

## Public Comments Received

This appendix contains a copy of all written comments received from the public on the Draft Residential Zoning By-law, since the release of the by-law on Jul. 2, 2025 and up to Sept. 19, 2025. It includes a copy of written comments emailed or mailed directly to staff, and responses submitted through the online General Comment Form that was made available on the New Zoning By-law Project webpage from Jul. 2, 2025 to Aug. 27, 2025.

All feedback received is being reviewed and considered by the project team in the preparation of the final draft by-law. The future staff recommendation report will include a comment response matrix with staff's responses to the comments.

### 1. Written Comments Emailed / Mailed to Staff

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
1.	Jane [REDACTED], Aug. 5, 2025, via email	<p>Dear Planning Staff and Council,</p> <p>I have already submitted a survey response but wanted to share an email also as a resident of Burlington, to provide input on the proposed zoning bylaw revisions. I respectfully urge the City to exclude non-compliant sheds and accessory structures (general provisions in section 5 I believe) from grandfathering, unless they meet current setback and construction standards.</p> <p>These smaller structures can still pose significant problems for neighbouring properties; especially in older neighbourhoods where homes are close together and lot sizes are modest. The updated bylaw is a key opportunity to address these long-standing issues.</p> <p>1.Safety and Fire Risk: Sheds near lot lines can pose fire spread risks, especially if constructed with flammable materials or placed too close to fences and homes.</p> <p><b>I personally witnessed this risk materializing which led to a 3-alarm fire in Toronto a couple of months ago in May - it was absolutely awful and could've been avoided.</b></p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>I recommend that no grandfathering be granted unless the structure meets modern setback and construction safety standards (Burlington is the only municipality hasn't adopted setbacks). This is particularly important in residential zones where emergency access and fire separation distances are critical.</p> <p>2. Drainage and Water Issues: Older sheds built without proper setbacks may redirect runoff, snow melt, or rainwater onto neighbouring yards, causing erosion, pooling, or even foundation issues. These environmental impacts were not always addressed under earlier zoning rules or permit processes.</p> <p>3. Neighbourhood Character: Many legacy sheds were built with little regard for placement or impact. They may conflict with the City's vision for open, green, and visually consistent residential areas. Allowing them to remain indefinitely would compromise the intent of the new zoning direction and could lead to a patchwork of non-compliant and potentially unsightly structures.</p> <p>4. Minimal Burden to Comply: Sheds are relatively low-cost and simple to move or replace, especially compared to larger structures. Requiring compliance either immediately or within a reasonable transition period (e.g., 2–5 years) would not place undue hardship on property owners, while improving both safety and neighbourhood cohesion.</p> <p>I respectfully recommend:</p> <p>Non-compliant sheds not be grandfathered unless they meet current setback and construction standards.</p> <p>The City consider a compliance timeline for older sheds that fall short of today's safety and drainage</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>expectations.</p> <p>Enforcement be prioritized in cases where sheds create risks or ongoing disputes between neighbours.</p> <p>Thank you for your work on this important review. I appreciate the City's commitment to modern, safe, and neighbour-friendly zoning.</p> <p>Kind regards, Janet</p>
2.	<p>Brynn [REDACTED], Aug. 18, 2025, via email</p>	<p>Hi Todd!</p> <p>How are you, and how is the team? Congratulations to all of you on this amazing milestone of the draft zoning bylaw!</p> <p>I wanted to slip in my 2 cents as a resident :)</p> <p>1 - it's really exciting to see the city positioning itself for maturation and 'thickening up' as they say.</p> <p>2 - I was wondering how the City will be nimble and responsive to neighbourhood evolving needs. For example, if one area densifies more quickly with ADUs, is there a mechanism to smoothly fit in walkable amenities like bodegas, coffeeshops, etc, or a threshold to allow that area to automatically qualify to 'level up' it's permitted density in acknowledgement of the demand in that area?</p> <p>3 - thinking of efficiency in application processing: What is the planning rational for typical side yard setbacks? Is that provision redundant to obligations of the building code or the GDC by-laws - and if so, is this an opportunity to reduce the number of departments who are simultaneously evaluating that aspect of an application? (Personally this feels like a holdover simply because zoning bylaws have historically regulated this, without bringing much real public benefit from a planning standpoint, vs building code/GDC).</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>Tell everyone I say hi, and regardless of my questioning some of the details, I am thoroughly impressed with what the team has accomplished.</p> <p>Wishing you a smooth tride through committee. :)</p> <p>Brynn</p>
3.	<p>Jeff [REDACTED], Aug. 21, 2025, via email</p>	<p>I am trying to understand the information provided in the <a href="#">September 2024 zoning bylaw</a> and the <a href="#">June 2025 draft</a>.</p> <p>I am in R2.1 which in the current bylaw permits detached dwellings and Additional Residential Units (ARUs, subject to Part 1, section 2.21, subsection (u)) ,with a minimum lot width of 18 m, lot area of 700 m<sup>2</sup>, and various other parameters.</p> <p>According to the draft <a href="#">map</a> this property will be LN5 which will permit detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, triplex dwellings and fourplex dwellings, with detail of the latter two subject to "further review". LN5 will have minimum lot area of 680 m<sup>2</sup>, minimum lot frontage of 18 m, and various other parameters. I don't see anything about ARUs for LN5.</p> <p>I am not a land use planner, a lawyer, etc. nor do I have resources to properly review and understand all the details of the zoning changes contained in hundreds of pages affecting the entire city.</p> <p>Could you please advise if my summary of the changes as they will affect my property are correct?</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Jeff [REDACTED]</p>
4.	<p>Jeff [REDACTED], Aug. 29,</p>	<p>Why is it "necessary" to significantly change the types of housing permitted (semi, triplex, fourplex) in an area that has been single family detached for as long as I can remember? I understand there</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
	2025, via email	<p>is pressure to increase density, but this should be done in new developments where the buyers are choosing to live in a higher density area.</p> <p>Rezoning from R2.1 to LN5 means that I and other property owners are having the nature of our area changed without our desire or consent after we have been here for many years. This will inevitably result in increased traffic, noise, construction, congestion and all the other consequences of squeezing higher density into an area that was never designed, built or intended for it.</p> <p>Jeff</p>
5.	Tino [REDACTED] Sept. 4, 2025, via email	<p>Thank you for your prompt response. I would be available Thursday Sept 11. However if my questions can be answered below I can possibly forgo the meeting.</p> <p>Questions 1 and 2 pertain to setbacks in current zone R1.2 or LN6(proposed).</p> <p>1) Currently in R1.2 interior side yard setback (with attached garage) is 10% of lot width. In proposed LN6 you have a fixed setback limit of 2.4m. Is this correct?</p> <p>2) Porches (roofed) in front yard (eg over front entrance). Currently in R1.2 Part1(2.13.1(d)) the encroachment is set at 0.65m and with proposed LN6 is set at 2m Is this correct?</p> <p>Just a comment...In the zoning bylaw draft page 55 table I am confused by the circled letter references eg.. "A" "B" "C" and "D".. example in the Porch Rear Yard 3m provision. Is "A" not a reference to the front yard in your definitions. If so should this not be shown as "B".... same comment applies to other placements of the letters A,B,C,D in the table for other rules.</p> <p>Garages...</p> <p><i>Under current bylaw Part2 4.8 GARAGES (a) The width of a front loading attached garage shall not exceed 50% of the width of its building elevation. (b) An attached garage with a garage door facing a street is not permitted to project beyond the longest portion of a wall facing a street and containing residential floor area on the first storey of a dwelling.</i></p> <p>3) For corner lots, are garages (door side) permitted facing exterior side yard, provided the front (garage door) wall meets exterior side setback?</p> <p>4) if allowed, how does the 50% rule apply if any in this case? example ..if the front street side elevation of the building is 20m then the garage facing exterior side yard cannot exceed 15m in width?</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>In the new draft plan page 93 <i>Note(2) Except that for the wall of a private garage containing an opening for a vehicle, the minimum front yard setback or exterior side yard setback to the garage door of the private garage shall be 5.5 meters.</i></p> <p>5)Does this rule only apply for properties in zones LN1 through to LN5 but not LN6?</p> <p>Timelines Not to hold anyone to it...but what is the projected timeline to enacting the new bylaw? That's it for now.... Appreciate your feedback. Tino [REDACTED]</p>
6.	<p>Jason [REDACTED] Sept. 5, 2025, via email</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Just a question to begin:</p> <p>If fourplexes are supposed to be as of right why are they mostly illegal to build in most of the city under this new planning bylaw? If I'm not reading it incorrectly it looks like permissions are restricted to major streets only.</p> <p>Thank you, Jason [REDACTED]</p>
7.	<p>Stephen [REDACTED], Sept. 9, 2025, via email</p>	<p>I am writing to share my concerns with the direction of the Housing Strategy. While I understand the need to plan for growth, I worry that the current focus on adding large numbers of multi-unit and high-density buildings will create significant traffic issues and strain our infrastructure.</p> <p>Neighbouring cities have already shown us the risks—quality of life for existing residents declines when growth is pursued too aggressively, without first addressing the impacts on transportation, services, and neighbourhood character. Burlington has always stood out as a place people want to live because of its balance, livability, and sense of community.</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>Please don't forget your current citizens in pursuit of additional tax revenue. Growth must be thoughtful, measured, and in keeping with the very qualities that make Burlington attractive in the first place.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Stephen [REDACTED]</p>
8.	<p>Leslie [REDACTED] Sept. 15, 2025, via email</p>	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>As discussed with Kyle and Nick at the Food for Feedback event, please see below the email which I sent to Mark Johnson following our stakeholders' meeting last summer. I wouldn't be able to put together this kind of message now due to changes in personal circumstances, but my comments still hold true (it's interesting how the real estate market has changed in the last year and we're seeing that some developers got in over their heads as their "investments" sit around unsold, while leaving some of the negative impacts noted below).</p> <p>Anyway, as mentioned, I was hoping you could point me to the areas of the current draft that address my comments and concerns. I'm still hoping to make it to the meeting tomorrow at Mountainside so perhaps we can continue the conversation then.</p> <p>Thank you and have a good day,</p> <p>Leslie [REDACTED]</p> <p>--</p> <p>Good morning Mark</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>Apologies for leaving this til the last minute of your deadline as I had a few personal matters to deal with the last few weeks.</p> <p>I mainly wanted to provide a summary of some of the issues I see pop up in our neighbourhood. And I should preface these comments by saying that many of us in the Shoreacres area are aware that our "Character Area" designation is likely to be reconsidered with the changes to Zoning Bylaws. Perhaps we can discuss this further at the next stakeholder meeting? My views on low density residential zoning have evolved over the last few years. I never wanted this neighbourhood to be seen as "exclusive" but as excessively large homes make their way into the community, it feels like that is the direction it's moved in. House flippers and investors have changed the sense of community that existed when we first moved in - now it's "build a big home, take the money and leave the neighbours to deal with the lingering impacts". I could certainly never afford this neighbourhood if we were buyers over the last 5 or 6 years! And while I'm more amendable to other forms of housing than i used to be, I'm also aware that more flexible zoning probably impacts those of us in older neighbourhoods disproportionately, since no one is likely to tear down homes in the Orchard or Alton Village! Builders &amp; investors will want to get their hands on every bungalow and turn it over to something more lucrative... construction is already a constant around here and I anticipate that would just increase if someone knows they can build a few townhomes or a triplexes on their lot. My thoughts on zoning now relate directly to flooding mitigation and preserving one's enjoyment of their home &amp; property. I hope some of my anecdotal information at the last meeting helped provide context for some of my points, many of which are repeated below:</p> <p>*When choosing a home, there is a reasonable expectation that the conditions under which you bought it will not be significantly impacted. Where adjacent redevelopment occurs how can zoning bylaws ensure that the impact, if any, is minimal? This is particularly important where there are differences in elevation, since new builds are consistently built with higher foundations. Depending on elevation differences, that could mean a new house's first floor starts at the midway point of an</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>adjoining neighbour's. This leads to a massing situation and loss of privacy. Perhaps a limit on foundation heights for new builds?</p> <p>*For infill development, especially within areas prone to flooding (including groundwater flooding): limit the size of the new footprint to a reasonable number, i.e. max 25% larger than the previous one. Many of the new homes are building a footprint 3 times as big as what previously existed, disrupting the natural course of groundwater.</p> <p>*Clarity on building height: what is considered the "grade" if the elevation of property is higher than street grade? Also, what kind of height maximums is the City now considering since we can only build UP in Burlington? This would be a good section to include a picture or other visual to demonstrate height more clearly.</p> <p>*While others in my community may disagree, I welcome semi-detached homes. In my opinion, this is preferable over a single detached 4000-5000 sq ft home, which seems to have become the norm, often with only a few people living in it, and usually, put up for sale after 2 or 3 years. Again, with semis, impacts to neighbouring properties should be minimized.</p> <p>*What kind of zoning, if any, can be applied to what is built underground?</p> <p>*Conversations about increased dwelling depth and lot coverage are concerning given our vulnerability to flooding. Perhaps we should be increasing minimum requirements for permeable surfaces?</p> <p>*Side yard setbacks have become increasingly important for stormwater mitigation between properties. There should be no reduction to sideyard setbacks, and it is not a one-size fits all situation.</p> <p>*Window wells on new builds seem to be getting larger. As we have now seen due to recent storms, these fill up with water, causing flooding in those basements. Some properties are built with an enormous number of window wells, which encroach into the side yard setback, reducing the opportunity for suitable stormwater mitigation. There does not appear to be any notations on window</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>wells in the current zoning bylaws (at least, none that I could see), so perhaps they need to be looked at in terms of the number permitted, size/depth &amp; encroachment.</p> <p>*Flexibility to fencing &amp; privacy screen bylaws, particularly as it relates to loss of privacy due to new development. Residents should not be required to apply for a Variance in circumstances where their privacy has been compromised due to no fault of their own.</p> <p>*Porches - the wording below from the current zoning bylaw is puzzling, i.e. one can have as big a porch as they like as long as it has a roof? Covered porches have become de facto living spaces, with kitchens, fireplaces, televisions, and so on. They are being built with foundations or full basements underneath and are attached to the home and therefore need to be considered as part of the footprint.</p> <p>2.3.4 Porches are permitted in all zones, provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum size 20 m2 (no roof)</li> <li>• <b>No maximum size if roofed over</b></li> <li>• Must meet principal building setback with encroachment allowance permitted in Part 1, Section 2.13 (d)</li> </ul> <p>*Balconies - new builds have been able to navigate around the “no 2nd storey balcony” by constructing covered porches that are accessible from a second storey window. Perhaps some tighter design controls here? And if they are to be permitted by way of an ADU, once again, impacts to neighbouring properties must be accounted for.</p> <p>*ADUs - as noted in the stakeholder meeting, Planning Staff and Council may want have the conversation about potential flooding impacts on basement units. If a homeowner builds a basement ADU, they may not be able to get proper insurance, leading to illegal rental units. Further, if they have insurance and become flooded, they are not likely to be re-insured.</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>*While the Committee of Adjustment rules fall under Provincial jurisdiction, is it possible for our Planning department to expand the current COA notification of 60 meters? Within the current guidelines, those notices only go out to a small handful of neighbours in older areas, leaving many folks unaware of potential changes. Could this be increased at your discretion?</p> <p>And lastly, i agree that the Zoning Bylaws should be in plain language, and include graphics/visuals that clearly demonstrate the item. Residents should also not need to click on multiple embedded links to find the information they need (I find this is something that happens a lot when searching for City documents and it is easy to get lost &amp; confused in all of that)</p> <p>Mark, thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. I'm sure I will have other thoughts along the way.</p> <p>Have a nice weekend!</p> <p>Leslie [REDACTED]</p>
9.	Ivan [REDACTED] Sept. 18, 2025, via email	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I was speaking with Nataliya from Community Planning Division and she referred me to you. I was having a look at the draft for the New Zoning and I noticed in it there are no mention of Designated Areas any longer. Are these being removed except for Roseland &amp; Shoreacres?</p> <p>I am mostly interested in lot coverages. From what I understand, currently if I want to build a 2-storey house with attached garage in a designated area, it can only cover a maximum of 25% of the lot, but if its not located in a designated area it can cover 35% of the lot. In the new zoning draft, I only see the 35% figure.</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>Can you let me know about this please. I tried to reach Nikolas, Rebecca and Victoria without success.</p> <p>Thank you!</p> <p>Ivan</p> <p>--</p> <p>Thank you Rebecca.</p> <p>So, for LN4 and LN5, if this draft gets approved, it would be 35% maximum lot coverage if I am just building a house on it without any additional residential units.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>Ivan</p>
10.	Jeff [REDACTED] Sept. 18, 2025 via email	<p>I don't agree that the change from R2.1 to LN5 constitutes a "gentle" intensification, it is potentially substantial.</p> <p>On King Road south of Marley Road most of the properties are large because the area was developed prior to the availability of city sewer systems, so needed space for septic fields. Sewer service has since been added, but many of the other characteristics of the area have not been updated to sustain higher density.</p> <p>For example, on King Road south of Marley there are no proper sidewalks separated from the roadway by either median or curb, just a couple of lines on the road to indicate lanes for pedestrians, cyclists, and motor vehicles. Likewise on King Road south of Marley there are no left turn lanes to</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>keep traffic flowing when a vehicle is waiting to turn left. Instead, vehicles pass on the pedestrian / cyclist lanes, ignoring the NO PASSING ON THE RIGHT signs. Also, landscapers, delivery vehicles, and anyone else who wants to use the pedestrian / cyclist lane as a place to park, because again it is just a line painted on the road.</p> <p>King Road from Marley to North Shore is 500 meters, it is straight and flat, with no features or characteristics to reinforce the 50 km/h speed limit. So traffic in this area often travels at 60 km/h or faster.</p> <p>Areas designed for higher density residential will have curbs, centre turn lanes, curves and other features intended to provide safer management of the additional traffic attracted by the higher density. To the best of my knowledge there are no plans for any such roadway improvements in this area, just the opportunity for developers to build much higher density on existing property without suitable and corresponding changes in the infrastructure.</p> <p>Jeff</p>
11.	<p>Albert  ██████████,  Sept. 18,  2025, via  email</p>	<p>Thanks for the meeting yesterday..</p> <p>We would like some information for the upcoming meeting scheduled for October the 1st at City Hall room 305 and 307.</p> <p>In regards to the development and construction of a 4 plex and or a home with 3 ARU's and one principal unit we would like to know the tenure possibilities of this described development ..</p> <p>IE: can a 4 flex be sold as 4 individual units ? Or can the Home with 3 ARU's and a principal unit be sold as individual units.. This would fulfill the " Missing Middle " mandate by creating more housing choices and most likely preferred by neighbouring homeowners.</p> <p>What development charges would apply to these two type of developments?</p> <p>For clarification why is a 4 plex and a home with 3 ARU's and a principal unit ( 4 units in total ) referred in different terms creating confusion.. if the intent is for the 4 plexs to be developed on the periphery of the neighbourhoods, by laws can be established to accommodate them for the ARU's by laws can be established for construction of 4 plexs in the established neighbourhoods allowing 4 units in each area</p>

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
		<p>Regards, [REDACTED] Coral Gable Homes Ltd</p>
12.	<p>Lloyd [REDACTED] Sept. 18, 2025, via email</p>	<p>Currently the by law allows 3 ARU's in single family homes and freehold townhomes.. we are developing 6 condo 3 story townhomes on Plains rd and would like to add 3 ARU's in them when we construct. The current by law does not allow this as they have to be freehold or POTL's. To convert our condos to POTL's will cost approx \$100k.. We don't want to go through this process if not necessary..</p> <p>If the new by law is talking about triplex, fourplex and low rise buildings in the periphery, the ability to add more units in a townhome that is a condo should not make any difference.. we would like this addressed at the next meeting on the 01 Oct 2025 at City Hall.</p> <p>If you have a question in regards to this e mail please contact me directly</p> <p>Regards, [REDACTED] Coral Gable Homes Ltd</p>

## 2. Comments Received Through Online Comment Form


	Date Received	Specific Section of By-law	Comment
1.	Jul. 3, 2025	General Comment	Totally against this new by law. No thought had been to put on strain on services nor aesthetics to the existing neighbourhoods. Changing the whole bylaw to appease certain federal government ideologies is wrong.
2.	Jul. 3, 2025	General Comment	I have already had my next door neighbour build a totally out of place monster home. If any of my neighbours put an accessory building or a triplex or 4 plex I will move out of Burlington
3.	Jul. 3, 2025	Part 4: Definitions	Additional Residential Units - you can have multiple on one lot!!! Without taking into consideration of the size of the lot makes no sense! If I read correctly a 35 foot lot could have a ADU of size 80 metres???? And a 100 foot lot could have the same? If we are to build more houses having people live in a shed is not the answer. I love in an area where massive homes are built taking up most of the lot and towering over other homes - I don't think having an max ADU of 80 m is an answer to our housing crisis.
4.	Jul. 3, 2025	Proposed Zoning Map comment	This system is impossible to understand. TWhat is an LN4. What's the colour coded system explanation. Clear as mud. I'm used to heavy technology but this would be to thwart anyone from understanding the change from present to proposed. Can you make it more opaque? Get out and interact with the community. No one will have much use for this. Seems sneaky. Poor start. Start again.

5.		1.2 Compliance With This By-law	Who understands the magnitude of this doc. Certainly not any ordinary citizen. How can one possible be connected to this.
6.	Jul. 3, 2025	General Comment	<p>Upon scanning the draft of the Burlington Residential Zoning Bylaw, as well as the Housing Strategy I'm unable to see the alignment to the City's Climate Action Plan, Climate Resilient Plan or the Urban Forest Management Plan - how is this possible? I found a single reference to 'complete communities" in the Housing Strategy.</p> <p>Burlington must plan for growth that respects a healthy environment for future generations. Retrofitting homes in the future to be more climate resilient versus advancing a strategy that builds green and affordable from the start, is irresponsible. I hope the next version is accountable to these key Plan's that support the City's Vision to Focus commitment.. Thank you</p>
7.	Jul. 3, 2025	General Comment	<p>City of Burlington is one of the best places to live in Canada because it is not so condensed. Current tax paying residents do not want all these new developments in our city, destroying all our open green spaces. We love it the way it is and choose Burlington as our home because of this. Developing more and more housing and condensing our traffic and infrastructure will definitely make our city less desirable, not more.</p>
8.	Jul. 9, 2025	General Comment	<p>Parking, and traffic is already very bad and adding fourplex's and ARUs everywhere in the community will make it worse. The proposal to bring more growth to stable neighborhoods all while continuing to raise property taxes each year is a flawed approach - we pay high property taxes because we don't want to live next to a fourplex... ARUs or "gentle" density will shift growth from the urban areas served by transit into low rise</p>

			neighborhoods. This will not solve the housing crises - it will simply change the character of our community.
9.	Jul. 13, 2025	General Comment	<p>There should be no allowance for four units as of right. If more housing is needed it should be focused on intensification in the downtown area or on lands today that have little value to the community such as many areas along Fairview which maintain businesses that are seem to be falling apart and or are desolate. These proposed allowances should not occur in already established subdivisions. If the city is opposed to the above the only option should be to develop lands north of dundas on the greenbelt. The pressure, increased issues that will result should not come at the expense of homeowners and the communities they have bought into and developed.</p> <p>Does the city have a plan to deal with increased intensification outside of this option? Will it tax those homeowners who operate more than one unit more?</p> <p>This is not a good idea, and Brampton is a perfect example of this.</p> <p>Do not allow for intensification of existing communities at all.</p> <p>Horrible map to depict what you are proposing and provides no value to visualize what you are trying to propose.</p>
10.	Jul. 14, 2025	General Comment	Can you make it so corner stores are allowed in residential areas?

11.	Jul. 22, 2025	General comment	<p>It maybe my phone but I found it hard to navigate - the site disappeared on a regular basis and I had to restart everything from the beginning.</p> <p>Also the background music is very annoying after being on the site for a half hour reading the proposed zoning by-law and going through the zoning map.</p>
12.		Proposed Zoning Map comment	<p>I looked around the map quite a bit and I may be blind but I could not catch sight of a colour index for the residential zone legend. The map shows all existing development, is there nothing pre-zoned like the Millcroft redevelopment? Again I may have missed it, but is this bylaw is for the "Urban boundary" only? If not, where are the zoning classes for all the rural estate subdivisions and small villages north of Dundas.</p>
13.		Part 4: Definitions	<p>Just a dumb question, why are the definition list at the beginning of the bylaw and not at the end?</p>
14.	Aug. 3, 2025	General Comment	<p>Are you able to advise when the by laws will be effective if passed?</p>
15.	Aug. 5, 2025	Part 5: General Provisions: (5.2 Accessory Buildings And Structures And Unitary Equipment)	<p>Dear Planning Staff and Council,</p> <p>I am writing as a resident of Burlington to provide input on the proposed zoning bylaw revisions. I respectfully urge the City to exclude non-compliant sheds and accessory structures from grandfathering, unless they meet current setback and construction standards.</p> <p>These smaller structures can still pose significant problems for neighbouring properties — especially in older neighbourhoods where homes are close together</p>

and lot sizes are modest. The updated bylaw is a key opportunity to address these long-standing issues.

 Safety and Fire Risk


Sheds near lot lines can pose fire spread risks, especially if constructed with flammable materials or placed too close to fences and homes. I recommend that no grandfathering be granted unless the structure meets modern setback and construction safety standards. This is particularly important in residential zones where emergency access and fire separation distances are critical.


 Drainage and Water Issues

Older sheds built without proper setbacks may redirect runoff, snow melt, or rainwater onto neighbouring yards, causing erosion, pooling, or even foundation issues. These environmental impacts were not always addressed under earlier zoning rules or permit processes.

 Neighbourhood Character

Many legacy sheds were built with little regard for placement or impact. They may conflict with the City's vision for open, green, and visually consistent residential areas. Allowing them to remain indefinitely would compromise the intent of the new zoning direction and could lead to a patchwork of non-compliant and potentially unsightly structures.

 Minimal Burden to Comply

			<p>Sheds are relatively low-cost and simple to move or replace, especially compared to larger structures. Requiring compliance either immediately or within a reasonable transition period (e.g., 2–5 years) would not place undue hardship on property owners, while improving both safety and neighbourhood cohesion.</p> <p> Recommendation</p> <p>I respectfully recommend:</p> <p>Non-compliant sheds not be grandfathered unless they meet current setback and construction standards.</p> <p>The City consider a compliance timeline for older sheds that fall short of today’s safety and drainage expectations.</p> <p>Enforcement be prioritized in cases where sheds create risks or ongoing disputes between neighbours.</p> <p>Thank you for your work on this important review. I appreciate the City’s commitment to modern, safe, and neighbour-friendly zoning.</p>
--	--	--	---

16.	Aug. 5, 2025	General Comment	<p>Ammendments to current zoning to encourage or allow for more population density in the downtown Burlington core will negatively affect those living in Ward 2 by increasing local traffic, decreasing safety for pedestrians, increasing travel times, and increasing foot traffic through adjacent downtown neighbourhoods. The increase in population density will reduce already scarce availability of community supports and services, further populate schools where there is no land to further expand education spaces, and increase crime in the core. Panhandling and homelessness will continue to increase due to the amount of foot traffic in the downtown area and the anticipated increase in donations from pedestrians. Petty crime will continue to rise. We are already seeing items being stolen off of front yards in our neighbourhood, where this has never been a concern. Without better transportation supports, creating dense housing by way of condos or apartment buildings, will congest the city and make it less desireable, in addition to clogging an already busy waterfront. This will also reduce real estate values and create less safe spaces for our children to bike, walk, scooter, etc. This sounds like a short-sighted bylaw that is in the best interest of developers and downtown business owners, not taxpaying home owners.</p>
17.	Aug. 5, 2025	General Comment	<p>We need better infrastructure prior to any new builds. Traffic is already over stressed through the city. Worst in the northeast.</p> <p>We should also protect all remaining green space. Overpopulating Burlington damages the quality of life.</p>

18.	Aug. 5, 2025	Part 7: Residential Zones (7.3 Provisions for Detached Dwellings and Duplex Dwellings in the Low-Rise Neighbourhood 1 to 6 Zones)	The use of the words "to the garage door" in note 2 aka "Except that for the wall of a private garage containing an opening for a vehicle, the minimum front yard setback or exterior side yard setback to the garage door of the private garage shall be 5.5 metres." is confusing or assumes that the garage door is parallel with the front of the dwelling. As can be the case, the garage door can be perpendicular (90 deg) to the front wall of the dwelling. The front and and side setbacks are to a wall and not the garage door.
19.	Aug. 5, 2025	General comment	<p>Please stop building and adding more people to our already over crowded city.. it was nice 10 years ago.. now it's unrecognizable and not in a good way.</p> <p>Please stop building and adding more people to our already over crowded city.. it was nice 10 years ago.. now it's unrecognizable and not in a good way.</p>
20.	Aug. 6, 2025	General Comment	That City Staff consider including a as-of-right green roof addition to homes in the zoning by-law
21.	Aug 24, 2025	General Comment	The proposed changes to the existing R2.1 (proposed LN5) zone will favour the construction of larger detached dwellings through reduced setbacks and increased lot coverage without increasing the number of dwelling units on a property. There should be different requirements for detached dwellings as opposed to semi-detached and duplex dwellings. Hoping the City will add curbs and sidewalks to the residential streets in the proposed LN5 zone as the increased number of dwelling units will increase traffic volumes. Hoping the City will upgrade approximately 70 year-old water & sewer infrastructure in the proposed LN5 zone to handle the increased number

			of dwelling units. Suggesting the parking requirement be reduced to 1 space per dwelling unit to not add to already increasing traffic congestion and motivate people to walk, cycle and/or use public transit.
--	--	--	---