the Upper Brant area. The park symbol is intended to be representative of the need to consider additional parkland in the area. The policies that will be developed for consideration by Council will provide more detail about how the vision for incorporating additional parkland might be achieved, through the development application process.</p> <p>7. While the theme of green space/open space and parks did inform the vision and the land use map and concepts, Official Plan policy will be developed to guide the ultimate development of the Downtown, including consideration of green space, open space and parks.</p> <p>8. As noted in the SGL report with relation to the model limitations “Heritage has not been considered in the massing of the model”. Figure 8 on page 16 provides</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
				<p>details related to registered and designated heritage buildings. Official Plan policy will be developed that will provide direction on heritage</p> <p>9. The findings of the first round of engagement (as summarized <a href="#">here</a>) confirmed the vision for the Downtown. Council will have the opportunity to formally confirm the vision when considering the proposed modifications to the Official Plan.</p> <p>10. No. Council will generally confirm the vision and precincts when a preferred concept is recommended in January. The specific details of the vision for the downtown and each respective precinct will be confirmed through the consideration of policies in the spring.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL QUESTION: The Watson jobs and unit counts are a market forecast of what could occur in the Downtown UGC by 2031. As it is a market forecast, the numbers do not take into account any specific development. The Taking a Closer Look - Phase 2 report compared the Watson number to currently approved but unbuilt units, buildings under construction and recently</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
				completed buildings. It did not look at the potential from other areas outside the study area.
P9	Nov 25, 2019	Sustainable Development Committee (email)	<p>8. This study appears to be offering two different options primarily focused on how the Downtown could look. It is difficult for the SDC to comment on the sustainability of the two concepts at this early stage without more detail on how the different possible designs would perform with respect to sustainability criteria such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GHG emissions and energy generation</li> <li>• Climate resilience</li> <li>• Affordability/accessibility</li> <li>• Green space and tree population</li> <li>• Active transportation and transit</li> <li>• Complete communities</li> </ul> <p>9. The City of Burlington has committed to improving its sustainability and moving to a lower carbon future. In the 2015-2040 Strategic Plan, the City stated that it would work towards “the goal of the Burlington community being net carbon neutral”. In April 2019, City Council unanimously declared a climate emergency, "deepening our commitment to protecting our economy, environment and community from climate change...", resolving that " Council and staff immediately increase the priority of the fight against climate change..." and directing staff to prepare a Climate Action Plan by the end of 2019. A climate lens must be applied to the plans and actions of the City of Burlington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability should be added as a theme for the overall Downtown and reflected in the vision.</li> </ul>	<p>The October-December 2019 engagement period was primarily concerned with establishing a land use vision and built form concept for the downtown. Other planning and sustainability considerations will be applied in the next phase when detailed policies (or policy modifications) are developed for the Downtown. Some very detailed sustainability considerations may not be applicable to the Re-examination project at all and would instead be considered in later projects such as the development of guidelines or the review of a site-specific development application. Sustainability is a pillar of the overall Adopted Official Plan as embodied in the Strategic Plan directions which include “A Healthy and Greener City”. Chapter 4 of the Adopted Official Plan, “Environment and Sustainability”, contains objectives and policies that apply City-wide, including in the Downtown, and the modifications to Downtown policies arising from this study will be consistent with Chapter 4. The importance of sustainability considerations to the Re-examination is re-enforced through the inclusion of the City’s Senior Sustainability Co-ordinator on the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Director of Environment, Infrastructure, and Community Services on the Steering Committee. Engagement with the Sustainable Development Committee further ensures a sustainability lens is applied to the project. The project team has also</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>10. It should be clarified if the concepts presented show maximum building envelopes and not the maximum footprint of specific buildings within the envelope.</p> <p>The SDC would like to continue to be engaged on the Downtown concept as it moves through more detailed planning.</p>	<p>met with the Senior Sustainability Co-ordinator to discuss alignment of the project with the draft Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>The 3-D modelling utilized in the October-December engagement period showed a hypothetical built form to stimulate discussion of appropriate development patterns in the downtown. In some cases building envelopes were shown while in others it was possible to show hypothetical building footprints consistent with current guidelines. The 3-D modelling could not address individual building design and none of the modelling should be considered as an endorsement of a specific design for any particular site.</p>
P10	Dec 5, 2019	Suzanne Mammel, Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association (HHHBA) (letter)	<p>The purpose of this submission is to once again outline concerns similar to those that we have identified in the past. Throughout the course of the process leading up to the adopted OP, the HHHBA was engaged and committed to the review; we attended various meetings, made several requests for information, background research and supplementary studies, and submitted written comments plus oral delegations. In addition, in the summer of 2017, HHHBA provided a map to the City based on our own Association-initiated research and findings, entitled Viable vs Non-Viable Development Activity in the Downtown Mobility Hub, which identified several developable properties throughout the downtown. The mapping demonstrated where and when redevelopment could be anticipated within the UGC. The HHHBA worked diligently with the development industry and identified "immediately developable" lands within the next 0-5 years. Unfortunately, no response or recognition of this work was ever received. ...</p> <p>Our ask, once again, is to be provided with any and all background studies that have been completed to date that have informed not only the creation of the adopted OP, but also those studies that have led to the creation of the 2 concepts presented now. We will also take this opportunity to</p>	<p>Refer to row P7 above for response regarding comments and responses on past projects, including the Adopted Official Plan.</p> <p>Refer to row P7 above for response regarding release of technical studies.</p> <p>With respect to HHHBA's 2017 submission of a map entitled "Future/Proposed Development Activity: Downtown Mobility Hub", this was received by City staff and responded to by email on August 11, 2017.</p> <p>The Interim Control By-law is a separate study from the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies in the Adopted Official Plan. For information on this study and technical background informing it, visit <a href="http://www.burlington.ca/icbl">www.burlington.ca/icbl</a>.</p>

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>request to be provided with copies of all background studies that are being used to inform any revised planning policies for the interim control by-law as well.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider our request. The HHHBA feels strongly that the City of Burlington should not go forth with the review or recommendations until the requested information is provided to us, and until such time that the industry is genuinely engaged and involved in the discussions. The building industry is a significant contributor to the regional economy and must be accounted for. We are unable to support the planning and growth options for the OP and Urban Growth Centre until such time that the building industry is consulted, and the requested background information is provided for our review and consideration. We look forward to receiving this information and are hopeful that an improved engagement process can be achieved.</p>	The City and SGL Planning & Design have considered all submissions received throughout the Re-examination project and will continue to incorporate the feedback of all interested and affected parties as the project progresses through the development of policy modifications.
P11	Dec. 5, 2019	Suzanne Mammel, Hamilton Halton Home Builders' Association (spoken delegation)	<p>Request for re-examination of downtown policies of Adopted Official Plan to be put on hold until further consultation with building industry can occur.</p> <p>Requests release of all technical studies for Re-examination and for 2018 Adoption of new Official Plan.</p>	Refer to row P10 for response to HHHBA written submission.
P12	Dec. 5, 2019	Roland Tanner, Engaged Citizens of Burlington (spoken delegation)	<p>Downtown's future should reflect the vision of Burlingtonians.</p> <p>Recommends proceeding with current Re-examination project to get new Official Plan adopted and then move on to other initiatives to achieve the downtown that Burlington wants.</p>	Comment noted.
P13	Dec 5, 2019	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate Homes	Requests more consultation with building industry on the Re-examination of the Downtown policies of the Adopted Official Plan. Requests release of all technical studies that have informed the Adopted Official Plan (2018)	Refer to row P7 above for response to Carriage Gate written submission.

PROCESS				
Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
		(spoken delegation)	and the current Re-examination of the Adopted OP, and adequate time to review those studies. Considers the approval of Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) 38 to have been a confirmation that Downtown Burlington has adequate infrastructure to support a density of 200 people and jobs per hectare.	

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
O1	Nov 7, 2019	WeLove Burlington Executive: Lynn Crosby Blair Smith Josie Wagstaffe Deborah Ruse Dave Myers (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City's approved Official Plan and the plan in force is the 2008 version that has been judged to be consistent with the overriding 2014 Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan. As such, all development proposals being submitted for approval should be assessed using the terms, conditions and provisions of the 2008 Official Plan.</li> <li>• Development proposals that seek approval to construct in the downtown core must provide clearly identified/identifiable, valued, measurable community benefits. The determination of these benefits must be an open and collaborative process involving all affected parties and must be pre-rather than post-approval.</li> <li>• Development proposals should always consider and identify the <b>cumulative</b> effects for things such as traffic, parking, shadowing, wind tunnelling etc. rather than those specific and isolated to only the development being proposed.</li> </ul>	<p>The in-effect Official Plan (as amended, notably including 2008 amendments) remains in effect and is the basis for review of all development applications.</p> <p>The review of site-specific development applications follows a process described on the City's website at <a href="https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/understanding-the-development-application-process.asp">https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/understanding-the-development-application-process.asp</a>. Changes to the development review process are out of scope of the project to Re-examine the Downtown Policies in the Adopted OP.</p> <p>In order for the Official Plan (OP) to remain current and continue to serve the community, it must be regularly updated and/or replaced. The Planning Act requires every city to update its Official Plan at least once every five years, or every 10 years after the approval of a new Official Plan. Burlington's last Official Plan review began in 2002, and the revised document was approved by Halton Region in 2008.</p> <p>The 2008 Official Plan amendment (OPA 55) was approved prior to the development of the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2017/2019 Provincial Plans, as well as Regional Official Plan Amendment 38 (ROPA 38) which was approved in 2011. It is necessary for the City's Official Plan to be updated to respond to changes in superior policies/laws as well as the ongoing evolution of our community and its priorities: for example, the current emphasis on affordable housing, climate change mitigation/adaptation, and innovations in employment and transportation.</p> <p>The Adopted OP (2018) represents the City's most current vision and policy framework. The current project will modify some of the downtown policies that were adopted in 2018. After that the Adopted OP must be approved by Halton Region</p>

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
				and withstand appeals to LPAT before coming into effect. Subsequently it will need to be updated on an ongoing basis to remain current, as did the previous (currently in effect) OP.
O2	Nov 18, 2019	Burlington Seniors' Advisory Committee (BSAC) (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support elimination of the downtown mobility hub designation. Sufficient bus stop areas are required for local route connections, but not a hub.</li> </ul>	The Mobility Hub designation originated with Metrolinx's "Big Move" plan (2008) and is enshrined in the Region's Official Plan. The City's OP must conform to the Region's OP and therefore must reflect the Downtown Mobility Hub. Changes to Downtown's status as a Mobility Hub can only happen through changes to the Region's Official Plan, and are therefore out of scope of the current project. Changes to transit service level are out of scope of the current project.
O3	Nov 19, 2019	Carriage Gate Homes (Mark Bales) (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City has failed to engage the building industry regarding the analyses being completed in response to City Council's imposition of the Interim Control By-law (ICBL) on March 5, 2019</li> </ul>	The Interim Control By-law (ICBL) Study is a separate project. Its progress is co-ordinated with that of the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies of the Adopted Official Plan. A Statutory Public meeting is scheduled for the Interim Control By-law on January 14, 2020 (PL-01-20) at which time public delegations will be heard.
O4	Nov 20, 2019	Claudette Mancini (email)	Would prefer to see new development at Burlington GO station area rather than in Downtown	The Burlington GO Station area is identified as a Primary Growth Area in the Growth Framework (Schedule B-1) of the Adopted Official Plan. The Interim Control By-law (ICBL) Study has examined the role and function of the Burlington GO station and Downtown Bus Terminal and has resulted in report PL-01-20, which makes recommendations for appropriate planning approaches to these two distinct Major Transit Station Areas. In conformity with provincial and regional plans, Downtown Burlington continues to be a Major Transit Station Area, Urban Growth Centre, and Mobility Hub, and will continue to see growth. The Taking a Closer Look at the Downtown project is concerned with establishing a vision and policies for appropriate growth in Downtown.
O5	Nov 27, 2019	Craig Brown (email)	Concern with perceived lack of police presence and traffic safety rule enforcement in the downtown.	Policing activities and law/by-law enforcement are not planning matters and are out of scope of the current project.

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>Desire for Burlington to pass a by-law prohibiting right-turns on red lights, to improve pedestrian safety at intersections.</p> <p>Desire for controlled crosswalks with lights for pedestrians in downtown.</p>	<p>The suggestion for new traffic by-laws is also not a planning matter and out of scope of the current project but will be shared with the Transportation Department.</p> <p>The desire for controlled crosswalks with lights for pedestrians in the downtown is acknowledged. Please refer to Transportation Department report TS-10-19 which recommended new crosswalks on Brant Street; this report was approved in December 2019.</p>
O6	Dec 2, 2019	Cycling Advisory Committee (letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of parking also has an inverse relationship with price. Has pricing been explored as a tool for managing parking demand and shaping parking behavior? On-demand pricing (as per SF Park) can serve effectively to maintain turnover of spaces and increase availability without dedicating additional land to provide car parking.</li> </ul>	<p>Management/administration of the City's parking lots is not a planning matter and is out of scope of the current project. This comment will be shared with the Transportation Department.</p>
O7	Dec 2, 2019	Diana and Paul Marchand (email)	<p>i.e restore class B and Class C properties to being fully protected and not just class A.</p>	<p>This comment refers to a "grading" system that was previously used by the City to differentiate heritage properties of various perceived levels of heritage value. In 2008, all "A" and "B"-level heritage properties were listed on the City's Municipal Register, a tool deriving authority from the Ontario Heritage Act. In 2012, all undesignated "B"-level properties were removed from the Municipal Register. Heritage Burlington's 2012 "New Approach" report identified that Heritage Burlington will study these properties individually to determine which, if any, should be re-added to the Municipal Register. That project is not yet complete.</p> <p>This comment will be considered by the project team insofar as it reflects community interest in the general conservation of heritage properties, which can be addressed to a certain extent through Official Plan policies.</p> <p>To the extent that this comment refers to the classification of specific properties using Heritage Act tools or other non-</p>

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
				<p>planning means, this comment is out of scope of the current project and will be forwarded to the City's Heritage Planner and Heritage Burlington.</p>
O8	Dec 3, 2019	David Bronskill, Solicitor for Core FSC Lakeshore GP Inc (letter)	<p>We are solicitors for Core FSC Lakeshore GP Inc, who are the owners of the properties known municipally as 2093, 2097 and 2101 Old Lakeshore Road and 2096 and 2100 Lakeshore Road (the "Properties"), which are located within the Old Lakeshore Road Precinct. As you know, in August 2019, our client submitted applications for Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment to permit the redevelopment of the properties as a 27 storey mixed use building.</p> <p>We are writing to provide our client's preliminary comments regarding the potential approach of the City to new Official Plan policies for the Downtown. In particular, our client is concerned with the emerging direction that contains no review or re-examination of the Old Lakeshore Road Precinct. In our client's view, this area should be reviewed as part of the ongoing planning exercise to ensure conformity and consistency with upper level planning documents, failing which this area should <u>immediately</u> be removed from the scope of the interim control by-law. In accordance with the above-noted applications, our client believes that the properties are appropriate for intensification that is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and in conformity with the Growth Plan. In particular, the Properties are identified within the boundary of the Downtown Urban Growth Centre, which has a minimum target density of 200 residents and jobs per hectare. Accordingly, the Properties are underutilized and appropriate for intensification today without need for any future study.</p>	<p>The Old Lakeshore Road Precinct is not within the scope of the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies of the Adopted Official Plan; however, the Old Lakeshore Road Precinct is within the scope of the Interim Control By-law (ICBL) Study that is concurrently underway.</p> <p>The ICBL and Re-examination projects are distinct projects with similar study areas. They are occurring separately but are co-ordinated and the findings of each may inform the other. The ICBL study has produced staff report PL-01-20 which recommends amendments to the City's <u>in-effect</u> Official Plan and Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The Re-examination project is concerned with the City's <u>Adopted</u> Official Plan.</p> <p>Analysis of the Old Lakeshore Road Precinct is out of scope of the Re-examination project, as is the delineation of lands affected by the Interim Control By-law 10-2019, as amended.</p>

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			Please also accept this letter as a request for notice on behalf of our client for any decisions made in respect of any new Official Plan policies for the Downtown.	
O9	Dec 4, 2019	John Was (letter)	<p>Following the recreation of Burlington’s new Official Plan (OP), is much like watching a bad movie that just won’t end. A bad movie of our own making.</p> <p>We have twisted, delayed and distorted the process, a process that should have always had the best interest of the city at the forefront. I hear and read comments saying: if only we could delay the OP approval; or, if only the Mobility Hub (MH) was removed from the Downtown and then my personal favorite, if only the Urban Growth Centre (UGC) was moved all would be well and our new OP would deflect any challenges to the wayside.</p> <p>Removing the MH and UGC is simply not an option for our new OP, as stated in Councils terms of reference for the scoped re-examination of the OP and its policies for the downtown:</p> <p><i>“The terms of reference for the OP re-examination does not include: shifting the Urban Growth Centre from the downtown to Burlington GO. The Urban Growth Centre location is established in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the Region of Halton Official Plan. Any policies proposed for the Official Plan must conform with both.”</i></p> <p>To those that believe removing the MH and relocating the UGC is a good strategy, I suggest you continue your advocacy but don’t be surprised if in the end the changes you seek do not materialized. However, you should understand that while you advocate for those changes that could take years, development in Burlington or in the Downtown will not wait or stand still for you or the results. There is also a very good chance that developments will be approved and built before you see any changes, (if you see</p>	<p>The “A Place to Grow” 2019 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe identifies some policy areas wherein the new 2041 planning horizon applies to all levels of government immediately, and other policy areas where the 2041 horizon does not apply as a requirement until after the upper-level municipality’s next municipal comprehensive review (Regional Official Plan review). The implication for Burlington’s Adopted Official Plan is that it must conform to the current Halton Region Official Plan (ROP), and when a new ROP is approved in future, the City’s OP will be updated to ensure conformity with the new document, including any shifts to a 2041 horizon. Regardless, the Growth Plan 2019 (policy 2.2.3) continues to identify 2031 as the date by which Burlington’s Urban Growth Centre must be planned to achieve a minimum density of 200 people and jobs per hectare.</p> <p>The timeline of the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies of the Adopted Official Plan targets spring 2020 for City Council’s endorsement of modifications to the downtown policies. This timeline has been set with the intent of avoiding any delays to Halton Region’s review of the Adopted Official Plan.</p> <p>The Adopted Official Plan, including the Downtown Re-examination, is intended to be approved by Halton Region prior to the Region completing its new ROP.</p>

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>them at all) as we will be stuck with an OP that is outdated and non-compliant with Regional and Provincial policy. The OP delay initiated by this Council has already consumed a year and we are nowhere close to getting any new OP changes, if any, approved by this Council prior to them being forwarded to the Region for review and approval. That delay continues to leave Burlington with only an outdated and non-compliant OP with which to consider applications and defend itself should appeals be submitted. The re-examination of the OP has generated two Downtown concepts as a result of resident input and provincial policy requirements yet there has been dissatisfaction indicated with both. They are remarkably like the concepts that formed the basis for the adopted OP. Could it be the policy's for Downtown were right the first time and this exercise (at taxpayers' expense) only serves to confirm what was already adopted over a year and a half ago?</p> <p>The cost to taxpayers for this re-examination is in excess of \$600,000 and it seems that little if anything has changed since that time and we have gained nothing. I remain skeptical that either of the two concepts proposed for the Downtown will result in the actual built form over the years let alone be approved by the Region and Province. There is and always will e a place for zoning and OP amendments as individual properties are developed. However, either option would provide, (according to the City's planning consultant), the necessary density for our Downtown. It would be irresponsible for this Council not to acknowledge these realities.</p> <p>The biggest obstacle this Council has created for itself is the 2031 planning horizon established in the Work Plan for the scoped re-examination of the Adopted Official Plan.</p>	

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p><i>“As a result, the scope of the modified precinct plan for the Downtown Urban Growth Centre has been shifted such that the precinct plan will contemplate the planning horizon of 2031, in conformity with provincial policy.”</i></p> <p>It is important to note Place to Grow 2019 is now law and contemplates a 2041 timeline. Burlington currently utilizes both that policy and the 2041 timeline when considering development applications yet chooses to disregard it for the OP re-examination.</p> <p>To achieve even the minimum density for the Downtown, most developments, if they are to be occupied by 2031, need to be in the planning stage now. The Future Growth Report prepared by yet another consultant (Dillon) acknowledges that to achieve the minimum population and density target for the Urban Growth Centre would require approval of several developments that are already under review. These developments are not approved and represent the exact opposite of what this Council has indicated it would support.</p> <p>At the same time the Region of Halton is very advanced with its Official Plan update. It’s updated OP (ROP) is intended to have a planning horizon of 2041. If City Council approves changes to our OP based on a 2031 timeline and if approved by the Region, they will soon be obsolete and non-conforming to a new ROP. A much stronger possibility is the Burlington OP may be approved by the Region and appealed. That would leave the appealed portions of the OP or the whole plan in abeyance until all appeals have been settled. In the past, it has taken years to sort out all the appeals and some portions of the current plan are still outstanding.</p> <p>This raises a fundamental and critical question: Will the new ROP be submitted and or approved by the Province before the Burlington’s 2031 OP is in effect?</p>	

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

Row #	Date Received	From (Name/ Company/ Organization)	Stakeholder Comment	Staff Response
			<p>That would become a major obstacle for Burlington, this Mayor and Council and we will remain vulnerable to an onslaught of appeals mainly because we will not have a new OP in place that complies with provincial policy and is ultimately defensible. This is and will not be the fault of any past Councils, outside influence, or changes to provincial policy. This will be a made in Burlington issue, more specifically an issue made by this Mayor and Council. You have been directing this process for just over a year, how much longer and how much more is this council willing to spend on a bad movie of their making?</p>	
O10	Dec 5, 2019	Don Fletcher, Plan B (spoken delegation)	<p>Concern with the project given that the Downtown is a UGC, MTSA, and Mobility Hub.</p>	<p>Provincial and Regional policy documents identify Downtown Burlington as an Urban Growth Centre (UGC), Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), and Mobility Hub. The City's Adopted Official Plan must conform with provincial and regional policies and therefore must acknowledge the reality of these designations. Changing the status or boundaries of the UGC, MTSA, or Mobility Hub, is out of scope of the Re-examination of the Downtown policies and outside the authority of the City.</p>
O11	Dec 5, 2019	Blair Smith and Lynn Crosby, We Love Burlington (spoken delegation)	<p>Objection to the project given that Downtown is a UGC, MTSA, and Mobility Hub. Concern with Action Lab and online survey being based on two concepts that both reflect downtown as a UGC, MTSA, and Mobility Hub and include tall buildings in the downtown. The City should take as much time as is needed to achieve the right outcome for downtown.</p>	<p>See row O10 above regarding UGC/MTSA/Mobility Hub and row O9 above regarding project timeline.</p>
O12	Dec. 5, 2019	Roland Tanner, Engaged Citizens of Burlington	<p>Downtown's future should reflect the vision of Burlingtonians. Promotes advocating to province for the removal of the Urban Growth Centre designation from Downtown Burlington.</p>	<p>Advocacy to the province for changes to the UGC is outside the scope of the Re-examination of the Adopted OP. In May, 2019, alongside approval of report PB-47-19, Council directed staff to report on options for the UGC and MTSA after the completion of the Re-examination project and Interim Control By-law Study are both completed.</p>

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
		(spoken delegation)	Recommends proceeding with current Re-examination project to get new Official Plan adopted and then move on to other initiatives to achieve the downtown that Burlington wants.	
O13	Dec. 5, 2019	Serge Langevin (spoken delegation)	Concern with the project given that the Downtown is a UGC. Concern with the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies of the Adopted Official Plan proceeding prior to advocacy to the Province to remove the UGC designation from downtown Burlington.	See response in row O10 above regarding UGC/MTSA/Mobility Hub and row O12 above regarding advocacy to province.
O14	Dec. 5, 2019	Gary Scobie (spoken delegation)	UGC should be removed from downtown Burlington. Concern about project given that the Waterfront Hotel site and Old Lakeshore Road Precinct are out of scope of the project. Consideration should be given to a Heritage Conservation District in downtown Burlington.	See response in row O10 above regarding UGC/MTSA/Mobility Hub. The Waterfront Hotel site and Old Lakeshore Road Precinct are out of scope of the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies in the Adopted OP and will be subject to separate studies to occur after the conclusion of the Re-examination project and the Interim Control By-law Study. The decision to launch a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) study is a Heritage Act matter and is outside the scope of the Re-examination of the Downtown Policies in the Adopted Official Plan. This comment will be considered by the project team insofar as it reflects community interest in the general conservation of heritage properties, which can be addressed to a certain extent through Official Plan policies. To the extent that this comment refers to the potential of a HCD study in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act, this comment is out of scope of the current project and will be forwarded to the City's Heritage Planner and Heritage Burlington.
O15	Dec 5, 2019	Mark Bales, Carriage Gate Homes (spoken delegation)	Disagrees with Region's delineation of UGC boundary and calculation of UGC area.	Modifications to the Adopted OP resulting from the Re-examination project will conform to provincial and regional policy, including UGC requirements and boundaries, as approved by the province through the last Regional Official Plan Review.

**OUT OF PROJECT SCOPE**

<b>Row #</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>From (Name/ Company/ Organization)</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
				The delineation of the UGC boundary is outside the scope of the Re-examination project and no boundary changes will be contemplated through this study.