

DGM-69-25 – Addendum: Additional Public Comments Received

This addendum contains a copy of written comments received from the public on the Draft Residential Zoning By-law between noon on Oct. 3, 2025 and Oct. 5, 2025. Comments received from the public between July 2 and Sept. 19, 2025 are found in [Appendix G to staff report DGM-69-25](#) and comments received between Sept. 20, 2025 and noon Oct. 3, 2025 can be found in the [Addendum Package](#).

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.

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
1.	Melinda MacRory, MHBC Planning on behalf of Alinea Oct. 3, 2025	Hi Rebecca, On behalf of our client, Alinea Land Corporation, please find enclosed our comment letter on the Draft Zoning By-law. Best, MELINDA MACRORY, M.Pl., MCIP, RPP Partner



October 3, 2025

Rebecca Lau, Senior Planner, Special Projects
City of Burlington
426 Brant Street, PO Box 5013
Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6

Via email: newzoning@burlington.ca

Dear Ms. Lau:

**RE: COMMENT LETTER
DRAFT ZONING BY-LAW – PHASE 1 RESIDENTIAL ZONES
255 BASS PRO MILLS DRIVE
OUR FILE 1886I**

MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (“MHBC”) has been retained by Alinea Land Corporation to provide comments on the Draft City of Burlington Zoning By-law – Phase 1 Residential Zones (“Draft ZBL”), released by the City on July 2, 2025.

Background

Alinea Land Corporation has several active development applications in the City of Burlington for large-scale developments inclusive of residential and employment intensification projects. Therefore, Alinea Land Corporation has a vested interest in the proposed changes to the Draft ZBL and the potential impacts to its active and future development applications to implement the proposals currently before the City. The following letter outlines our comments on the July 2, 2025 Draft ZBL, which we hope the City will consider addressing in the next iteration of the Zoning By-law.

Comments

Part 7: Residential Zoning Provisions

The New Residential Zoning By-law narrows and simplifies many standards compared to the current zoning by-law. Focusing specifically on the High-Rise Neighbourhood Residential zoning provisions, there are many positive changes, including:

- The addition of non-residential uses as permitted uses including convenience stores, personal service uses and restaurants (Section 7.2);
- The reduction in minimum lot width, front, side, street side, and rear yard requirements (Section 7.8, Table 11);

- The removal of density caps, setback requirements abutting lower-density zones, landscape buffers, and enclosed parking ratios; and,
- A reduction to the significant amenity area requirements with a reduction from 25 m² per unit to 5 m² per unit (Section 7.8, Table 11).

However, there are outstanding concerns that warrant further review and discussion with staff, including:

- The new tower and podium provisions (stepbacks, heights, separation distances, setbacks) are too prescriptive and should be addressed through Urban Design Guidelines instead of zoning (Section 7.8, Table 11);
- The amenity space requirements have improved, however, requiring a 55 m² contiguous outdoor area at grade is restrictive. We suggest considering dividing the common amenity area into an indoor and outdoor amenity area requirement instead of a specific contiguous outdoor area which can be difficult to achieve (Section 7.8, Table 11);
- The landscaped open space minimum of 35% is high for apartment buildings and we recommend that either a reduction should be considered or maintenance of the previous landscape buffer requirements (Section 7.8, Table 11); and,
- The inclusion of an angular plane requirement in the Zoning By-law is restrictive and difficult to achieve for infill developments and we suggest that it remain in the Urban Design Guidelines (Section 7.8).

Part 5: General Provisions

There have been many positive changes to the General Provisions in the Draft ZBL, including the reduction in visibility triangle requirements (Section 5.9) allowing for a more active and animated streetscape as well as clearer and generally more permissive encroachment provisions (Section 5.10).

However, there are some outstanding concerns that warrant further review and discussion with staff, including:

- Decreased awning and canopy and encroachments than the current Zoning By-law (Section 5.10); and,
- Requirement for a percentage of large dwelling units which is limiting and should remain as a policy direction for the City at large allowing for area-specific market needs to be considered rather than a general requirement. This is also very problematic for small infill lots where larger rooms can be difficult to achieve while conforming to all other zoning requirements (Section 5.47).

Part 6: Parking and Loading Provisions

The New Residential Zoning By-law modernizes parking standards with clearer, more prescriptive rules. There are many positive changes to the parking and loading provisions, including:

- Removal of overly prescriptive driveway and parking setbacks that were difficult to achieve.
- Elimination of underground parking structure setbacks and inclusion of a 2 m soil depth requirement for tree planting to allow for optimization of underground parking areas (Section 6.7).
- Reduction of parking space lengths and addition of varied space types (compact, motorcycle) improving flexibility (Section 6.2).
- Addition of vertical and large-format bicycle parking dimensions, with new bicycle parking rates (short- and long-term), aligning with current practices and providing clearer direction (Section 6.12).
- Provision for cash-in-lieu of parking to support flexible implementation (Section 6.17).

We recommend further consideration of the following key areas:

- Electric Vehicle Parking Space requirements (Section 6.16) are overly prescriptive and recommend that these requirements remain in the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines.

- Apartment parking rate of 1.25 spaces per unit (inclusive of visitors) (Section 6.1) is still high for urban and transit-supportive areas.

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments to the City and trust that our comments and recommended changes are implemented. We would be happy to meet with staff to review and discuss our comments further. We kindly request that we be kept apprised of any further meetings and updates related to the Draft Zoning By-law.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,
MHBC

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Melinda MacRory". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Melinda MacRory, M.Pl., MCIP, RPP
Partner

Cc: Alinea Land Corporation c/o Dave Pitblado

2.	Wendy Fletcher, Oct. 4, 2025	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I don't expect this letter to have any impact. If there is one thing I've learned dealing with this city council and these various feel good committees it's that transparency & accountability are a massive farce. When they don't get the results they want, they target the groups they know will give them the answers they want. Or they manipulate surveys to get the results they want. You can dismiss that. I've gone enough rounds and done enough deep research on this council to know different.</p> <p>It's like the comments in this directive. I was at that meeting. You know, the one advertised in the Post where making 4-plexes a right of way was discussed. There were 4 attendees including myself. 4. Go ahead and check the record. I was the only homeowner so guess who got their way? It wasn't me. There are shy of 200,000 people in this city. But please, impart upon me how that is the majority of residents demanding this. That is utter bs.</p> <p>Yet the comments in this memo include: "Whereas background research undertaken through the Housing Strategy indicates that Burlington residents do not feel there is enough diversity or options for ownership housing in the City to meet residents' needs throughout their lifecycle" What utter bs.</p> <p>Is there some other research or focus group that the city has failed to disclose? Bc as I said, I was the only home owner at that meeting and then it was approved. Not a hell of alot of input from actual residents. Or even attempts. That notice in the Post was long, verbose and not clear. But that's how you do it when you don't actually want the public there who are going to vote against it.</p> <p>After that decision was published in the media, that the city had approved this, there was overwhelming uproar from residents who had no idea it had happened. Approximately 90% of taxpayers were against it. That was based off hundreds of responses. Which was a helluva alot more than those who showed up for the meeting.</p>
----	------------------------------------	--

The real reason its being done is because that's the only way for this council to get their hands on the Housing Accelerator Fund. It is not bc Burlington residents want this. They absolutely do not. Tell me something. Are you going to put 4-plexes in Milcroft? How about on Lakeshore? Tyandaga? Roseland? Or is it just for the rest of Burlington that MMW considers throw away areas?

The fact is that most of us have been around long enough to be able to call Marianne Meed Ward out on her pledge to not change zoning in residential single family neighbourhoods. How convenient that she refuses to even acknowledge that now. I will be guaranteeing everyone is reminded of it before the next election. I was able to get >3500 signature on a petition in 30 days so having the next year to remind Burlington that she's all for slamming a 4-plex into you on top of her egregious tax increases for vanity projects and making the lives of city employees better while putting massive taxes on people earning half to a third of what they make will be so easy.

This entire thing is so hypocritical. MMW jumps on the Millcroft bandwagon when she'd already agreed to literally sell out the rest of Burlington. Burlington is 50% single family homes. That's it. The rest are duplex, larger plexes, town or row housing, apartment buildings, condos. To say that are housing stock doesn't offer enough options is so deceitful. It should be criminal. I'm all for legislation that puts a stop to politicians lying to the public. I'd say someone should find out from the ombudsman how lying to the public lists on offences but we pay for their office and they have never once found an issue with a complaint filed by the public against this council. Hardly shocking from an non arms length organization. Theres a term for that in private businesses which is why it isn't allowed.

Even Doug Ford knew that forcing 4-plexes was political suicide which is why he refused to do it. I hate Doug Ford but that is the one thing he is right about. He must know that home owners make up 65% of the vote. Crombie & Stiles were foolish enough to think coming down on the side of disgruntled young people was going to win them the election. The thing is, alot of them don't vote and even more do not want to live in 4-plexes or apts or condos. They want single family homes.

		<p>MMW would know that if she did her research. She thinks she's attracting talent here when its been turned into a 15 minute city with crappy 4-plexes devaluing the neighbourhoods? She needs to be smart and recognize all these things but apparently the allure of cash for 4plexes is too high to resist. Anyone who campaigns against her who points out that she's bringing 4-plexes and other unwanted density to your single family neighbourhoods and says they will reverse this bylaw, will be certain to beat her and anyone else on this council who supports it. If she isn't voted out on the next election, watch for the riots when you try to do this. It's not about helping people. Its nothing but a money grab. If this council actually gave a damn about residents, this would not be happening.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Wendy Fletcher</p>
3.	<p>Grahame Richards, Oct. 4, 2025</p>	<p>I live at [REDACTED] Linbrook. Has my property been re zoned?</p> <p>Best regards,</p>
4.	<p>Cathryn Kelly, Oct. 4, 2025</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>I understand you are considering approving 4-plex units in Burlington. I am strongly opposed to this idea.</p> <p>Our family has lived in Burlington since 1992. Since that time, I have seen the congestion increase exponentially.</p> <p>I used to be able to travel from Dundas/Appleby to Brant and Lakeshore in the same amount of time it takes me to travel from QEW/Appleby to Taywood Dr.</p> <p>We are surrounded by condos and apartments in North East Burlington.</p> <p>The congestion is worse than Toronto, due to poorly timed traffic lights.</p> <p>The roads are in disrepair due to the amount of vehicles.</p> <p>We do not need 4 plexes. I am opposed to them</p> <p>In Burlington.</p>

		<p>Our city has changed, and not necessarily for the better. Respectfully. , Cathy</p>
5.	<p>Wendy Fletcher, Oct. 5, 2025</p>	<p>Hello again,</p> <p>I've decided that I'm not going to let the City of Burlington get away with this. Especially not when you are outright lying to residents. That is something that I cannot let go of.</p> <p>In Appendix A of PL-05-22 on page 19, where it asked, why is important to add all this middle development it states, "The City's current housing stock is primarily composed of single-detached dwellings"</p> <p>That is 100% a blatant outright lie. You don't need the Stats Canada report to know that. All you have to do is drive around the city. Almost all areas with single family homes already have areas of duplexes or larger plexes, and row or townhouses right there with them. Many also have at least one apartment building within a kilometre. But since the Housing Strategy has chosen to publish such utter lies, here is that Stats Canada report.</p> <p>https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Burlington&DGUIDlist=2021A00053524002&GENDERlist=1,2,3&STATISTIClist=1&HEADERlist=0</p> <p>If you scroll down a few pages you'll come to "Total - Occupied private dwellings by structural type of dwelling - 100% data" The number of single family residents are 36795. Adding up all the other types comes to 36375. You can therefore see that the split btw single family homes and all other types, which includes middle housing, is almost exactly 50/50. In fact, of the 36375, only 12830 units are 5 storeys or more. So 65% of it is alternatives to single family homes other than higher apartment buildings. If you'd like more specific 50% single family homes, 32% less than 5 stories and 18% over 5 stories. But again there is this outrageous comment on Pg 19 claiming primarily single family homes.</p>

Of course with the number of high rises approved around the GO station that will change but that is this council's doing. Incidentally, those apartments beside the GO station, which still aren't completed years later, are maybe the ugliest buildings in all of Burlington. Great job making those hideous buildings what people see when they get off a GO train.

I haven't read the full "report" yet. Because as I said, I already know that this premise that residents are asking for this is absolute bullshit because again, I was at that meeting. In none of these documents has there been any reference to actual public input. When the city is taking the direction of Dillon and SHS Consulting who have a vested interest in writing a report that supports development, it does not in any way shape or form reflect public opinion. Nor could any purported research done by them be considered unbiased by any stretch of the imagination. They couldn't even be bothered to put any effort into trying to make this report believable.

I have watched far too much irresponsible governance of this city under this council to be willing to tolerate allowing this to go forward. I will be going thru these reports and identifying every single statement that is inaccurate or outright false. Since time is limited, I will not waste my time with the municipal ombudsman. All Burlington taxpayers know that's a complete waste of our time and one shouldn't even exist as its a waste of our \$ given the level of bias. But I will take this to the provincial Ombudsman. It's not the only issue that's going there. While they haven't yet made politicians lying an offense, the thing about being able to demonstrate a city not abiding by their legal obligations and also lying about major things like this, especially when there is money involved, is that it shows a pattern of behaviour.. That affects the city's credibility. Particularly when your entire argument for why the initiative is important is based on a verifiable lie that the City is attempting to sell to taxpayers. There is no scenario where anyone on this committee, on this council or at City Hall can say that they didn't know the premise of the report was completely untrue.

My demands to keep this out of the Provincial Ombudsman's office are simple. The initiative is axed. Minimally it is stopped until there is actual public engagement on this matter. Not this stacked report based on lies and unreliable research by consulting firms with financial interest in the outcomes. There has been no real public engagement on this matter. If you disagree, then please provide me

with the details of when that occurred and the feedback provided. That means BEFORE the decision to move forward with this. Not after. Under the Engagement Charter that was still in effect at that time, the City had a written contract with residents that bound them to fully engage with residents on this extremely important matter that affects their homes, their property rights, their neighbourhoods. If you think that I cannot make a very compelling argument to the Provincial Ombudsman, you would be mistaken.

We were a decade ahead of our housing requirements before Ford came to office. He is unlikely to stay in office past this term with the number of scandals mounting and having added \$140 Billion to our debt which we are now paying \$15B a year just in interest. Even if he does, Ford doesn't support forcing this type of right of way on property owners. We do not need federal \$ so badly as to whore out property owners rights. Nor should taxpayers have this forced on them bc this council repeatedly overspent on want to have's, not need to have's, and now needs money to fund the things we do actually need. I can discuss a significant number of those expenditures in great detail. I am nothing if not detail oriented. Its almost amusing that after my delegation on the asset management plan and the dedicated infrastructure tax that they changed the name to the Infrastructure renewal tax which means on a search, my extremely well researched paper backed by internal documents on how they fear mongered taxpayers into believing they were justified in implementing an accelerated funding plan, doesn't come up. Very interesting indeed

Again, my demands to keep this out of the Provincial Ombudsman's office are for the bylaw and initiative to be axed, with minimally this bylaw and initiative does not move forward until proper public engagement is conducted.

Given my findings on page 19, I clearly will have to carefully read all of these reports to identify what other untruths they contain.

Sincerely

Wendy Fletcher

No.	Commenter & Date of Comment	Comment
6.	Aldona Dubickas, Oct. 5, 2025	<p>50% of Burlington is already duplexes, other plexes, town or row houses, apartment buildings and condos. So, claiming there isn't enough diversity in housing options isn't true.</p> <p>It seems the decision to implement this change to zoning came as soon as the feds offered a Housing Accelerator Fund. So it's about a cash grab for the city and nothing more. Even Doug Ford knew that forcing this on taxpayers was political suicide as home owners are 65% of the vote. That's why he did not mandate it as part of provincial planning. Even though this initiative tries to imply that you have to do it because of provincial changes, that is simply not true.</p> <p>I do not want a bylaw that allows for 4-plexes or other "plexes" in my single family neighbourhood! In fact, I do not know of anyone that wants this, except for the City and that's not a good enough reason for the homeowners.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and do not allow this to happen!</p> <p>Aldona Dubickas [REDACTED] Ashland Drive Burlington</p>
7.	Caren Burcher, Oct. 5, 2025	<p>Attention: New Zoning Bylaw Project Team, and Burlington City Council</p> <p>Att: To all concerned</p> <p>I am a resident in Ward 2 here in Burlington.</p> <p>I am completely opposed to a New Zoning Bylaw that allows for duplexes; triplexes; or fourplexes in single family home neighbourhoods such as the one I live in.</p>

50% of Burlington is already duplexes; other plexes; town homes or row houses; apartment buildings; and condos. These stats are readily available.

Saying that there isn't a variety of different housing choices in Burlington is not correct.

There has been a total lack of engagement and information provided to the residents of Burlington on the "New Zoning Bylaw Project" in its entirety; and this "plan" should not move forward without further engagement and consultation with Burlington Residents.

This is a cash grab by the City of Burlington. And this "New Zoning Bylaw Project" has not been mandated as part of the Provincial planning in Ontario.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Caren Burcher

Ward 2