
SUBJECT: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for 1056-1060 Brant Street

TO: Committee of the Whole

FROM: Development and Growth Management
Community Planning

Report Number: DGM-26-26

Wards Affected: 2

Date to Committee: April 14, 2026

Date to Council: April 21, 2026

Recommendation

Refuse the applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments submitted by Bousfields Inc. on behalf of 2735843 ONTARIO INC., 2060188 ONTARIO INC., 2735841 ONTARIO INC., 2059977 ONTARIO INC. proposing an 11-storey residential building with 93 residential units at 1056-1060 Brant Street.

Executive Summary

Purpose of report:

- The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information on the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application that is necessary for proceeding with the Statutory Public Meeting and present a recommendation on the application.
- Planning Staff are recommending refusal of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications at 1056-1060 Brant Street (the “subject lands”) for an 11-storey residential building (plus mechanical penthouse) with 93 residential units.

Key findings:

- The applicants have applied for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment to facilitate the proposed redevelopment of the lands known as 1056 – 1060 Brant Street to permit an 11-storey, 93 unit multiple dwelling. The proposed amendments to the Official Plan designation include increased height to 11-storeys (plus mechanical penthouse) as well as increased Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to 4.5:1 and removal of non-residential space. Additionally, amendments to the Zoning By-law 2020 are required for

the yard abutting Brant Street, South Side Yard, Rear Yard, North Side Yard, setbacks to the parking structure, landscape area abutting the street, amenity area, building height, mechanical penthouse height, floor area ratio, parking rate, the use of a parking stacker, and the dimension of the spaces to be provided within this equipment, the use of a vehicle elevator to access parking garage, and the number and size of bicycle parking.

- Staff are recommending refusal of the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications based on the following:
 - The proposed amendments are not consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement (2024);
 - The proposed amendments do not conform with the Regional Official Plan (2009, as amended) and do not maintain the general intent of the Burlington Official Plan (1997) or Burlington Official Plan (2020);
 - The proposed development does not maintain the general intent of Zoning By-law 2020;
 - Staff is of the opinion that the proposed development does not represent good planning.

RECOMMENDATION:		Refusal	Ward:	2
Application Details	APPLICANT: OWNERS: FILE NUMBERS: TYPE OF APPLICATION: APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL:	Bousfields Inc. 2735843 ONTARIO INC., 2060188 ONTARIO INC., 2735841 ONTARIO INC., 2059977 ONTARIO INC. 505-01/26 and 520-01/26 Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendment 11-storey residential building (plus mechanical penthouse) with 93 residential units		
Property Details	PROPERTY LOCATION: MUNICIPAL ADDRESS: PROPERTY AREA: EXISTING USE:	West of Brant Street, south of interchange with 403/QEW 1056-1060 Brant Street 0.18 ha Vacant		
Documents	1997 OFFICIAL PLAN Existing:	'Mixed Use Corridor – General'		

	<p>1997 OFFICIAL PLAN Proposed:</p> <p>2020 OFFICIAL PLAN Existing:</p> <p>2020 OFFICIAL PLAN Proposed:</p> <p>ZONING Existing:</p> <p>ZONING Proposed:</p>	<p>'Mixed Use Corridor – General' with site specific policies as amended</p> <p>'Urban Corridor'</p> <p>'Urban Corridor' with site specific policies as amended</p> <p>'Mixed Use Corridor – General'</p> <p>'Mixed Use Corridor – General' with site specific exceptions</p>
Processing Details	APPLICATION SUBMITTED:	January 9, 2026
	APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE:	January 21, 2026
	STATUTORY DEADLINE:	May 9, 2026
	PRE-APPLICATION COMMUNITY MEETING:	May 6, 2025
	STATUTORY PUBLIC MEETING:	April 14, 2026
	PUBLIC COMMENTS:	At the time of writing this report, 6 written public comments were received out of 148 notices.

Recommendation Report

Background

On December 18, 2024, a pre-consultation meeting was held for the property at 1056-1060 Brant Street for an 11-storey building with 93 residential units. At the pre-consultation meeting staff provided comments identifying concerns with height, intensity, scale, shadowing, wind impacts, mix of uses, housing options, and rental replacement. The comments provided also identified the list of studies and reports that would be required for a complete application to allow staff to complete a thorough review of the proposal.

The applicants held a pre-application community meeting on May 6, 2025. Concerns from those who attended can be summarized into the following categories: building height and built form impacts, traffic and parking, tenure and affordability, building servicing, loading and access.

The applicants attended the Burlington Urban Design Panel on May 22, 2025, and received feedback from the panel regarding realigning the street-access, parking reductions, opportunities to increase the provision of amenity space, improved transition to adjacent townhouses through step backs and screening,

The applicants engaged in the Pre-Application Technical Review process by submitting material intended to address comments received through the initial concept pre-consultation review. Revisions were made to the plans intended to address feedback received from all the previous engagement opportunities. Some of the issues originally raised by staff were addressed while others remained unresolved and were sent back to the applicants to be considered in future revisions, for example the original submission provided 26 parking spaces and the revised submission offered 68 total parking spaces.

On January 9th, 2026, the applicants submitted an application to the City that was deemed complete on January 21st, 2026. Subsequently, on January 21st, 2026, the City acknowledged that a complete application had been received for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for 1056-1060 Brant Street.

The application requested permissions for a 11-storey (plus mechanical penthouse) residential building with 93 residential units. A total of 68 parking spaces are proposed in an underground parking structure, as well as 51 bicycle parking spaces. A total Gross Floor Area of 7,182 square metres, and FAR of 4.5:1 is proposed. Vehicular access is proposed from Brant Street.

Site Description

The subject property is located west of Brant and south of the interchange with the 403/QEW and is approximately 0.18 hectares in size. The property has approximately 36.68 metres of frontage on Brant Street and the site is currently vacant.

Surrounding uses are as follows:

- North: Service commercial use.
- East: Brant Street, single detached structures, retail / commercial and office uses, and a 4-storey apartment building
- South: Single detached structures.
- West: townhouses and single detached dwellings.

Burlington GO Station is approximately 1.7 km away travelling along Brant Street and Fairview Street. Travelling along Brant Street and Plains Road East allows access to the Burlington GO North Parking Lot, which is located approximately 1 km away from the subject lands.

The closest bus route (2) is located along Brant Street and provides access to the Dundas Street GO Parking Lot via Cavendish; and the Downtown Terminal via Guelph Line

Analysis

Bousfields Inc. has made applications on behalf of 2735843 ONTARIO INC., 2060188 ONTARIO INC., 2735841 ONTARIO INC., 2059977 ONTARIO INC. for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for an 11-storey residential building (plus mechanical penthouse) with 93 residential units.

Planning staff are recommending refusal of the applications based on the following rationale:

- Planning staff are of the opinion that the proposed intensity and scale of the 11-storey residential building (plus mechanical penthouse) exceeds what can be considered appropriate for this site and is therefore considered to be overdevelopment of the site. Concerns regarding overdevelopment relate to the proposed height, scale, setbacks, stepbacks, landscape areas, amenity areas, parking rate, transition to adjacent properties and overall compatibility;
- The proposal does not address staff concerns about the impact the development will have on vehicular travel along Brant Street as a result of anticipated queuing;
- Insufficient justification for parking reduction, and lack of information regarding the functionality of the parking stackers that are proposed;
- Planning staff are of the opinion that the proposed 11-storey building provides an insufficient mix of uses (93 residential units and no non-residential space) which does

not achieve the City's objective of providing a mix of uses throughout the subject designation;

- While staff acknowledge that the subject lands do have redevelopment potential, staff are of the opinion that the proposed 11-storey mid-rise building represents overdevelopment of the site. Staff are unable to modify the proposal due to the significant departure from what staff would consider good planning, as well as the nature of the identified concerns and unresolved planning matters. As such, planning staff is recommending refusal of the application as staff is of the opinion that the proposed development is not consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement (2024); does not conform with the Regional Official Plan (2009, as amended) and does not maintain the general intent of the Burlington Official Plan (1997) or Burlington Official Plan (2020); and, does not maintain the general intent of Zoning By-law 2020. Staff are of the opinion that the proposed development does not represent good planning, which is further outlined in the analysis below and in Appendix D.

Intensity and Scale of Proposal

Planning staff are of the opinion that the proposed intensity and scale of the proposal is not appropriate for this site given the City's vision as described by the policies that apply to the subject lands.

The scale of the proposed development presents challenges with transition to the existing townhouses located west of the subject property. Opportunities to implement transition measures such as setbacks, screening, and plantings are impeded by the proposed build out of the development in its entirety. The underground parking garage is shown to occupy the site to an extent that interferes with the ability to implement transition measures listed above. The proposed built form and the setback relief that is necessary to support what is proposed, does not leave enough space to allow for adjustments to be made. For example, adjusting the location of the building on the site is not a meaningful possibility because there are insufficient setbacks to accommodate shifting the footprint.

This inability to accommodate revisions has complicated efforts that could be otherwise used to provide for elements of the development that are lacking. For example, non-residential space and amenity space are in direct competition with each other for available floor area. There is not enough room in the building to provide for one without eroding the other. Further, the inability to provide more parking associated with non-residential uses also complicates efforts to address staff concerns.

As indicated above, the parking structure maximizes the amount of space available on the site. This provides as much parking as possible, which is further leveraged with the proposed

implementation of parking stackers, to what appears to be the upper limit of the total number of parking spaces. Without adding an additional floor of underground parking, it is the opinion of staff that what has been proposed by the applicants represents the greatest amount of parking spaces that be offered. There are no opportunities to provide more parking, without including another level of underground parking. Considering this, the provision of parking is at a diminished rate that staff cannot support, and there is no opportunity to provide more.

After reviewing all of these issues, Planning staff are of the opinion that the development exceeds what can reasonably be accommodated on-site, and as such staff are not supportive of what is opined to represent overdevelopment.

Transportation Matters

Queueing of Vehicles

The subject property is designed to be accessed by one driveway, directly from Brant Street. The current site design includes a driveway that provides access to the underground parking facility that will employ mechanical parking stackers in order to accommodate the number of parking spaces proposed in one level of underground parking. The impacts of this element of the design have raised technical concerns for staff. Staff are of the opinion that the use of a car elevator and parking stacker system are likely to create a queue for cars waiting to access parking that will back up onto Brant Street. There is insufficient information in the applications to allow staff to determine if concerns surrounding queuing can be addressed.

Proposed Parking Rate

Staff are of the opinion that insufficient onsite parking is being proposed which will have negative unintended consequences. Based on the information contained in the studies submitted with the applications, there is insufficient evidence presented through the Transportation Demand Management measures to support the reduction in parking.

Planning staff considered the use of a holding provision to obtain the additional information required; however, given the culmination of concerns around overdevelopment, the absent mix of uses, limits of the underground garage, queueing and parking deficiencies, staff are recommending refusal of the applications as the aforementioned matters are fundamental to staff support of the amendments.

Mix of Uses

The proposed development consists of residential intensification through the creation of 93 dwelling units (1, 2 and 3-bedroom units). The proponents have not shown any space identified for non-residential use with the development application, a point that planning staff raised during the pre-consultation process. The justification for the absence of non-residential space can be summarized from the Planning Rationale that was prepared by Bousfields Inc. as follows: the vehicle prioritization of Brant Street in its current state does not lend to the kind

of pedestrian traffic that commercial and service commercial uses depend on. While staff can appreciate that the current cross section of Brant Street may not currently be conducive to encouraging foot traffic, Planning staff are of the opinion that this can and must be achieved in order to support the level of intensity proposed by the redevelopment.

Additionally, Staff are of the opinion that redevelopment at the intensity proposed must provide the opportunity for an activated street and neighbourhood conveniences as envisioned by the mixed-use activity areas. Staff have considered the site and proposed built form and are unable to propose modifications that offer the opportunity to redesign the site to include a non-residential use and the required parking associated with it. This furthers the opinion of staff that the proposed built form represents overdevelopment for the subject lands.

Option 1 – Refusal (recommended by staff)

Planning staff have identified a list of concerns fundamental to staff's analysis on the proposed amendments ultimately requiring further revisions or justification therefore, Planning staff are of the opinion that a refusal is most appropriate as the applications as submitted, do not represent good planning.

A refusal decision could be appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) by the applicants.

Option 2 – Deferral (not recommended by staff)

Planning staff have identified a list of concerns fundamental to staff's analysis on the proposed amendments ultimately that require further revision or justification. Planning staff would be looking for a revised development concept which addresses the concerns in this report, inclusive of revised supporting materials and studies. Revisions to the development concept and supporting materials would be subject to subsequent review by staff.

A deferral would extend the processing of the application beyond the 120-day timeline to make a decision (May 9, 2026). After May 9, 2026, if Council had not made a decision on the applications, the applicants could appeal the non-decision of the applications to the OLT, without the benefit of a position on the applications from City Council.

Option 3 – Approval (not recommended by staff)

Council could approve the application as is or with modifications. Planning staff do not support the current proposal for the reasons outlined in this report and do not have sufficient studies or reports to recommend a modified proposal. In staff's opinion, the proposed deviations from the performance standards are too significant to allow staff to recommend an appropriate modified approval.

Technical Review

The applications were circulated to internal staff and external agencies on January 19, 2026, for review. The following are summaries of the comments received:

City of Burlington – Finance – Finance Staff requests as a condition of development that, “taxes must be paid on parcels associated with this file. This includes all outstanding balances plus current year taxes that have been billed but not yet due.”

City of Burlington – Development Engineering – Development Engineering Staff have no objections to the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.

City of Burlington – Urban Forestry and Landscaping – Urban Forestry and Landscaping staff have offered the following:

Removal and/or injury (MPTZ) of trees on neighbouring properties, or that are located on a shared property line (boundary trees) will require consent from the adjoining and/or adjacent owner(s).

- Where impacts are proposed (i.e., encroachment / injury) to neighboring and/or boundary trees the adjoining and/or adjacent owner(s) shall be consulted and made aware of the proposed development and potential impacts to their trees and/or boundary trees and the applicant shall submit a document in writing from adjoining and/or adjacent owner(s) that there are no concerns with the proposal for those trees, or the applicant’s qualified tree professional address the potential impacts to the neighbor’s trees and/or boundary trees and provide an attestation in the Arborist Report that the impacts proposed will not be a detriment to the trees, and they will remain in healthy condition. Information in the report shall also include the preservation methods, including pruning and fertilizing, that can be implemented by the owner to ensure the health of trees on neighboring properties.
- Impacts to more than 25% of MPTZ of shared and/or neighbouring trees require root exploration exercise to determine if trees will survive construction impacts. Finding to be presented to neighbouring property owners for consent to impact (injure/removal) the tree(s).
- If consent to injure or remove neighbouring trees is not provided with the OPA/ZBA submission, this application may result in Landscape’s non-support and be subject to holding provisions.
- If permissions to injure or remove trees are not granted by the adjacent homeowner, building setbacks may have to be adjusted to prevent injury to the MPTZ's of the neighbouring/shared trees.

Any impacts to City-owned trees or neighboring/boundary trees must be addressed within the OPA/ZBA submission or the application may result in Landscape’s non-support and be

subject to holding provisions.

City of Burlington – Parks and Open Space – Parks Staff wishes to collect cash in lieu of parkland (CILP), with CILP charged at the rate in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

City of Burlington – Transportation Planning – Transportation Staff are unable to provide support the Zoning By-law Amendment to provide for a reduction to the on-site parking rate or the use of a parking stacker based on the deficiencies in the information submitted with the application.

City of Burlington – Heritage Planning – No comments or concerns.

City of Burlington – Zoning – Amendments required to the Zoning By-law have been identified.

Halton Region – Halton Region Staff have requested a revised Functional Servicing Report to address discrepancies concerning the dimensions of the sanitary sewer along Brant Street; updates to the Waste Management Report and revisions to allow site to be eligible for Regional Waste collection; revisions to allow for the additional Right of Way to an ultimate deemed width of 47m be conveyed to the Region; revisions that address the discrepancies within the plans as identified.

Halton Police – No concerns with the applications as it does not interfere with the line-of-sight radio system.

Halton Catholic District School Board – No objections to the application. In terms of school accommodation, if the residential development were to proceed today, elementary students generated from the development would be accommodated at St. Gabriel CES located at 2227 Parkway Drive. Secondary school students would be directed to Notre Dame CSS located at 2333 Headon Forest Drive. Staff require conditions to be placed in subsequent agreements (e.g. Subdivision, Condominium, and Site Plan) and are to be fulfilled prior to final approval.

Halton District School Board – No objections to the application. Staff provided an overview of the potential impact of this development application on student accommodation needs as well as conditions to be placed in subsequent agreements (e.g. Subdivision, Condominium, and Site Plan) and are to be fulfilled prior to final approval.

Conservation Halton (CH) – No comments. Conservation Halton does not regulate the subject lands and given the small size would defer stormwater management review to the City.

Burlington Hydro – Staff have indicated that the proposed driveway may be in close proximity or conflicting with an existing hydro pole. The developer needs to submit plans showing existing assets based on survey and if in-conflict. The developer will need to reach out to BHI for relocation or other arrangements.

Burlington Sustainable Development Committee – The Sustainable Development Committee has indicated that the proposed development would be further enhanced by addressing issues such as: lack of safer and sufficient bicycle parking, the provisions of EV chargers or infrastructure which allows for retrofits, including transit passes or establishing car-sharing services, rainwater collection and on-site re-use, ensuring that effective recycling and waste facilities are established on-site.

Imperial Infrastructure – No comments.

Rogers Communications – No comments or concerns.

Sun-Canadian Pipeline – No comments.

Metrolinx – No comments or concerns.

Ministry of Transportation – MTO is supportive of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments in principle given the distance from MTO infrastructure.

Indigenous Consultation

The following are summaries of the comments received:

Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council – request that consideration be made for tree compensation at a rate of 10:1, bird and light friendly design, and landscaping that does not include invasive species, the installation of pollinator friendly plantings and the use green roofs on-site.

Mississauga of the Credit First Nation – request that a stage 1 archaeological report be completed for the subject lands.

Recommendation Details

- The proposed amendments are not consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement (2024);
 - The proposed amendments do not conform to the general intent of the Regional Official Plan (2009, as amended);
 - The proposed amendments do not conform to the general intent of the Burlington Official Plan (1997) and do not have appropriate regard for Burlington Official Plan (2020); and,
 - The proposed development does not maintain the general intent of Zoning By-law 2020
-

Key Dates & Milestones

- Pre-application Community Meeting: May 6, 2025
 - Burlington Urban Design Meeting: May 6, 2025
 - Application submitted: January 9, 2026
 - Application deemed complete: January 21, 2026
 - Statutory public meeting: April 14, 2026
 - Statutory deadline: May 9, 2026
-

Implications

Financial

All application fees have been received in accordance with the Development Application Fee Schedule.

Climate

In February 2020, City Council approved the City of Burlington Climate Action Plan to support the City's path towards a low-carbon future, focusing on mitigating greenhouse gases and reducing energy consumption. The Plan identifies seven implementation programs, including programs to enhance energy performance for new and existing buildings; increase transit and active transportation mode shares; encourage the adoption of electric mobility and equipment through personal and commercial vehicles and other currently gas-powered equipment; and support waste reduction and diversion.

As part of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment application, the applicant was required to provide consideration to the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines (2018) which provide an overview of the required and encouraged sustainable design

measures for new development across the City. The applicant submitted a Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines Checklist which includes consideration to the guidelines.

A detailed review of the Sustainable Building guidelines has been included under Appendix D – Detailed Policy Analysis. Staff are of the opinion the proposed development does not comply with the required Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines and therefore the development does not consider the City of Burlington Climate Action Plan to support the City’s climate considerations. Staff acknowledge the applicant has identified that the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines will be addressed at Site Plan, however, the applicant has proposed a largely hardscaped site with few opportunities for vegetation and trees. Sustainable design elements such as percentage of landscaping are appropriately dealt with in the zoning by-law through applicable zoning by-law provisions. As such, this issue should be addressed at the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment stage to ensure that space is available on-site for vegetation and that the site isn’t being overdeveloped.

Engagement Matters

Notice signs were posted on the subject lands on February 13, 2026. A public notice of the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application was mailed to 148 addresses, which includes all property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands.

A webpage was created on the City of Burlington website, accessible at www.burlington.ca/1056brant. This webpage provides information about the subject application including dates of public meetings, links to supporting studies, and contact information for the applicant’s representative and Community Planning Department.

As of the writing of this report, 6 written public comments have been received by staff with respect to the subject application in objection to the proposal. The public comments received to date have been included under Appendix C – Public Comments. The letters received represent positions of opposition regarding the following themes:

Public Comment Theme	Staff Response
Built Form and Massing	The applicants submitted an Urban Design Brief prepared by Bousfields Inc. dated December 2025. Figures 9 through 12 show the height and massing of the proposed development. Planning Staff have reviewed the built form and setbacks in terms of the intent of the Mid-Rise Building Guidelines, and staff have considered impact on the neighbourhood with respect to transition opportunities and setbacks which present constraints that preclude opportunities to alter

	the built form or its footprint. Planning staff share the concerns that the proposal is not appropriate for the area, for the reasons offered in this report and the appendix.
Insufficient amenity space	Planning staff have considered the subject lands, and the built form that has been brought forward, and access to existing open spaces. The outcome of the review is that planning staff are of the opinion that the amenity space as proposed is insufficient to meet the needs of residents.
Design is not appropriately transit supportive, and concerns over increased traffic.	Transportation staff from the City and the Region have reviewed the proposal and have raised concerns regarding the reduced parking rate, the measures presented in the TDM, the inability to provide the Road Widening identified in the Region's Transportation Master Plan, and the potential for vehicle queuing onto Brant Street.
Lack of clear benefit to the existing community presented in Planning Brief	While benefits to the existing community are not addressed directly through policy or zoning regulations, planning staff interpret this comment to apply to the inclusion of additional uses that would be accessible to the existing community as well as the new residents moving into subject development. Staff are not satisfied with the proposed removal of non-residential uses from the subject proposal.

References

The applicant has submitted the following materials in support of the subject applications:

- [A completed application form for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications on the subject site;](#)
- [The Planning and Urban Design Rationale, including Comments and responses to the Burlington Urban Design Panel, Public Consultation Strategy, Housing Analysis, Urban](#)

Design Brief and Response to Comments Received at a Community Meeting, prepared by Bousfields dated December 2025;

- The Boundary and Topographic Survey, prepared by MMP Land Surveyors and Mappers dated June 16, 2023;
- The Architectural Plans, including the Conceptual Site Plan Layout, and Waste Management Plan prepared by WZMH Architects dated December 17, 2025;
- The Shadow Study, prepared by Bousfields dated April 2025;
- The Wind Impact Study, prepared by Gradient Wind dated October 1, 2025;
- The Arborist Report, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting dated October 22, 2025;
- The Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting dated May 12, 2025;
- The Landscape Plan, prepared by PMA Landscape Architects dated December 19, 2025;
- The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Counterpoint Land Development dated December 1 2025;
- The Site Grading Plan, prepared by Counterpoint Land Development dated December 22, 2025;
- The Site Servicing Plan, prepared by Counterpoint Land Development dated December 22, 2025;
- The Transportation Impact Study, including the Parking Justification Report, prepared by LEA Consulting dated October 2025;
- The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by EXP dated April 7, 2025;
- The Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by EXP dated April 3, 2025;
- The Noise Feasibility Study, prepared by HGC Acoustics dated December 11, 2025;
- The Geotechnical Report, prepared by EXP dated March 18, 2025;
- The Hydrogeological Report, prepared by EXP dated March 13, 2025;
- The Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines Checklist, prepared by Bousfields dated December 5, 2025;
- The Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire (signed and commissioned);
- The draft Official Plan Amendment, prepared by Bousfields;
- The draft Zoning By-law Amendment, prepared by Bousfields;
- The Air Quality Assessment prepared by RWDI dated October 14, 2025;
- City-issued minutes of the Burlington Urban Design Panel;
- Road Widening documents, including surveyors sketch confirming the centreline of the road prepared by MMP Surveyors and Mappers dated December 11, 2025;
- Comment Response Matrix, dated December 22, 2025; and
- A copy of the Pre-application Consultation Minutes and submission checklist;

The supporting documents have been uploaded on the City's website for the subject application which can be found on the following link www.burlington.ca/1056Brant

Conclusion

Planning staff are of the opinion that the proposed development represents overdevelopment of the subject lands.

Opportunities to revise the proposal are precluded by the scale and massing of what is proposed, efforts to amend the proposal and provide for one solution create new issues elsewhere.

Therefore, it is the opinion of Planning staff that the proposed amendments are not consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement (2024); the proposed amendments do not conform with the general intent of the Regional Official Plan (2009, as amended) and do not maintain the general intent of the Burlington Official Plan (1997) or Burlington Official Plan (2020); the proposed development does not maintain the general intent of Zoning By-law 2020; as such, staff is of the opinion that the proposed development does not represent good planning and should be refused.

Strategic Alignment

- Designing and delivering complete communities
 - Providing the best services and experiences
 - Protecting and improving the natural environment and taking action on climate change
 - Driving organizational performance
-

Author:

Benjamin Kissner, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner, Community Planning Department
905-335-7600 Ext. 7913
Benjamin.Kissner@burlington.ca

Appendices:

- A. Existing Zoning
- B. Concept Plan
- C. Public Comments
- D. Detailed Policy Analysis

Draft By-laws for Approval at Council:

- Not applicable as staff are recommending refusal of applications.

Notifications:

Bousfields Inc.
c/o David Falletta
416-947-9744 ext. 407
dfalletta@bousfields.ca

Report Approval:

All reports are reviewed and approved by the Commissioner, Head of Corporate Affairs, Chief Financial Officer, and Commissioner of Legal and Legislative Services/City Solicitor.