

## ROPA 48 – Prescribed Agency Submission Response Document

**Staff Analysis of Comments Received from Prescribed Agencies on Draft ROPA 48 – “An Amendment to implement components of the Regional Urban Structure to establish a hierarchy of strategic growth areas in the Regional Official Plan” Received February 16, 2021 to June 23, 2021.**

### Overview

This document provides responses to written submissions received by Halton Region on Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) No. 48 from February 16, 2020 to June 23, 2021

The document is organized into three columns: ‘Source’, ‘Submission’, and ‘Response’.

The submissions are organized chronologically.

### Index of Submissions

No.	Commenter	Date Received	Page
1	Town of Oakville	March 21, 2021	3
2	City of Mississauga	March 22, 2021	16
3	Conseil Scolaire Viamonde	March 26, 2021	16
4	Conservation Halton	April 7, 2021	16
5	Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)	April 7, 2021	17
6	Credit Valley Conservation	April 13, 2021	17
7	City of Hamilton	April 19, 2021	18
8	Town of Halton Hills	May 10, 2021	18
9	Town of Oakville	May 10, 2021	29
10	Town of Milton	May 12, 2021	41
11	City of Burlington	May 12, 2021	49
12	City of Brampton	May 17, 2021	86
13	Region of Peel	May 21, 2021	87
14	Halton District School Board	May 31, 2021	88

No.	Commenter	Date Received	Page
15	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	June 7, 2021	96
16	Halton District School Board	June 16, 2021	105
17	Halton Catholic District School Board	June 18, 2021	107

## Submissions & Responses

No.	Source	Submission	Response
1	Town of Oakville	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review - Draft Regional Plan Amendment 48 - An Amendment to Define a Regional Structure</i> dated March 9, 2021, be received.</li> <li>2. That the report titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review - Draft Regional Plan Amendment 48 - An Amendment to Define a Regional Structure</i> dated March 9, 2021, be submitted to Halton Region as part of the statutory process for ROPA 48 and the Regional Official Plan Review.</li> <li>3. That the report titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review - Draft Regional Plan Amendment 48 - An Amendment to Define a Regional Structure</i> dated March 9, 2021, be forwarded for information to the City of Burlington, the Town of Halton Hills, the Town of Milton, Credit Valley Conservation, Grand River Conservation Authority and Conservation Halton.</li> </ol> <p><b>KEY FACTS:</b></p> <p>The following are key points for consideration with respect to this report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase 2 of Halton's Regional Official Plan Review is underway and involves research, technical analyses and community engagement around key themes.</li> <li>• The key theme of growth management and urban systems is focused on how and where to direct population and job growth that is required to achieve conformity with the province's 2019 Growth Plan, as amended.</li> <li>• Intensification is a vital component of growth management for Halton Region and its local Municipalities, including Oakville.</li> <li>• Regional staff has prepared a Regional Official Plan Amendment under Section 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i> that will advance certain strategic local municipal planning priorities related to urban structure.</li> <li>• Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 helps define and provide direction on elements of the urban structure including Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, Regional Nodes and employment areas.</li> <li>• An official plan amendment (or a new official plan) initiated by an upper-tier municipality (or single-tier) under section 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i> that comprehensively applies the policies and schedules of 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, is known as a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR).</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This report presents an overview of draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 and provides detailed comments from Town of Oakville staff.</li> </ul> <p><b>BACKGROUND:</b> The Regional Official Plan Review (ROPR) is being undertaken in partnership with its local Municipalities of Oakville, Burlington, Halton Hills and Milton and within the context of the provincial policy framework, which is based on the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended.</p> <p>The 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, requires the accommodation of forecasted population and job growth, is focused on the development of complete communities and involves the integration of climate change considerations into growth management and planning decisions.</p> <p>Halton Region is planned to 2031 as a result of the last ROPR. The 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, now requires that the region plan for an additional 20 years to 2051, which consists of accommodating a total population of 1.1 million and total jobs of 500,000. In broad terms, the required growth to be accommodated in the region to 2051 is nearly equal to the combined population and employment of today's Oakville and Burlington.</p> <p>The ROPR is examining several key themes including climate change, natural heritage, rural and agricultural systems, growth management and urban systems. At present in the ROPR, there is an emphasis on planning to accommodate required growth within the urban area and with the majority of growth directed to an urban structure, which is described as follows:</p> <p><i>"An urban structure is how the land use of a city or town is set out. It helps further the growth within our community by providing a way to guide the development of buildings, spaces or municipal infrastructure. An urban structure can consist of growth areas, employment areas, stable residential areas, and the transportation and growth corridors that connect these areas."</i></p> <p>Numerous regional reports and initiatives have supported the concepts and dialog around a Regional Urban Structure involving Regional Council, Oakville Council, and the public as well as local and regional staff.</p> <p><b>Report No. LPS56-20 - July 2020</b></p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Regional Council authorized the release of the Regional Urban Structure Discussion Paper for public consultation. The discussion paper explored elements of a Regional Urban Structure for accommodating growth and intensification in Halton, aligned to local plans and priorities.</p> <p>The discussion paper also described requirements of the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, to be addressed through the ROPR including implementing Urban Growth Centres (UGCs), Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs), Corridors and other potential strategic growth areas that were identified through local urban structures, as well as consideration for employment areas and employment conversions.</p> <p>The discussion paper recognized a hierarchy of strategic growth areas to accommodate intensification and transit supportive growth.</p> <p>At their meeting of September 8, 2020, Planning and Development Council received the report titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review – Regional Discussion Papers</i>, which provided and overview of the Regional Urban Structure Discussion Paper as well as the Climate Change, Natural Heritage, Rural and Agricultural System and the North Aldershot Planning Area Discussion Papers.</p> <p><b>Report No. LPS84-20 - September 2020</b></p> <p>Regional Council directed regional staff to prepare an initial scoped ROPA, under Section 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i> that would advance certain local municipal planning priorities related to urban structure as presented in the Regional Urban Structure Discussion Paper.</p> <p>The report identified local priorities such as boundary and policy changes to UGCs, delineation and assignment of density targets for MTSAs, identification of additional growth nodes and strategic growth corridors with a corresponding policy framework as well as limited employment conversions to be considered in the ROPA.</p> <p>LPS84-20 contained a letter from the province dated November 2019 confirming that municipalities could advance multiple official plan amendments to achieve a phased approach to its municipal comprehensive review.</p> <p><b>Report No. LPS17-21 – February 2021</b></p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Regional staff prepared draft ROPA 48 which identifies elements of a Regional Urban Structure to support strategic local municipal land use plans and priorities.</p> <p>The draft ROPA 48 proposes direction on implementing urban structure elements such as UGCs, MTSAs, Regional Nodes, and certain strategic employment conversions by removing lands from the Regional Employment Area.</p> <p>The draft ROPA 48 may be viewed as part of the Regional Council Meeting Agenda for February 17, 2021, as Attachment #1 to LPS17-21 at this link:  <a href="https://edmweb.halton.ca/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Meetings/ViewMeeting?id=4196&amp;doctype=1">https://edmweb.halton.ca/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Meetings/ViewMeeting?id=4196&amp;doctype=1</a></p> <p>At their meeting of February 17, 2021, Regional Council authorized regional staff to release draft ROPA 48 for public engagement and to initiate the statutory public process required by the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p> <p>Regional staff circulated Report No. LPS17-21 and the draft ROPA 48 to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as required under the <i>Planning Act</i>. In addition the report and draft ROPA 48 was circulated to the City of Burlington, the Town of Halton Hills, the Town of Milton, the Town of Oakville, Conservation Halton, Credit Valley Conservation and Grand River Conservation for comment.</p> <p>Given that draft ROPA 48 is part of a municipal comprehensive review as provided for in Section 26 of the Planning Act, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will be the approval authority for this amendment to the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>In addition to adopting the recommendations of Report No. LPS17-21. Regional Council adopted additional recommendations that had the effect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding additional lands in the Town of Milton to be considered by ROPA 48, namely portions of the Agerton and Milton Education Villages lands;</li> <li>• Requesting regional staff to consider a policy to permit adjusting population and employment ratios outside of an MCR to provide flexibility and responsiveness to changes in the market around the nature of employment and the success of mixed use nodes; and</li> <li>• Requesting regional staff to consider local input in defining growth node policies and that regional staff comment how growth nodes contribute to</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>higher density employment and how this is factored into the land needs for employment forecasts.</p> <p><b>COMMENT/OPTIONS:</b></p> <p><b>Oakville's Official Plan Review and Town-Wide Urban Structure</b></p> <p>The Town of Oakville, like Halton, is also planned to 2031 by way of Livable Oakville. As part of the town's ongoing Official Plan Review, underway since May 2015, a significant amount of work has been undertaken including a number of planning studies completed and resulting in amendments to the town's Official Plan.</p> <p>A number of additional studies have been initiated and are currently underway. A key component for Oakville is the town-wide urban structure established for Livable Oakville, which was recently updated and approved by the region through Official Plan Amendment No. 15. Oakville's town-wide urban structure is intended to accommodate required growth to 2041 and beyond and has the following goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect the natural heritage system and cultural heritage resources</li> <li>• Maintain the character of established areas</li> <li>• Direct the majority of required growth to an interconnected system of nodes and corridors supported by public transit.</li> <li>• Other key components of the town's Official Plan Review are the area specific studies to implement Oakville's town-wide urban structure including the Hospital District, the North West Area and Palermo Village, Bronte GO Major Transit Station Area and Midtown Oakville.</li> </ul> <p>Through the town's Official Plan Review, it is well positioned to feed into the current ROPR in the form of study results and planning decisions by Oakville Council.</p> <p>Another benefit of all the work completed through the town's Official Plan Review is that it is well positioned to respond to what the region is proposing in draft ROPA 48.</p> <p><b>Context for Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48</b></p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Using the staged approach confirmed by the province, draft ROPA 48 proposes to advance local plans and priorities supported by studies and initiatives undertaken by the local Municipalities, ahead of the conclusion of the MCR.</p> <p>Town staff notes that the draft of ROPA 48 has evolved positively in response to discussion and comments back and forth at the staff level. While this is indicative of the region's collaborative approach and a credit to good working relationships, town staff have identified some areas of the draft ROPA 48 that would benefit from further refinements.</p> <p>The matter of where future growth will be accommodated is being addressed as part of the region's MCR through the Integrated Growth Management Strategy (IGMS).</p> <p>The IGMS is the project to establish where and how Halton will accommodate required population and employment growth to 2051, not only within a Regional Urban Structure but also to include possible settlement area boundary expansions.</p> <p>The IGMS is at a stage where four Growth Concepts have been developed and presented in a Discussion Paper. Regional Council authorized the release of this paper under the cover of Regional Report No. LPS18-21 at their meeting of February 17, 2021.</p> <p>The Town of Oakville staff report on these matters is found elsewhere on tonight's agenda and is titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review - Growth Concepts Discussion Paper - Integrated Growth Management Strategy</i>. Regional staff confirmed the approach that moving forward with the draft ROPA 48 would not compromise the ability of Regional Council to comprehensively and objectively evaluate the full range of growth concepts associated with the Integrated Growth Management and a subsequent Regional Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Regional staff state that in addition to developing an updated Regional Urban Structure, the draft ROPA 48 also intends to implement non-discretionary and strategic elements required to achieve conformity to the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended. Town staff shares this opinion for portions of draft ROPA 48 but recommend further modifications that are discussed below with additional town staff opinion provided where appropriate.</p>	



No.	Source	Submission	Response										
		<p><b><i>Regional Urban Structure and Hierarchy</i></b></p> <p>A Regional Urban Structure is proposed, consisting of Strategic Growth Areas (SGAs), Regional Employment Areas, Built-Up Areas, and Designated Greenfield Area. These features are shown in proposed Map 1H in Appendix A.</p> <p>The Regional SGAs and their Oakville equivalents, as appropriate, are listed in the table below. The hierarchy is from most intense to least intense:</p> <table><tr><th>Region of Halton SGAs</th><th>Town of Oakville Equivalent SGAs</th></tr><tr><td>Urban Growth Centre (UGC)</td><td>Midtown Oakville UGC</td></tr><tr><td>Major Transit Station Area (MTSA)</td><td>Bronte GO MTSA</td></tr><tr><td>Primary Regional Node</td><td>Uptown Core Hospital District Palermo Village</td></tr><tr><td>Secondary Regional Node</td><td>Neyagawa Urban Core Kerr Village Bronte Village Downtown Oakville</td></tr></table> <p>Regional Corridors are important elements also found in Oakville's town-wide urban structure of nodes and corridors and the region is proposing to address the mapping and policies for these elements at a later stage of the MCR.</p> <p>Additional elements of the Regional Urban Structure are proposed in the draft ROPA but are not represented in Oakville's town-wide urban structure. These elements include Proposed Major Transit Station Areas and Local Nodes.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff has reviewed the Regional Urban Structure elements of draft ROPA 48 and are of the opinion that it is consistent with Town of Oakville Official Plan Amendment 15. This includes the policies and process for adding new SGAs to the Region and Town's respective urban structures.</p> <p>Draft ROPA 48 proposes defined boundaries for MTSAs including the boundary for the Bronte GO MTSA as shown in Appendix B, which contains Proposed Map 6f - Bronte GO MTSA</p>	Region of Halton SGAs	Town of Oakville Equivalent SGAs	Urban Growth Centre (UGC)	Midtown Oakville UGC	Major Transit Station Area (MTSA)	Bronte GO MTSA	Primary Regional Node	Uptown Core Hospital District Palermo Village	Secondary Regional Node	Neyagawa Urban Core Kerr Village Bronte Village Downtown Oakville	
Region of Halton SGAs	Town of Oakville Equivalent SGAs												
Urban Growth Centre (UGC)	Midtown Oakville UGC												
Major Transit Station Area (MTSA)	Bronte GO MTSA												
Primary Regional Node	Uptown Core Hospital District Palermo Village												
Secondary Regional Node	Neyagawa Urban Core Kerr Village Bronte Village Downtown Oakville												

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff has reviewed the proposed boundary for Bronte GO MTSA and has no concerns since it consistent with the results of the town's Bronte GO MTSA Study.</p> <p>However, Appendix B shows only the partial removal of the Regional Employment Area overlay from lands within the MTSA boundary.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff is of the opinion that the entire MTSA area should be removed from the region's employment overlay in draft ROPA 48. This would be appropriate since it reflects the town's priorities, provides local flexibility to develop a mixed use node and would be the consistent with local Official Plan Amendments being advanced in the town's Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the previous, regional staff indicate that the balance of the Bronte GO MTSA lands will be removed from the Regional Employment Area overlay following the completion of the MCR.</p> <p>In addition, minor boundary adjustment are being proposed for Midtown Oakville UGC/MTSA by removing the MTO lands around the QEW interchanges and removing the Regional Natural Heritage System on the west side of the SGA.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff has reviewed the proposed boundary for the Midtown Oakville UGC/MTSA and has no concerns since it consistent with the results of the town's Midtown Oakville Growth Area Review.</p> <p><b>2051 Growth Forecasts</b></p> <p>Draft ROPA 48 updates Table 1 in the Region's Official Plan to incorporate the revised growth forecasts from the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended. For Halton, this is a population of 1,100,000 and 500,000 jobs to the year 2051. Distribution of the 2051 population and employment forecasts to the local Municipalities will be determined through the IGMS and the MCR.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff has no concerns with this item in the draft ROPA.</p> <p><b>2051 Growth Targets</b></p> <p>Draft ROPA 48 introduces a new Table 2b, which contains for certain SGAs, minimum density targets and target proportions of residents and jobs, as shown in the table below.</p>	<p>Please see Regional staff's comments on this matter addressed in the response to Town of Oakville's May 20, 2021 staff report</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response																												
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Strategic Growth Areas</th><th>Minimum Density Target (Residents and Jobs per hectare)</th><th colspan="2">Target Proportion of Residents &amp; Jobs</th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th></th><th>Residents</th><th>Jobs</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Midtown Oakville UGC</td><td>200</td><td>65%</td><td>35%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Bronte GO MTSA</td><td>150</td><td>40%</td><td>60%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Uptown Core</td><td>n/a</td><td>85%</td><td>15%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hospital District</td><td>n/a</td><td>40%</td><td>60%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Palermo Village</td><td>n/a</td><td>60%</td><td>40%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Minimum Density Targets for the remaining SGAs will be approved by the Region based on work completed by the local Municipalities.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff has no concerns with the Minimum Density Targets proposed for UGCs and MTSAs since these are required by the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, and are considered non-discretionary. Staff also supports the approach of allowing the Minimum Density Targets for other SGA's established as required by the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, to be informed by work conducted at the local level. However, town staff has concerns with the proposed Target Proportion of Residents &amp; Jobs and is of the opinion that these targets should be removed from draft ROPA 48.</p> <p>Town staff has reviewed the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, and companion provincial planning documents and do not see a requirement for target proportions of residents and jobs planned to be achieved within SGAs. In this regard, town staff is of the opinion that target proportions appear to be a discretionary policy introduced by the region.</p> <p>Further, while the target proportions for SGAs have been described as "aspirational", the companion draft policies for implementing planning for employment uses within SGAs are proposed as "requirements". This is discussed later in the report.</p> <p>Consistent with past comments, town staff supports retaining and accommodating employment opportunities in SGAs but remains concerned that the target proportion approach creates uncertainty and raises questions and challenges regarding implementation. For example:</p>	Strategic Growth Areas	Minimum Density Target (Residents and Jobs per hectare)	Target Proportion of Residents & Jobs				Residents	Jobs	Midtown Oakville UGC	200	65%	35%	Bronte GO MTSA	150	40%	60%	Uptown Core	n/a	85%	15%	Hospital District	n/a	40%	60%	Palermo Village	n/a	60%	40%	<p>Given the importance of accommodating employment growth in SGAs to the Region's growth strategy, a target proportion of residents and jobs in Table 2b is maintained in ROPA 48. However, Table 2b is revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify the general nature of the target (through the addition of the word 'General' and through the addition of the tilde (~) symbol which is commonly read as 'approximately');</li> <li>update the targets for specific SGAs based on local feedback (Milton UGC, Palermo Village) and/or to achieve a greater level of consistency across the SGAs and to reflect the more general nature of the targets (Aldershot, Acton, etc.);</li> <li>add a footnote to reinforce the general / long-term / aspirational nature of the target and the latitude for refinements to it through a local process, consistent with Section 55.3, which has also been revised to clarify the</li> </ul>
Strategic Growth Areas	Minimum Density Target (Residents and Jobs per hectare)	Target Proportion of Residents & Jobs																													
		Residents	Jobs																												
Midtown Oakville UGC	200	65%	35%																												
Bronte GO MTSA	150	40%	60%																												
Uptown Core	n/a	85%	15%																												
Hospital District	n/a	40%	60%																												
Palermo Village	n/a	60%	40%																												

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a target proportion to be achieved over time within a SGA?</li> <li>• Or will each individual development application require a target proportion?</li> <li>• How is a target proportion to be achieved among disparate landowners with different aspirations?</li> <li>• Across the SGA, which landowner gets to develop the residential proportion after</li> <li>• the employment is achieved? And vice-versa?</li> <li>• How is a ratio required within a mixed-use building?</li> <li>• Could underachievement of a target proportion be used to deny planning approvals even if a development application conformed to the land use policies?</li> <li>• How will the region monitor the target proportion since it will be a requirement of the Regional Official Plan?</li> </ul> <p>Town staff supports mixed use development due to the synergies created between the uses that locate in these areas. For example, mixed use areas that permit residential uses will attract better employers and better jobs. Likewise, higher density mixed use areas will produce more jobs and greater employment densities.</p> <p><b>2051 Growth Targets – Oakville's Strategic Growth Areas</b></p> <p>In the event that target proportions for SGAs are introduced into the Regional Official Plan through ROPA 48, town staff could accept the targets for Midtown Oakville UGC, Bronte GO MTSA, Uptown Core and the Hospital District SGAs. However, town staff does have concerns with the target proportion for Palermo Village, specifically the jobs rate of 40% is far too high. The proposed target in draft ROPA 48 is based on outdated information in the Livable Oakville Plan from 2009, a time when the Palermo Village growth area consisted only of lands south of Dundas Street West.</p> <p>Since then, development in Palermo Village has followed a different track and planning for the area has evolved such that Palermo Village now includes lands north of Dundas Street West. Further detail can be found in the report for the new Palermo Village SGA which is the subject of a local Official Plan Amendment scheduled to be recommended for adoption by Town Council on March 22, 2021.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Palermo Village lands north of Dundas Street West have been under appeal for many years. Both Region and Town's Official Plans are not in full force and effect in this area. Because of these</p>	<p>implementation of the general target in Table 2b through local planning processes.</p> <p>In terms of Section 79.3(13), the detailed directions in Draft ROPA 48 have been replaced with more general direction that allows for more flexibility in local implementation. This includes the removal of requirements related to specific development criteria or policy approaches..</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>appeals, it is the opinion of Town staff that these lands are not located within the Regional Employment Area and therefore the town's recommended plan for a mixed use node on these lands does not constitute an employment conversion. This further supports assigning a much lower target proportion for jobs in Palermo Village, if there is to be any target.</p> <p>The recommended plan for Palermo Village has a much higher proportion of residential uses as well as a substantial number of public service facilities and community amenities including a transit terminal, library and community centre and parks and open space. While employment opportunities will be encouraged, the amount of employment that can be generated in the plan for Palermo Village will be limited.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff are of the opinion that the target proportion proposed in draft ROPA 48 for Palermo Village does not reflect Oakville's current plans and priorities and are requesting the opportunity to work with regional staff to establish an appropriate target proportion to be included in Table 2b.</p> <p><b><i>Planning for Employment Uses within Strategic Growth Areas</i></b></p> <p>The region is proposing a series of policy requirements for the local municipalities in order to plan for employment uses in certain SGAs. These are excerpted in Appendix C.</p> <p>As mentioned, town staff supports retaining and accommodating employment opportunities in SGAs, this is a requirement of Policy 2.2.5.14 from the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, which states:</p> <p><i>"Outside of employment areas, development criteria should be established to ensure that the redevelopment of any employment lands will retain space for a similar number of jobs to remain accommodated on site"</i></p> <p>The region proposes this concept in draft ROPA 48, as follows: <i>"Policy 79.3 (13) a) establishing development criteria to ensure that the <b>site-specific</b> redevelopment of any employment lands retains space for a similar number of jobs to remain accommodated on site" (emphasis added)</i></p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff does not support the introduction of the term "site specific" to the policy; it alters the intent and gives the appearance of discretionary policy introduced by the region to draft ROPA 48.</p>	<p>Table 2b has been updated as described above and now contains a general target proportion of residents and jobs of 85% and 15% respectively.</p>



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>policy to develop a strategy for redress in the case of a deficit or a deviation from achieving those planning goals related to the balance of population and employment.</p> <p><b>Draft ROPA 48 Timing and Next Steps</b> Regional Council will be notified when dates for the Open House/Public Information Centre and statutory public meeting have been confirmed. Public notification of these engagement opportunities will be provided through the Region's website, newspaper advertisements, mailing lists, social media, stakeholder groups, and other means.</p> <p>Town staff anticipates that the earliest opportunity for a Statutory Public Meeting on Draft ROPA 48 will be June 2021.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS:</b> Town staff will continue to engage in the ROPR process to improve alignment among the parties and to focus on reaching consensus. As the ROPR moves into Phase 3, town staff will be providing Oakville Council with further updates, analysis and commentary.</p> <p>Town staff anticipates that there will be substantial review work and comments generated during Phase 3 of the ROPR when Halton Region produces the Policy Directions Synthesis Report, draft official plan policies and a draft Regional Official Plan Amendment for consideration.</p> <p><b>CONSIDERATIONS:</b></p> <p><b>(A) PUBLIC</b> There are no public considerations and no notice requirements from this report.</p> <p><b>(B) FINANCIAL</b> There are no financial considerations from this report.</p> <p><b>(C) IMPACT ON OTHER DEPARTMENTS &amp; USERS</b> Multiple town departments have had the opportunity to provide input into the town's responses to Halton's Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p><b>(D) CORPORATE AND/OR DEPARTMENT STRATEGIC GOALS</b> This report addresses the corporate strategic goal to:</p>	<p>flexibility in local implementation. This includes the removal of requirements related to specific development criteria or policy approaches..</p> <p>Policies for monitoring the achievement of planning goals related to the balance of population and jobs in SGAs have been maintained in the proposed ROPA.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be the most livable town in Canada</li> </ul> <p><b>(E) COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY</b>  Consideration of the sustainability goals and objectives of the Livable Oakville Plan are part of all town reviews of Regional initiatives.</p> <p>Prepared by: Recommended by:  Kirk Biggar, MCIP, RPP  Senior Planner, Policy Planning  Diane Childs, MCIP, RPP  Manager, Policy Planning and Heritage</p> <p>Submitted by:  Gabe Charles, MCIP, RPP  Acting Director, Planning Services</p>	
2	City of Mississauga  E-mail dated March 22, 2021	<p>Good afternoon Matt,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on Halton's Regional Draft Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) No. 48. We have reviewed the documents and have no comments related to the proposed amendments.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Amina Menkad B.Arch/MSc.PL, MCIP, RPP  Planner, P&amp;B/Official Plan Review</p>	Noted
3	Conseil Scolaire Viamonde  E-mail dated March 26, 2021	<p>Good Morning Matt,</p> <p>The Conseil scolaire Viamonde has no comments regarding the Halton Region Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) No. 48.</p> <p>Best regards and happy Friday!</p> <p>Kenny Lamizana</p>	Noted
4	Conservation Halton  E-mail dated April 7, 2021	<p>Hi Karyn,</p> <p>We have reviewed the materials provided on ROPA 48. Conservation Halton has provided feedback on the related discussion papers and draft ROPA</p>	



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>language throughout the process, and can confirm we have no further feedback on the materials circulated.</p> <p>Our key feedback has focused on ensuring natural hazards are addressed through the ROPR, particularly in growth areas. Updates to the ROP natural hazard policies and the inclusion of hazard mapping in the ROP would further assist in identifying the constraints in these areas, and region wide. We will provide further feedback on updates to hazard policies/mapping when this topic area is addressed in the next phase of the ROPR.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback throughout the process. Please don't hesitate to contact me if we can provide further assistance or feedback.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p> <p>Leah</p>	<p>Regional staff look forward to receiving Conservation Halton's comments on a future Regional Official Plan Amendments related to the Natural Heritage System and natural hazards policies.</p>
5	<p>Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)</p> <p>E-mail dated April 7, 2021</p>	<p>Hello Karyn:</p> <p>We did review the circulated information, and the GRCA will not be providing specific comments, but would defer to our neighbouring Conservation Authorities as they may have more of an interest in ROPA No. 48 which deals with Regional Urban Structure. If we can be of further assistance please let us know.</p> <p>(Response to Karyn's response to Leah Smith on behalf of Conservation Halton).</p>	<p>Noted</p>
6	<p>Credit Valley Conservation</p> <p>E-mail dated April 13, 2021</p>	<p>Hi Karyn,</p> <p>CVC staff have also reviewed the relevant materials with respect to ROPA 48 and echo CH's comments. I think for the most part our interest will lie with the continued updates to the ROP related to any natural hazards policies and associated mapping.</p> <p>We will provide further comments at that time and are always open to discussing and providing guidance as necessary, related to lands within CVC's jurisdiction and as a coordinated effort with the three CAs.</p>	<p>Regional staff look forward to continuing to work with Credit Valley Conservation on future Regional Official Plan Amendments related to natural hazards policies and associated mapping.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review.</p> <p>Dorothy Di Berto, RPP</p>	
7	<p>City of Hamilton</p> <p>E-mail dated April 19, 2021</p>	<p>April 19, 2021 Karyn Poad Senior Planner Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L6M 3L1 Email: <a href="mailto:Karyn.poad@halton.ca">Karyn.poad@halton.ca</a></p> <p>Dear Ms. Poad,</p> <p><b>Re: Halton Region - Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 - An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure – Circulation for Comments</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated March 9, 2021 and the opportunity to review the “Halton Region Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 – An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure”. Please be advised that City of Hamilton staff have reviewed the draft Amendment and have no comments at this time.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Heather Travis..</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Steve Robichaud</p> <p>Director of Planning and Chief Planner Planning Division Planning and Economic Development Department City of Hamilton</p>	Noted
8	<p>Town of Halton Hills</p> <p>E-mail dated May 10, 2021</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b></p> <p>THAT Report PD-2021-0015, Regional Official Plan Review – Draft Scoped Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 (ROPA 48), dated April 22, 2021, be received;</p> <p>AND FURTHER THAT prior to the adoption of ROPA 48 by Regional Council, the Region be requested to address the outstanding comments contained in Report PD-2021-0015 regarding:</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>i) the proposed minimum density targets and population/employment ratios for the Georgetown and Acton Major Transit Station Areas;</p> <p>ii) ensuring that growth expectations for Local Nodes is reflective of the studies undertaken by the Town;</p> <p>iii) ensuring that the policy direction for Local Nodes can be implemented through Local Official Plan policies without the requirement for the preparation of Area Specific Plans (e.g. Secondary Plans); and,</p> <p>iv) the detailed policies that need to be satisfied regarding employment conversions;</p> <p>AND FURTHER THAT this report be submitted to Halton Region as the Town's comments during the statutory public process for ROPA 48 which is being prepared as part of the broader Regional Official Plan Review Process;</p> <p>AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this report be forwarded to the Local Municipalities of Burlington, Milton and Oakville, Conservation Halton, Credit Valley Conservation and the Grand River Conservation Authority.</p> <p><b>BACKGROUND:</b></p> <p>The purpose of this report is to highlight the key components of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 (ROPA 48) — An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure, which is being introduced as part of the Regional Official Plan Review (ROPR), and to present Town staff comments. A key element of the Regional Official Plan Review is the Integrated Growth Management Strategy which examines options on how to address growth requirements as per the <i>Growth Plan (2020)</i> in Strategic Growth Areas, Employment Areas, and Settlement Areas. As per Report PD-2020-0035, a Regional Urban Structure Discussion Paper was prepared by the Region identifying key population and employment growth areas, highlighting potential greenfield expansion areas and listing employment conversions being considered as part of the ROPR process. ROPA 48, attached to this report as Appendix A, has been introduced to implement components of the Regional Urban Structure, establish a hierarchy of strategic growth areas in the Regional Official Plan and to address local municipal planning priorities related to the urban structure in advance of the next phase of the ROPR process.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>At its meeting on February 23, 2021, Regional Council was presented with the draft ROPA 48 through Report LPS17-21. The draft ROPA includes the following planning matters: Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas (including boundaries and density targets), Strategic Growth Areas and limited Employment Land Conversions of those properties identified by local municipalities as having strategic importance in advancing elements of the local urban structure. At the meeting, Regional Council amended the report requesting the inclusion of the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To direct staff to include the southern portion of the Agerton Secondary Plan (lands south of hydro corridor) to facilitate the Major Transit Station Area and the southerly Milton Education Village employment land conversions as part of the draft ROPA.</li> <li>• To request regional staff to consider a policy to permit adjusting population and employment ratios in growth nodes outside of Municipal Comprehensive Reviews to provide flexibility and responsiveness to changes in the market around the nature of employment and the success of mixed-use nodes.</li> <li>• To request regional staff to consider local input in defining growth node policies and that regional staff comment on how growth nodes contribute to higher density employment and how this is factored into the land needs for employment forecasts.</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with the statutory public process required by Section 26 of the <i>Planning Act</i>, ROPA 48 has been released for public consultation. A Public Open House and a Statutory Public Meeting are also required as part of the process and are anticipated to take place in late May/early-June.</p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <p>Town staff are generally supportive of the broad purpose and intent of ROPA 48. Town staff have previously reviewed draft ROPA 48 and detailed comments were provided to Regional staff through the Halton Area Planning Partnership (HAPP) consultation process on January 26, 2021. Below is a description of the key components of ROPA 48 and relevant Town staff comments that were provided for consideration by the Region.</p> <p>Planning Targets:</p> <p>Amendment 1 to the <i>Growth Plan</i> introduced population and employment forecasts for Halton Region. ROPA 48 proposes to update the Regional</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Official Plan to include the 2051 population and employment forecasts for Halton Region contained within the <i>Growth Plan (2020)</i>. However, the distribution of growth and jobs to the Local Municipalities would be determined through the next phases of the Regional Official Plan Review process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 1, attached as Appendix B to this report, would be updated to include the 2051 Regional population and employment forecasts for Halton Region.</li> <li>• Table 2B, attached as Appendix C to this report, would be added to the Regional Official Plan to include minimum density targets of jobs and residents for certain Strategic Growth Areas. Table 2B would also include minimum job targets for certain Strategic Growth Areas in proportion to the number of residents that the areas are planned to accommodate. These minimum targets are to be achieved beyond the 2051 planning horizon of this Plan. Table 2B includes minimum density and resident/job ratios for the Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) located in Georgetown and Acton. The Georgetown density has been established at 100 residents and jobs per hectare and an 80% residents/ 20% jobs ratio, while in Acton, the minimum density has been established at 70 residents and jobs per hectare and 70% residents/ 30% jobs ratio.</li> </ul> <p>Town Staff Comments:</p> <p>The inclusion of the 2051 population and employment forecasts into the Regional Official Plan is required in order to conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. As previously noted, the distribution of the growth to the local municipalities will be determined through subsequent phases of the Regional Official Plan review and be incorporated through a Regional Official Plan Amendment that implements the Preferred Growth Concept once selected by Regional Council.</p> <p>To complete the review of the proposed MTSA minimum density targets and resident/job ratio and prior to the adoption of ROPA 48 by Regional Council, further discussion with Regional staff will be necessary on how the recommended targets for the Acton and Georgetown MTSAs have been determined. This is particularly important as the minimum targets and resident/jobs ratio will have to be incorporated into the Halton Hills Official Plan and pertinent Secondary Plans and be considered at the development review stage. Currently, the densities for both MTSAs are relatively low and staff would like to understand how local planning work such as the Intensification Opportunities Study Update and the Employment Land Needs</p>	<p>The target identified for both the Georgetown GO and Acton MTSA took into consideration the existing low and medium density area context, as well as the available sites to accommodate redevelopment potential. The density target for the MTSA do not need to be achieved by 2051 and can go beyond the horizon of the plan.</p> <p>The established density target for the Georgetown GO MTSA density target was supported by the Town's Georgetown GO Secondary Plan,</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Assessment has been considering in establishing these densities. Further discussion regarding MTSA's is provided in an ensuing section of this report.</p> <p>Urban Growth Centres (UGC):</p> <p>Urban Growth Centres (UGC) are existing or emerging downtown areas identified in the <i>Growth Plan (2020)</i>. UGCs are intended to accommodate a large proportion of population and employment growth. There are currently three Urban Growth Centres identified in the Region of Halton: Burlington GO MTSA/UGC, Midtown Oakville GO MTSA/UGC, Milton GO MTSA/UGC. Changes propose include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjustments to Urban Growth Centre boundaries.</li> <li>• Minor policy changes to achieve conformity with the Provincial <i>Growth Plan</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Town staff have not provided comments regarding UGC policies since there are no UGCs in Halton Hills.</p> <p>Major Transit Station Areas:</p> <p>Major Transit Station Areas are defined in the Growth Plan as areas within an approximate 500 to 800-metre radius of a transit station, representing about a 10 minute walk. Major Transit Station Areas are to be planned to accommodate growth including a diverse mix of uses such as additional residential and affordable housing. The Province directs Upper and Single-tier municipalities to delineate MTSA boundaries and identify minimum density targets. The Town has two Major Station areas identified around the Acton GO Station and the Georgetown GO Station (maps of the Georgetown and Acton MTSA boundaries have been attached as Appendix D) ROPA 48 introduces the following changes to the Regional Official Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundary delineation and density targets for all Major Transit Station Areas.</li> <li>• Policy changes to ensure conformity with the <i>Growth Plan</i> and provide direction for Local Municipalities to implement Area Specific Plans for Major Transit Station Areas.</li> <li>• Removal of the Downtown Burlington Major Transit Station Area designation from the Regional Official Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Intensification Opportunities Study update and Employment Land Needs Assessment. The target took into consideration the existing low and medium density area context, as well as the available sites to accommodate redevelopment potential.</p> <p>The target for the Acton GO MTSA was supported by the Town's Intensification Opportunities Study, as well as considering intensification opportunities within the delineated boundary, the existing low and medium density area context.</p> <p>Section 81.2(2.1) allows for the minimum density target for a Major Transit Station Area to be updated as part of the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review following completion of the Integrated Growth Management Strategy.</p> <p>A new objective is added to Section 81(7) and a policy to Section 81.2(4)k that enables the local municipalities to consider contextually appropriate intensification opportunities within stable residential neighbourhoods through the area specific planning process.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommended interim policies for proposed Major Transit Station Areas (including the proposed Trafalgar GO Major Transit Station Area in Milton).</li> </ul> <p>Town Staff Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town staff worked with the Regional staff to identify the proposed MTSA boundaries, which are generally in keeping with those identified through the Town's Employment Land Needs Assessment. The proposed Boundaries for Acton and Georgetown can be found in Appendix D to this report.</li> <li>As previously stated, Town staff require clarification on how the minimum densities and resident/ job ratio have been determined for the Acton and Georgetown MTSAs.</li> </ul> <p>Growth Nodes</p> <p>ROPA 48 will update the Regional Official Plan by identifying and recognizing Regional Nodes, or regionally-significant strategic growth areas. Local municipalities are required to prepare Area Specific Plans (e.g. Secondary Plans) or detailed Official Plan policies for Regional Nodes.</p> <p>The following areas indicated on the Regional Urban Structure map have been identified for accommodation of growth, concentration of public services and high-density uses at a scale appropriate for their context.</p> <p><b>Primary Nodes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uptown Core, Oakville</li> <li>Hospital District, Oakville</li> <li>Milton Education Village, Milton</li> <li>Palermo Village, Oakville</li> <li>Uptown Urban Centre, Burlington</li> </ul> <p>The following historic downtown areas or villages or areas have been identified for growth through mixed-use intensification at a scale appropriate for their context:</p> <p><b>Secondary Nodes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neyagawa Urban Core, Oakville</li> <li>Kerr Village, Oakville</li> </ul>	<p>See comment above.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bronte Village, Oakville</li> <li>• Downtown Oakville</li> <li>• Downtown Urban Centre, Burlington</li> <li>• Downtown Georgetown, Halton Hills</li> <li>• Guelph Street Corridor, Halton Hills</li> </ul> <p>In addition, as part of Strategic Growth Areas, ROPA 48 includes policy references to Local Nodes which are recognized in local Official Plans and have a concentration of residential and employment uses with development densities and patterns supportive of pedestrian traffic and public transit.</p> <p>Town Staff Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town staff seeks clarity as to which Local Nodes within the Town of Halton Hills are currently considered/included in the Regional Strategic Growth Areas and the expectations for these nodes to accommodate Regional growth. In Halton Hills, Local Nodes which are not included in the ROPA as either Secondary Regional Nodes or within the MTSA Areas, would include the broader Civic Centre District in Georgetown, which is subject to two Council approved Comprehensive Development Plans (CDP) and existing planning approvals, and the Queen Street Corridor in Acton, which was recently identified as an Intensification Area in the Intensification Opportunities Study Update.</li> <li>• If Local Nodes are to be considered for accommodating expected Regional growth, the ROPA must include provisions to ensure that each Local Node's capacity for accommodating growth is assessed based on the local context. Further to the above comments, Town Staff require confirmation of the messaging provided by Regional staff at the January 21, 2021 Halton Area Planning Partnership (HAPP) meeting wherein it was explained that local nodes and corridors identified through the Scoped ROPA will not require the completion of an Area Specific Plan as is currently required per Section 48 of the Regional Official Plan. Staff recommend that Section 48 be modified to align with other sections of the Regional Official Plan that provide flexibility to Local Municipalities to develop detailed Official Plan policies for Strategic Growth Areas in lieu of Secondary Plans.</li> </ul> <p>Employment Area Conversions:</p>	<p>A Local Node is defined in Section 255.1 as a Strategic Growth Area identified by a Local Municipality in an approved Official Plan, which has a role in accommodating intensification. Therefore, these nodes are SGAs that do not currently rise to the level identified in the ROP, but do have a role in the accommodation of intensification. The magnitude of growth to be directed to the Local Nodes is informed by the Town's intensification Study to be confirmed through the development of a Preferred Growth Concept.</p>



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>A limited amount of Employment Area conversions that meet the criteria identified by the Region in conformity with the <i>Growth Plan</i> are being considered for conversion to mixed use through ROPA 48. The proposed conversions have been identified by the Local Municipalities as having strategic importance in advancing elements of the local urban structure and support the Regional Urban Structure and strategic planning objectives. In the context of Halton Hills, these includes the properties in Acton located at 153, 159, 165, 173 Perth Street and 12 Wallace Street, and one parcel located at 344 Guelph Street in Georgetown. The conversions throughout the Region that are being considered in this ROPA including the proposed locations within the Town of Halton Hills can be found on the map attached as Appendix E.</p> <p>Town Staff Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conversion of these sites should consider a wide range of permitted uses that would enable the area to develop as a mixed-use area over the long-term. These sites may provide opportunities for office (a range of office uses, including multi-tenant office buildings smaller than 20,000 sq.ft.) retail and commercial services, and high-density or live-work residential uses. Conversion of these lands to provide for a broader range of uses over the long term would support the Town's intensification objectives.</li> <li>• Section 79.3(13) requires "...local municipalities to establish development criteria to ensure that the redevelopment of any employment lands outside of Employment Areas will retain space for a significant number of jobs". How is a significant amount of jobs defined? In the case of Halton Hills, enough flexibility must be given to these conversion sites to incentivize intensification and redevelopment opportunities that fit within the context of the area.</li> </ul> <p>Town staff also note that as part of the development of the Preferred Growth Concept further discussion with the Region will be required on whether the Gateway designations located south of Steeles Avenue in the Halton Hills Premier Gateway should be examined as potential conversion sites as part of the development of the Preferred Growth Concept given the existing development and/or land use permissions which align with the Town's vision to attract a broad range of employment uses to the area.</p> <p>Next Steps:</p>	<p>Section 79.3(3) of Draft ROPA 48 modifies existing policy (which currently applies to Mixed Use Nodes identified in Local Official Plans, which requires <u>either</u> an Area-Specific Plan <u>or</u> detailed official plan policies for Strategic Growth Areas, including Local Nodes. No changes have been made to Section 48.</p> <p>Regional staff have recommended these employment conversions be advanced through Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 to support the Regional Urban Structure and Local Municipal strategic planning objectives. More information on how this conversion conforms to the principles of the Region's employment conversion assessment criteria is available in Appendix C of the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Section 79.3(13) has been modified to align with the language in the Growth Plan to require Local Municipalities to establish development criteria to</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>As required by the Planning Act, the proposed ROPA is to be presented at the Statutory Public Open House/Public Meeting in the summer and will be made available to the public on the Region's website at least 20 days before the Statutory Public Meeting.</p> <p>Notification of this engagement opportunity will be provided through the Region's website, newspaper advertisements, mailing lists, social media, stakeholder groups, and other means. Town staff is supporting the Region's communications efforts by using social media to advertise the Open House and inform local residents of future engagement opportunities.</p> <p><b>RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:</b> This report directly aligns to the following values in the Strategic Plan 2019-2022 including:</p> <p>Foster a Healthy Community</p> <p>To maintain and enhance a healthy community that provides a clean environment and a range of economic and social opportunities to ensure a superior quality of life in our community.</p> <p>Preserve, Protect and Enhance our Environment</p> <p>To preserve, protect and enhance our natural environment for the health benefits and enjoyment it provides to present and future generations.</p> <p>Foster a Prosperous Economy</p> <p>To maintain and enhance the economic vitality of the Town through the provision of a wide range of opportunities for economic development.</p> <p>Achieve Sustainable Growth</p> <p>To ensure that growth is managed so as to ensure a balanced, sustainable, well planned community infrastructure and services to meets the needs of its residents and businesses</p> <p>The report is also closely linked with a number of Focus Areas/Priorities including Shaping Growth.</p>	<p>ensure that, outside of Employment Areas, the redevelopment of any employment lands will retain space for a similar number of jobs to remain accommodated on site rather than a significant number. The establishment of development criteria by the local municipality provides an opportunity to identify how this direction can be implemented in a manner appropriate to local contexts.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPACT:</b></p> <p>There are no financial impacts associated with this report.</p> <p><b>CONSULTATION:</b></p> <p>Planning staff will continue to consult with the different Town departments including, Transportation and Public Works, Recreation and Parks, Economic Development, Climate Change, Finance and Fire and continue to update the Senior Management Team and Council as needed.</p> <p><b>PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:</b></p> <p>The Region of Halton has ongoing consultation and engagement related to ROPA 48 and the ROPR process. A webpage has been created specifically to inform the public about ROPA 48 and ways to get involved in the process.</p> <p>ROPA 48 is being advanced under Section 26 of the Planning Act, which requires the amendment to be approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. As a result, Section 17(17.1) of the Planning Act applies and requires the Region to circulate a draft ROPA for the Minister's review at least 90 days in advance of providing notification of an Open House and Statutory Public Meeting. Report LPS17-21 presented at the February 23rd Regional Council meeting, authorized the circulation of the draft ROPA 48 to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to meet this legislative requirement.</p> <p>The Planning Act requires both an Open House/Public Information Centre and a Statutory Public Meeting to allow the public to review and provide comments on draft ROPA 48. An Open House/Public Information Centre as well as a Statutory Public Meeting is anticipated in late May/early June. Any comments received through the statutory process will be documented on the Region's public record and responded to by Regional staff prior to bringing forward a recommendation report to Regional Council.</p> <p>In addition, the Region will be hosting six Public Information Centres on the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper starting from May 4 to May 29th (four municipally focused PIC, one Region wide PIC and one focused on North Aldershot).</p> <p>Dates for the PICs are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Halton Hills: May 4 at 7 p.m.</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milton: May 6 at 7 p.m.</li> <li>• Burlington: May 11 at 7 p.m.</li> <li>• Oakville: May 13 at 7 p.m.</li> <li>• North Aldershot: May 17 at 7 p.m.</li> <li>• Region-wide Wrap-up: June 29 at 7 p.m.</li> </ul> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:</b></p> <p>The Town is committed to implementing our Community Sustainability Strategy, Imagine Halton Hills. Doing so will lead to a higher quality of life.</p> <p>This report supports the Environmental Health pillar of Environmental Health and Social Well-Being. ROPA 48 advances components of the Region's Official Plan Review which include planning for growth within Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, Strategic Growth Corridors and considering limited Employment Land Conversions align well with this pillar. Overall, the alignment of this report with the Community Sustainability Strategy is: GOOD.</p> <p><b>COMMUNICATIONS:</b></p> <p>Upon Council approval of this report, a copy will be forwarded to the Region of Halton, the Local Municipalities of Burlington, Milton and Oakville, Conservation Halton, Credit Valley Conservation and the Grand River Conservation Authority.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION:</b></p> <p>Regional staff have released the draft ROPA 48 to advance components of a Regional Urban Structure as part of the Regional Official Plan Review Process. An Open House/Public Information Centre as well as a Statutory Public Meeting are anticipated in late May/early June. As previously noted, Town staff are generally supportive of the broad purpose and intent of ROPA 48. A number of specific issues have been identified regarding minimum densities and population/employment ratios for the Georgetown and Acton MTSA, the policy and growth expectations for Local Nodes, and the detailed policies that need to be satisfied for employment conversions. It is recommended that the Region address the outstanding issues referenced in this report prior to the adoption of ROPA 48.</p> <p>Reviewed and Approved by,</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Bronwyn Parker, Director of Planning Policy  John Linhardt, Commissioner of Planning and Development  Chris Mills, Acting Chief Administrative Officer</p>	
9	<p>Town of Oakville</p> <p>E-mail dated  May 10, 2021</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review – Integrated Growth Management Strategy and Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 – May 10, 2021</i>, be received.</li> <li>2. That the report titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review – Integrated Growth Management Strategy and Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 – May 10, 2021</i>, be submitted to Halton Region as part of the statutory process for ROPA 48 and the Regional Official Plan Review.</li> <li>3. That the report titled <i>Regional Official Plan Review – Integrated Growth Management Strategy and Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 – May 10, 2021</i>, be forwarded for information to the City of Burlington, the Town of Halton Hills, the Town of Milton, Credit Valley Conservation, Grand River Conservation Authority and Conservation Halton.</li> </ol> <p><b>KEY FACTS:</b>  The following are key points for consideration with respect to this report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase 2 of Halton's Regional Official Plan Review is underway and involves research, technical analysis and community engagement around key themes.</li> <li>• Halton is exploring issues and opportunities related to growth management through the Integrated Growth Management Strategy. This is a key component.</li> <li>• of the Regional Official Plan Review that addresses where and how Halton will grow to from 2031 to 2051.</li> <li>• Another component of the Regional Official Plan Review is Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 that intends to advance certain strategic local municipal plans and priorities related to urban structure.</li> <li>• Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 helps define a regional urban structure and provides direction on key elements including Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, Regional Nodes and employment areas.</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public engagement is an ongoing component of the Regional Official Plan Review and a range of opportunities has been provided to date.</li> <li>Current opportunities for participation include taking an on-line survey, attending a virtual Public Information Centre and having a discussion with a regional planner through a virtual meeting.</li> <li>This report presents an update on the Regional Official Plan Review and highlights comments from town staff.</li> </ul> <p><b>BACKGROUND:</b></p> <p>The purpose of the Regional Official Plan Review (ROPR) is to update the Regional Official Plan (ROP) to meet the evolving needs of Halton Region. The ROPR will also update policies required by the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, as well as other provincial plans and policies changes affecting the growth, development and protection of lands within the region.</p> <p>Halton Region is undertaking the ROPR in partnership with its local Municipalities of Oakville, Burlington, Halton Hills and Milton. A wide range of residents, businesses, stakeholder groups, governmental agencies and Indigenous Communities are also engaged.</p> <p>The ROPR is currently in Phase 2, which involves the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrated Growth Management Strategy</li> <li>Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48</li> <li>Public Engagement</li> </ul> <p>Town staff has participated in the ROPR since it was initiated in 2014 and has provided regular updates to Oakville Council. The most recent update was March 22, 2021 where Oakville Council received the following Discussion Items and accompanying staff presentations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 3. Regional Official Plan Review - Growth Concepts Discussion Paper - Integrated Growth Management Strategy, March 11, 2021</li> <li>Item 4. Regional Official Plan Review - Draft Regional Plan Amendment 48 - An Amendment to Define a Regional Structure, March 11, 2021</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the link to the meeting agenda containing those items #3 and #4: <a href="https://securepwa.oakville.ca/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=4176&amp;doctype=AGENDA">https://securepwa.oakville.ca/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=4176&amp;doctype=AGENDA</a></li> <li>The key messages from <i>Item 3. Integrated Growth Management Strategy</i> included:</li> <li>Livable Oakville is the town's growth management strategy and Oakville's ongoing official plan review is focused on implementing a town-wide urban structure.</li> <li>For Oakville to maximize the benefits of accommodating required population and employment growth, the Preferred Growth Concept resulting from Halton Region's Integrated Growth Management Strategy must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support existing local urban structure;</li> <li>Minimize greenfield expansions to protect natural heritage and agricultural lands; and</li> <li>Build complete communities in a compact urban form with sustainable transportation choices.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The key messages from <i>Item 4. Draft Regional Plan Amendment 48</i> identified areas of agreement and areas where town staff expressed the opinion that further refinement of the draft Regional Plan Amendment 48 (ROPA 48) would be appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the Bronte GO Major Transit Station Area, Halton Region's Employment Area overlay should be entirely removed from the study area lands.</li> <li>The use of minimum density targets of combined people and jobs per hectare as required by the 2019 Growth Plan to focus and distribute forecasted population and employment growth to strategic growth areas (SGAs) was appropriate.</li> <li>The proposed regional requirements for a <i>Target Proportion of Residents &amp; Jobs</i> for SGAs was not appropriate and since this is not a requirement of the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, should be removed from draft ROPA 48.</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed regional requirements for site-specific employment targets and development criteria such as gross floor area thresholds within mixed use SGAs was prescriptive and not appropriate for an upper-tier municipal official plan.</li> <li>Town staff raised concerns with a prescriptive approach in the ROP related to difficulty in implementation and that unintended consequences of a restrictive approach could lead to missed opportunities and limit the town's ability to implement its urban structure and manage required growth accordingly.</li> <li>Town staff expressed the opinion that flexibility in the policy framework would enable mixed use SGAs to thrive independently and that a generic or universal approach in the ROP for SGAs was not appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENT/OPTIONS:</b></p> <p>This section of the report provides an update on the ROPR key components listed above and highlights comments and opinion from town staff including areas where further refinement to the region's proposals would be appropriate.</p> <p>Town staff notes that collaborative discussions with regional staff are ongoing with the aim of reaching consensus on the outstanding matters and to see that this is reflected in the ROPR.</p> <p><b>Integrated Growth Management Strategy</b></p> <p>The Integrated Growth Management Strategy (IGMS) looking at how and where Halton Region will accommodate forecasted population and employment growth from 2031 to 2051, as required by the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended.</p> <p>As presented to Oakville Council on March 22, 2021, the region's IGMS Growth Concepts Discussion Paper containing four Growth Concepts and an evaluation of those growth concepts has been released for public consultation.</p> <p>Since then, through a series of reports and resolutions, regional staff has been directed by Regional Council to undertake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An analysis that builds on Concept 3 that accommodates employment growth to 2051 without a settlement area boundary expansion</li> </ul>	



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An analysis on the creation of a permanent food belt/agricultural preserve</li> <li>• A comparative assessment of greenhouse gas emissions for each Growth Concept</li> </ul> <p>Report No. LPS45-21 <i>Additional Information relating to Growth Concepts associated with the Integrated Growth Management Strategy – Regional Official Plan Review</i> received by Regional Council at their meeting of April 21, 2021, detailed this information and the directions to regional staff.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff is supportive of a Growth Concept that accommodates employment growth to 2051 without a settlement area boundary expansion.</p> <p>Town staff is also of the opinion that for Oakville, there is a strong future for high quality and dense employment opportunities in mixed used developments and through employment intensification at strategic locations.</p> <p>A Growth Concept that does not expand the settlement area boundary will protect agricultural lands and help reduce overall greenhouse emissions across the region.</p> <p><b>Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48</b></p> <p>Draft ROPA 48 helps to define and provide direction on elements of a regional urban structure. This is accomplished through the identification of SGAs across the region including Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, Regional Nodes as well as providing long-term planning direction for employment areas.</p> <p>Regional staff has stated that draft ROPA 48 implements non-discretionary policies of the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, in order to achieve conformity with that plan and is intended to advance certain strategic local municipal planning priorities related to urban structure.</p> <p>As presented to Oakville Council on March 22, 2021, town staff supports the intent of draft ROPA 48 and supports advancing draft ROPA 48 in a timely manner so that local plans and priorities can be recognized and implemented.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Town staff identified areas of support for the region's amendment to the ROP through draft ROPA 48, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The region's proposed hierarchy of SGAs,</li> <li>• The proposed boundaries for the Midtown Oakville Urban Growth Centre and the Bronte GO Major Transportation Station Area in accordance with provincial requirements,</li> <li>• Proposed updates to incorporate the revised growth forecasts from the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended. For Halton Region, this is a population of 1,100,000 and 500,000 jobs to the year 2051,</li> <li>• Assigning Minimum Density Targets to certain SGAs since these are required by the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, and are considered non-discretionary.</li> </ul> <p>Notwithstanding the areas of support and alignment identified, there are remaining areas where town staff is of the opinion that further refinements to the region's proposals are necessary.</p> <p>These outstanding matters are addressed in the following sections.</p> <p><b><i>Process Timing and Responses to Comments</i></b></p> <p>According to regional staff, draft ROPA 48 is targeted for a Statutory Public Meeting before Regional Council on June 16, 2021. Town staff has been providing comments to the region on draft ROPA 48 since initial versions were made available in January 2021 and more recently through authorized comments provided through Oakville Council.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> In this context, town staff wishes to understand how and when comments provided to date will be recognized and acknowledged in the region's process.</p> <p>Regional staff has advised that the date for a final recommendation report on ROPA 48 to Regional Council has yet to be confirmed.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i> Town staff is of the opinion that the date for a recommendation report should reflect an appropriate period of time for</p>	<p>Comments received on the Regional Urban Structure Discussion Paper and Supplementary Discussion Paper on the Burlington Urban Growth Centre and MTSA are summarized as Attachment #2 to LPS60-21 - Adoption of Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 - "An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure".</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>consideration and acknowledgement of the comments received to date on draft ROPA 48.</p> <p><b><i>Regional Employment Area Overlay</i></b></p> <p>Town staff continues to raise concerns around the application of the region's Employment Area overlay to the Bronte GO Major Transit Station Area (Bronte GO MTSA) and the Neyagawa Urban Core.</p> <p>Town staff and regional staff continue to engage in productive dialogue to resolve matters and updated comments from town staff are presented below.</p> <p><b><i>Bronte GO MTSA</i></b></p> <p>Town staff is of the opinion that the region's Employment Area overlay should be removed in draft ROPA 48 from the areas in the Bronte GO MTSA proposed to be designated Urban Centre and Urban Core. This would be appropriate since it reflects the town's priorities, provides local flexibility to develop a mixed use SGA and would be the consistent with local Official Plan Amendments being advanced through the town's Official Plan Review.</p> <p><b><i>Neyagawa Urban Core</i></b></p> <p>These lands are identified in the town's urban structure as a Node for Further Study as a mixed use area. Through the town's ongoing official plan review, a study will be undertaken of the Neyagawa Urban Core Area (NUC) to delineate a boundary and to determine an appropriate mix, scale and intensity for this SGA. Town staff anticipate that this study will be initiated in Q4 2021.</p> <p>This study would also examine the potential role, support and connectivity of the NUC with a future 407 Transitway station at Neyagawa Boulevard and Highway 407.</p> <p>Although the town will study all four quadrants of the NUC at the intersection of Neyagawa Boulevard and Burnhamthorpe Road West, the northeast and northwest quadrants are currently designated in the region's Employment Area overlay.</p> <p><b><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i></b> Town staff is of the opinion that the region's Employment Area overlay should be removed from the NUC north of Burnhamthorpe Road West in order for the town's study to proceed. More specifically:</p>	<p>Comments received from the public agencies and public on draft ROPA 48 between February 16 and June 23, 2021 are considered in Attachments #3 and #4 to LPS60-21 - Adoption of Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 - "An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure".</p> <p>Given the scale of the Bronte GO request, its strategic location in relation to goods movement facilities, and that it currently functions as part of the Region's supply of employment land, the conversion of the entirety of the lands required further analysis and consideration. Analysis by the Town of Oakville through the Bronte GO MTSA study, as well as through the IGMS process, has identified the potential for the Bronte GO lands to accommodate significant employment growth following a conversion. A draft official plan amendment prepared by the Town would continue to provide opportunities for employment uses in a mixed use context, particularly within the 'Urban Centre' and 'Urban Core' land use designations, while maintaining certain areas within employment designations. On this basis, Regional staff have recommended the conversion of those lands designated 'Urban Centre' and 'Urban Core' to be advanced through ROPA 48. The remaining lands in the Bronte GO MTSA are designated for employment uses in the official plan amendment which align with the permitted uses in the Regional Employment Area and as a result, these lands are recommended to be retained within the employment area.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the northeast quadrant, the lands extending eastward to line up approximately with the northerly extension of Carding Mill Trail; and</li> <li>For the northwest quadrant, the lands west of Neyagawa Boulevard should be removed, as well as the lands west of Fourth Line over to the limit of the Region's Natural Heritage System.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Prescriptive Employment Planning Policies in the Regional Official Plan</i></b></p> <p>Town and regional staff agree that certain SGAs being converted from Employment Area to mixed use areas should still be planned to maintain an employment focus. The success of mixed use nodes will depend on a combination of employment, commercial and residential uses. The region's policies should enable the local municipalities to implement this direction at the local level where it can be tailored to the local context.</p> <p>However, town staff continues to raise concerns around the prescriptive nature of certain policies proposed for SGAs in draft ROPA 48. Town staff is the opinion that a prescriptive and universal set of policies do not belong in the ROP since they may not be appropriate for all SGAs across the local Municipalities.</p> <p>There is a concern for Oakville that development focused on Council priorities and implementing the town-wide urban structure could be impaired through unintended consequences of restrictive policies leading to missed opportunities.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i></p> <p>Town staff is of the opinion that the ROP policies should enable flexibility in the policies for mixed use SGAs so they can thrive and be successful by responding to the market and the changing nature of employment. Greater flexibility is also appropriate in light of the constantly evolving nature of employment recently brought into focus by the COVID-19 emergency pandemic.</p> <p>This evolution was highlighted recently for Regional Council at their meeting of April 21, 2021 in a presentation from StrategyCorp titled the "Changing Nature of the Economy and Employment".</p>	<p>In regard to the Neyagawa Urban Core, Regional staff recommend that the consideration of this request continue to occur as part of the Integrated Growth Management Strategy and the development of a Preferred Growth Concept. More information on assessment of this request is available in Appendix C of the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper.</p> <p>In terms of Section 79.3(13), the detailed directions in Draft ROPA 48 have been replaced with more general direction that allows for more flexibility in local implementation. This includes the removal of requirements related to specific development criteria or policy approaches..</p> <p>Policies for monitoring the achievement of planning goals related to the balance of</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>That presentation covered initial research findings on the growth and composition of Halton's economy, impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, Halton's non-residential real estate market outlook, financial risks, growth and jobs of the future and strategic approaches for attracting employment. Town staff understand that additional reporting on this research is still to come.</p> <p>The following sections of this report provide more detailed comments on proposed prescriptive policies in draft ROPA 48.</p> <p><i>Site-Specific Development Criteria for Strategic Growth Areas</i></p> <p>Draft ROPA 48 proposes a series of policy requirements for the local municipalities in order to plan for employment uses in certain SGAs. These proposed policies would apply to <b>site-specific</b> developments and require that multiple development criteria be satisfied, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of <b>minimum employment targets</b> for SGAs;</li> <li>• Identification of minimum amount of <b>gross floor area</b> to be planned for employment uses;</li> <li>• Identification of <b>a minimum proportion or threshold of the total gross floor area</b> within this area to be developed for employment uses (<b>emphasis added</b>)</li> </ul> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i></p> <p>Town staff does not support the introduction of these requirements through draft ROPA 48 and recommends that they be removed to provide greater flexibility for meeting planning goals in SGAs.</p> <p>The proposed regional policies are not requirements of the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, and appear to be discretionary policies being introduced by the region.</p> <p><i>Target Proportions for Strategic Growth Areas</i></p> <p>Draft ROPA 48 introduces a new Table 2b, which contains for certain SGAs, Minimum Density Targets and Target Proportions of Residents &amp; Jobs. As mentioned earlier, minimum density targets are non-discretionary requirements of the 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, and town staff has no concerns with this policy.</p>	<p>population and jobs in SGAs have been maintained in the proposed ROPA.</p> <p>See comment above.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>However, Town staff has concerns with the proposed Target Proportion of Residents &amp; Jobs. Draft ROPA 48 proposes the following regional requirement:</p> <p><i>"Require Local Municipalities to plan for employment uses within Strategic Growth Areas by: ...</i>  <i>... b) planning to achieve, where applicable, the target proportion of residents and jobs within the Strategic Growth Area as identified in Table 2b, through policies that:...</i>  <i>... [iii] identify the minimum amount of gross floor area that should be planned for employment uses, including major office uses, within the Strategic Growth Area in order to meet the minimum jobs target and the target proportion of residents and jobs."</i></p> <p>Requiring local municipalities to create official plan policies that identify a minimum amount of gross floor area in order to meet the proposed target proportions is onerous and will be difficult to establish accurately.</p> <p>Determining a minimum amount of floor area to accommodate a specific number of residents and job requires the use of numerous assumptions and estimates about the nature of the future development.</p> <p>Some of these assumptions and estimates include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• estimated gross floor area per employee or job (which varies based on the type of employment)</li> <li>• estimated mix of employment uses</li> <li>• estimated average residential unit size</li> <li>• estimated persons per residential unit</li> <li>• estimated building efficiency</li> </ul> <p>Knowing the exact values for each of these assumptions prior to development is not possible. The actual values can only be known after a development is completed and residents and tenants have moved in.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Furthermore, these values do not remain constant over the life of a development and change continually as the occupants of the places of employment and residential units change periodically.</p> <p>The exercise is also not as simple as requiring a minimum proportion of gross floor area that is equal to the target proportion in Table 2b. In general, gross floor area used by a resident is greater than the gross floor area used by an employee or job.</p> <p>For example, requiring a minimum 35% of all gross floor area to be dedicated to employment would likely yield far more than 35% jobs. Depending on the values selected for the above list of assumptions, 35% gross floor area dedicated to employment could yield 55% jobs and thereby only 45% residents. The target proportion is looking for more residents than jobs. If this same proportion were applied to gross floor area, however, the result would be more jobs than residents.</p> <p><i>Town Staff Opinion:</i></p> <p>Town staff is of the opinion that these targets should be removed from draft ROPA 48. The 2019 Growth Plan, as amended, and companion provincial planning documents do not contain requirements for target proportions of residents and jobs planned to be achieved within SGAs.</p> <p>In this regard, the proposed regional target proportions appear to be a discretionary policy introduced by the region. And while it may be possible for a regional policy to be more restrictive than a provincial policy, that possibility alone does not constitute a planning rationale for the more restrictive policy.</p> <p><b>Public Engagement in the Regional Official Plan Review</b></p> <p>Information about the Regional Official Plan Review can be found on-line at their main webpage for the project:</p> <p><a href="https://www.halton.ca/The-Region/Regional-Planning/Regional-Official-Plan-(ROP)-(1)/Halton-s-Regional-Official-Plan-Review-(ROPR)?mc_cid=a40331bb63&amp;mc_eid=d937cdb23a">https://www.halton.ca/The-Region/Regional-Planning/Regional-Official-Plan-(ROP)-(1)/Halton-s-Regional-Official-Plan-Review-(ROPR)?mc_cid=a40331bb63&amp;mc_eid=d937cdb23a</a></p> <p>From that page, there are links to additional information, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn about the Growth Concepts</li> <li>• Take a short questionnaire</li> <li>• Join a virtual Public Information Centre</li> <li>• Discuss the Growth Concepts with a regional planner</li> </ul>	<p>Given the importance of accommodating employment growth in SGAs to the Region's growth strategy, a target proportion of residents and jobs in Table 2b is maintained in ROPA 48. However, Table 2b is revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarify the general nature of the target (through the addition of the word 'General' and through the addition of the tilde (~) symbol which is commonly read as 'approximately');</li> <li>• update the targets for specific SGAs based on local feedback (Milton UGC, Palermo Village) and/or to achieve a greater level of consistency across the SGAs and to reflect the more general nature of the targets (Aldershot, Acton, etc.);</li> <li>• add a footnote to reinforce the general / long-term / aspirational nature of the target and the latitude for refinements to it through a local process, consistent with Section 55.3, which has also been revised to clarify the implementation of the general target in Table 2b through local planning processes.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of Section 79.3(13), the detailed directions in Draft ROPA 48 have been replaced with more general direction that allows for more flexibility in local implementation. This includes the removal of requirements related to specific development criteria or policy approaches..</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Read the initial consultation report</li></ul> <p>A virtual Public Information Centre (PIC) for the Town of Oakville is scheduled for Thursday, May 13 at 7:00 PM. Town staff will attend the Oakville PIC.</p> <p>The full schedule and instructions on how to join are in the table below:</p> <table><tr><th>Dates</th><th>How to join</th></tr><tr><td>Halton Hills: Tues., May 4 at 7 p.m. Milton: Thurs., May 6 at 7 p.m. Burlington: Tues., May 11 at 7 p.m. Oakville: Thurs., May 13 at 7 p.m. North Aldershot: Mon., May 17 at 7 p.m. Region-wide: Tues., June 29 at 7 p.m.</td><td>Online: Visit <a href="http://halton.ca/ropr">halton.ca/ropr</a> on the date of the PIC to join. By phone: Call 1-855-703-8985 (toll-free).<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Meeting ID: 970 665 2261</li><li>Passcode: 858099 (if requested)</li></ul></td></tr></table> <p><b>CONCLUSIONS:</b></p> <p>Town staff will continue to engage in Phase 2 of the Regional Official Plan Review process to improve alignment among the participants and to focus on reaching consensus. Town staff welcomes the opportunity to participate and will be providing information to Oakville Council as appropriate.</p> <p>Phase 3 of the Regional Official Plan Review will provide a Policy Directions Synthesis Report, draft official plan policies and further draft Regional Official Plan Amendment for consideration.</p> <p>Town staff anticipates that there will be a considerable amount of reviewing and commenting to undertake during Phase 3 of the Regional Official Plan Review in addition to the ongoing collaboration with staff from the Halton Region and the local Municipalities.</p> <p>Town staff will continue to provide Oakville Council with further updates, analysis and commentary through Phase 3 of the Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p><b>CONSIDERATIONS:</b></p> <p><b>(A) PUBLIC</b></p> <p>There are no public considerations and no notice requirements from this report.</p>	Dates	How to join	Halton Hills: Tues., May 4 at 7 p.m. Milton: Thurs., May 6 at 7 p.m. Burlington: Tues., May 11 at 7 p.m. Oakville: Thurs., May 13 at 7 p.m. North Aldershot: Mon., May 17 at 7 p.m. Region-wide: Tues., June 29 at 7 p.m.	Online: Visit <a href="http://halton.ca/ropr">halton.ca/ropr</a> on the date of the PIC to join. By phone: Call 1-855-703-8985 (toll-free). <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Meeting ID: 970 665 2261</li><li>Passcode: 858099 (if requested)</li></ul>	
Dates	How to join						
Halton Hills: Tues., May 4 at 7 p.m. Milton: Thurs., May 6 at 7 p.m. Burlington: Tues., May 11 at 7 p.m. Oakville: Thurs., May 13 at 7 p.m. North Aldershot: Mon., May 17 at 7 p.m. Region-wide: Tues., June 29 at 7 p.m.	Online: Visit <a href="http://halton.ca/ropr">halton.ca/ropr</a> on the date of the PIC to join. By phone: Call 1-855-703-8985 (toll-free). <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Meeting ID: 970 665 2261</li><li>Passcode: 858099 (if requested)</li></ul>						



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><b>(B) FINANCIAL</b></p> <p>There are no financial considerations from this report.</p> <p><b>(C) IMPACT ON OTHER DEPARTMENTS &amp; USERS</b></p> <p>Multiple town departments have had the opportunity to provide input into the town's responses to Halton's Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p><b>(D) CORPORATE STRATEGIC GOALS</b></p> <p>This report addresses the corporate strategic goal(s) to be the most livable town in Canada.</p> <p><b>(E) CLIMATE CHANGE/ACTION</b></p> <p>Managing and directing required population and employment growth to a defined urban structure is an action to mitigate Climate Change.</p> <p>Prepared by:</p> <p>Kirk Biggar, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner, Policy Planning and Heritage</p> <p>Recommended by:</p> <p>Diane Childs, MCIP, RPP Manager, Policy Planning and Heritage</p> <p>Submitted by:</p> <p>Gabe Charles, MCIP, RPP Acting Director, Planning Services</p>	
10	<p>Town of Milton</p> <p>E-mail dated May 12, 2021</p>	<p><b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) 48 was initiated through Report No. LPS17-21 as endorsed by Council in February 2021. ROPA 48 advances select local municipal planning priorities related to urban structure and will provide important foundational policies to support Provincial objectives to increase housing supply and support growth and economic development in Halton.</li> <li>This report provides Milton's response to ROPA 48 for the consideration of Halton Region.</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Background Regional Council directed Regional staff to prepare an initial scoped ROPA, under Section 26 of the Planning Act that would advance certain local municipal planning objectives. The draft ROPA 48 may be viewed as part of the Regional Council Meeting Agenda for February 17, 2021, as Attachment #1 to LPS17-21 at this link:</p> <p><a href="https://edmsweb.halton.ca/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Meetings/ViewMeeting?id=4196&amp;doctype=1">https://edmsweb.halton.ca/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Meetings/ViewMeeting?id=4196&amp;doctype=1</a></p> <p>ROPA 48 (see map in Attachment 1) is proposing to advance the following key changes to the Regional Official Plan that align with and implement the Provincial Growth Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjustments to boundaries and policy changes to Urban Growth Centres (Burlington, Mid-Town Oakville, and Milton)</li> <li>• Delineation and assignment of density targets for Halton's Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs);</li> <li>• Identification of additional growth nodes and strategic growth corridors with the corresponding policy framework; and</li> <li>• Advancement of strategically important employment conversions to advance and support a mixed-use development approach.</li> </ul> <p>ROPA 48 would implement an adjustment to the Burlington Urban Growth Centre designation that would identify the area around the Burlington GO MTSA as the Urban Growth Centre and primary growth node to stimulate growth and redevelopment of the MTSA as the focus of growth in the City of Burlington. ROPA 48 contains key employment land conversions to support growth planning in Halton, in accordance with the Growth Plan, that can achieve economic development objectives in a changing economy. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lands within the Aldershot and Burlington GO MTSAs in Burlington;</li> <li>• lands within the Acton GO and Guelph Street Corridor areas in Halton Hills;</li> <li>• lands within the Bronte/Main Street Corridor, the Meritor lands as well as the Milton Education Village (MEV) and Agerton areas in Milton; and</li> <li>• lands within the Palermo Village, the Hospital District and Trafalgar Corridor and a portion of the Bronte GO MTSA in Oakville.</li> </ul> <p>Further to the above, it must be noted that Regional Report No. LPA17-21, as originally authored did not include Milton's most strategically important</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>employment land conversions (Agerton and the MEV), despite Milton's repeated requests and supporting rationale. In light of this, a motion was tabled and approved at the Regional Council meeting held February 17, 2021 directing the following: "THAT Regional staff be directed to include the southern portion of the Agerton Secondary Plan (lands south of hydro corridor) to facilitate the Major Transit Station Area and the southerly Milton Education Village employment land conversions as part of the draft "Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 – An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure", attached to Report LPS17-21 and work with Town of Milton staff to frame the supporting rationale and basis for the inclusion of these lands prior to commencing the statutory public process and circulating the draft amendment to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing."</p> <p>"THAT given the changing nature of employment and the need to understand the role of employment in the mixed use growth nodes, request that Regional staff consider a policy which would allow for changes in the ratio between population and jobs within each of the growth nodes outside of municipal comprehensive reviews. A policy should allow for changes to capture the evolving nature of employment uses which are flexible and responsive to the market and which capture the contribution the mix of employment and residential uses which contribute to the vibrancy and success of the growth nodes." Given that draft ROPA 48 is part of a municipal comprehensive review as provided for in Section 26 of the Planning Act, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will be the approval authority for this amendment to the Regional Official Plan. There is no ability to appeal the decision of the Minister. As such, it is imperative that Milton's interests are addressed in this amendment.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>At their meeting of February 17, 2021, Regional Council authorized Regional staff to release draft ROPA 48 for public engagement and to initiate the statutory public process required by the Planning Act.</p> <p>This report is seeking direction to submit the following comments as Milton's formal response to ROPA 48: Rationale and Basis for the Inclusion of the MEV and Southern Agerton in ROPA 48</p> <p><b>General comments:</b></p>	<p>Regarding the Agerton lands, ROPA 48 proposes to convert the Agerton employment area that is west of Trafalgar Road. The conversion of the Agerton employment area east Trafalgar is proposed to be considered as part of the balance of the IGMS. There are number of reasons for this approach.</p> <p>The Agerton lands were originally identified as requiring further analysis in order to more fully</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is good planning to require that urban places be created to support and complement the significant investment in the MEV and the Trafalgar GO station in Agerton. Providing for an appropriately planned mix of housing and jobs together with complementary retail and services uses accomplishes this. This approach to planning will serve to increase the density of these areas and provide for a greater diversity of jobs in Milton as well as create an urban environment attractive to both employers and employees.</li> <li>• The nature of planning for employment is aspirational and about creating the opportunity to attract employers. The employment planned for these areas includes new types of employment, which typically occur within urban or community areas as opposed to in more traditional employment areas on designated employment lands. Once designated, the lands could accommodate all jobs immediately, although the timing for when they are realized cannot be predicted with the precision requested by the Region.</li> <li>• The Town continues to strongly market itself, particularly through its economic development efforts to attract employers. These activities occur outside of the planning documents. Secondary Plans are land use planning documents that provide a policy framework to arrange land uses and comprehensively manage development in a manner that achieves densities and growth objectives.</li> <li>• With regard to the MEV Secondary Plan, the vision includes a mix of uses across the entire MEV. Maintaining the current Employment Area designations could allow warehousing and logistics at the MEV and would completely contradict Council's direction to develop the MEV as a complete community anchored by a strong post-secondary presence and innovation employment.</li> <li>• The Town is taking this one step at a time – securing the Trafalgar GO station is a major investment that will spark employment and population growth in this area of the Town. The intent is to create significant demand at this GO station that could help make two-way all-day GO service more viable. We need residents and jobs in that location to support the station. Mixed use is critical to the success of the proposed GO station (residential, office, and retail). Warehousing and logistics type uses would not support the GO station.</li> <li>• Given the limited area and the attractiveness of mixed use developments resulting from the MEV and Agerton conversions, staff is of the opinion that the conversions will enhance the Town's and Region's ability to realize increased jobs in key sectors. Both the forecast need and</li> </ul>	<p>understand whether the conversion would have the potential to adversely impact the Region's supply of land over the 2051 planning horizon and the ability to achieve Regional employment targets. Further analysis was also required to confirm that there was a demonstrated need for the conversion on the basis of its strategic location and strategic opportunity to contribute to key strategic growth management objectives and to assess how the conversion relates to the lands to the north owned by Canadian Pacific Railway from a compatibility perspective.</p> <p>The lands west of Trafalgar Road are located in the vicinity of the Proposed Trafalgar GO Station as identified in the Regional Urban Structure and conversion could enable strategic opportunities for growth that would support the Regional and/or Local Urban Structure by contributing to strategic growth management objectives such as accommodating significant population and employment growth and achieving density targets within strategic growth areas. As a result, Regional staff are of the opinion that the conversion of the lands west of Trafalgar Road to enable development that accommodates residential and employment growth following conversion is supportable and recommended that this conversion be advanced as part of ROPA 48.</p> <p>The basis of Regional Council's direction to move forward with ROPA 48 was to advance select local municipal planning priorities related to urban structure including advancing an initial set of strategic employment land conversions required for fully implementing local municipal plans and priorities related to growth and intensification and which support the Regional Urban Structure. Given the scale of the Agerton request, its strategic location in relation to goods movement facilities, and that it currently functions as part of</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>requirement for employment lands and the types of jobs generated by more traditional employment uses should be considered overall through the Region's MCR process, along with updated Best Planning Estimates (BPEs).</p> <p><b>Growth Plan Policies and Responses:</b></p> <p>The Growth Plan allows the contemplation of employment land conversions subject to various tests. The following outlines how the proposed conversions of southern Agerton and the MEV meet these tests (responses are bold italicized):</p> <p>2.2.5.9. The conversion of lands within employment areas to non-employment uses may be permitted only through a municipal comprehensive review where it is demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) there is a need for the conversion; Milton is directing growth to major investments which support the Town's urban structure and job creation objectives. These investments require additional uses to realize urban places which attract the right kind of employment uses.</p> <p>b) the lands are not required over the horizon of this Plan for the employment purposes for which they are designated; The potential conversion equates to less than 20% of the Town's remaining vacant employment lands to 2031. The locations identified for conversion are not appropriate for the more traditional types of employment uses for which they are currently designated and are not anticipated to generate the number of jobs required to satisfy growth requirements. Moreover, there is a potential that additional employment lands will be required in more appropriate places to meet the forecasts to 2051.</p> <p>c) the municipality will maintain sufficient employment lands to accommodate forecasted employment growth to the horizon of this Plan; Assuming a density of 16-20 jobs per hectare, the Region would require approximately 1,850-2300 hectares of employment land to accommodate the 37,000 employment lands type jobs (industrial, warehousing and logistics) projected between 2021-2031. As measured in 2018, the Region has a supply of approximately 2,800 ha of vacant employment land. The conversion of 200 hectares will allow the Town and Region to maintain a sufficient supply of employment land within the horizon of the Plan.) This is consistent with the change in employment land type employment projections, where the updated projections for the Region to 2031 have a more than a 40,000 reduction in employment land</p>	<p>the Region's supply of vacant employment land available to accommodate employment growth in the Region, the conversion of the entirety of the lands requires further consideration to understand the potential impacts to the Region's supply of land required for employment purposes over the 2051 planning horizon. As a result, the conversion of the Agerton lands east of Trafalgar through ROPA 48 is not recommended by Regional staff as it would be more appropriate to continue considering this conversion through the balance of the IGMS and the development of a Preferred Growth Concept.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>types jobs in that timeframe for Halton Region (previously forecasted at 206,000 employment lands type jobs and now closer to 164,000 jobs.</p> <p>d) the proposed uses would not adversely affect the overall viability of the employment area or the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan, as well as the other policies of this Plan; neither the MEV nor Agerton conversions will preclude the realization of employment lands type employment on adjacent lands, and as noted both will result in an increase in employment with higher densities. Through detailed secondary planning exercises, the Town has demonstrated that appropriate transitions can be incorporated which will maintain land use compatibility.</p> <p>e) there are existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities to accommodate the proposed uses. Both the MEV and Agerton have planned infrastructure and public service facilities to accommodate the proposed uses, as demonstrated through the secondary plan processes.</p> <p>2.2.5.10 Notwithstanding policy 2.2.5.9, until the next municipal comprehensive review, lands within existing employment areas may be converted to a designation that permits non-employment uses, provided the conversion would:</p> <p>a) satisfy the requirements of policy 2.2.5.9 a), d) and e); noted above.</p> <p>b) maintain a significant number of jobs on those lands through the establishment of development criteria; both the MEV and Agerton conversions will realize an increase in the number of jobs.</p> <p>c) not include any part of an employment area identified as a provincially significant employment zone unless the part of the employment area is located within a major transit station area as delineated in accordance with the policies in subsection 2.2.4. Neither Agerton nor MEV are within a provincially significant employment zone.</p> <p><b>Additional General Comments on ROPA 48:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While staff does not object to the concept of “Regional Nodes” and “Strategic Growth Areas” (SGAs), when located in greenfield locations (i.e. Trafalgar Secondary Plan, Agerton Secondary Plan, MEV Secondary Plan); the Region’s Official Plan should not define density and job targets. Rather, this should occur through the comprehensive Secondary Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Given the importance of accommodating employment growth in SGAs to the Region’s growth strategy, a target proportion of residents and jobs in Table 2b is maintained in ROPA 48. However, Table 2b is revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify the general nature of the target (through the addition of the word ‘General’ and through the addition of the tilde (~)</li> </ul>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>process undertaken at the local level. Any suggestion to set density and job targets in ROPA 48 should refer to “Area Specific Plans”. This will prevent conflicting policy while still providing specific targets, consistent with local urban structure plans, through a comprehensive process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff offers no concerns with the Minimum Density Targets proposed for Urban Growth Centres and Major Transit Station Areas since these are required by the 2019 Growth Plan, and are considered non-discretionary. Staff also supports the approach of allowing the Minimum Density Targets for other SGAs as required by the 2019 Growth Plan, to be informed by work conducted at the local level. However, Town staff has concerns with the proposed Target Proportion of Residents and Jobs and is of the opinion that these targets should be removed from draft ROPA 48.</li> <li>• Staff is supportive of the proposed employment land conversions of the “Meritor Site” and “Bronte/Main Street Corridor”, as depicted in ROPA 48.</li> <li>• While staff generally supports the delineation of Milton’s Major Transit Station Area at the Milton GO Station, as depicted in ROPA 48, staff requests that lands at 45 Bruce Street, the former site of a Milton Library also be included.</li> <li>• Staff does not support the delineation of the Major Transit Station Area for Agerton (proposed Trafalgar GO Station) at this stage. This should be defined and informed through the comprehensive Secondary Plan process.</li> <li>• Subject to the population and employment targets being defined at the local level through an “Area Specific Plan” and not through the Region’s Official Plan, staff supports the identification of Trafalgar Road as a “Regional Corridor”.</li> <li>• The Milton Mobility Hub Study Demonstration Plan has a projected density of 221 persons per hectare. This is based on 25,114 residents and 4,137 jobs. The proportion of residents and jobs is 85% and 15% respectively. There was estimated to be 2,971 existing jobs in the area. ROPA 48 must be revised accordingly to reflect this.</li> </ul>	<p>symbol which in commonly read as ‘approximately’);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• update the targets for specific SGAs based on local feedback (Milton UGC, Palermo Village) and/or to achieve a greater level of consistency across the SGAs and to reflect the more general nature of the targets (Aldershot, Acton, etc.);</li> <li>• add a footnote to reinforce the general / long-term / aspirational nature of the target and the latitude for refinements to it through a local process, consistent with Section 55.3, which has also been revised to clarify the implementation of the general target in Table 2b through local planning processes.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of Section 79.3(13), the detailed directions in Draft ROPA 48 have been replaced with more general direction that allows for more flexibility in local implementation. This includes the removal of requirements related to specific development criteria or policy approaches.</p> <p>Regional staff have recommended 45 Bruce Street be included within the Milton GO MTSA and UGC to support the Regional Urban Structure and Local Municipal strategic planning objectives.</p> <p>The Trafalgar GO MTSA is not delineated through ROPA 48, however the policy framework for Proposed Major Transit Stations applies until a location for a station is confirmed.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Table 2b has been updated to reflect the study findings and now contains a general target proportion of residents and jobs of 80% and 20% respectively.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With respect to new policy 78.1 - What do a "significant proportion of" and "certain types of" mean? Suggest revising this to read: "To promote population and employment growth within Strategic Growth Areas".</li> <li>• With respect to new policy 78.1 - How does the Regional Urban Structure provide "increased opportunities"? We suggest deleting this to read: "To provide for the development of Affordable Housing".</li> <li>• With respect to new policy 79.3(12) - This is based on the land use compatibility policy in the Provincial Policy Statement which refers to major facilities - not major employment uses. Major facilities is a defined term and should be used here.</li> <li>• With respect to new policy 79.3(13) - This is based on 2.2.5.14 of the Growth Plan. But, notably, the words "site-specific" have been added. There may be circumstances where we would want flexibility to consider the transfer of employment from one site to another in the same ownership. For example, the phased redevelopment of the Milton Mall may involve relocating jobs from one development site to another site.</li> <li>• With respect to new policy 79.3(13)(v) – This proposed policy could stifle development and intensification and should be removed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Next Steps:</b></p> <p>Regional Council will be notified when dates for the Open House/Public Information Centre and statutory public meeting have been confirmed. Public notification of these engagement opportunities will be provided through the Region's website, newspaper advertisements, mailing lists, social media, stakeholder groups, and other means.</p> <p>Town staff anticipates that the earliest opportunity for a Statutory Public Meeting on Draft ROPA 48 will be June 2021.</p> <p><b>Financial Impact</b></p> <p>There are no financial implications from this report. However, the implementation of the Region's ultimate growth management strategy – through regional and local official plan amendments will impact the financing and delivery of municipal programs and services.</p>	<p>No change made.</p> <p>No change made.</p> <p>Terminology has been updated to reflect the PPS, 2020.</p> <p>The words "site-specific" have been removed.</p> <p>In terms of Section 79.3(13), the detailed directions in Draft ROPA 48 have been replaced with more general direction that allows for more flexibility in local implementation. This includes the removal of requirements related to specific development criteria or policy approaches.</p>



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Respectfully submitted, Barbara Koopmans, MPA, MCIP, RPP, CMO Commissioner, Planning and Development For questions, please contact: Jill Hogan, MCIP, RPP</p>	
11	<p>City of Burlington</p> <p>E-mail dated May 12, 2021</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Direct the Director of Community Planning to submit community planning department report PL-20-21 and its appendices as the City of Burlington submission on the Region of Halton's Regional Official Plan Amendment Number 48; and Direct the Director of Community Planning to provide any further comments to the Region, if any, upon Council's decision on May 18, 2021.</p> <p><b>PURPOSE:</b></p> <p>To provide comments on the first Regional Official Plan amendment (ROPA 48) which has been prepared to define a Regional Urban Structure.</p> <p><b>Vision to Focus Alignment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase economic prosperity and community responsive city growth</li> <li>• Improve integrated city mobility</li> <li>• Support sustainable infrastructure and a resilient environment</li> <li>• Building more citizen engagement, community health and culture</li> </ul> <p><b>Executive Summary:</b> City of Burlington Staff have reviewed the Region of Halton's scoped Regional Official Plan Amendment titled Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 and have prepared a submission to inform the Statutory Public meeting and to inform the finalization of the amendment. Staff are supportive of the amendment and of moving the implementation of the Regional Official Plan Review forward in a phased manner. Staff encourage the Region to move expeditiously to prepare a recommendation report related to the amendment and to provide sufficient time to consider any comments received prior to, and through the statutory process. Staff have also proposed a series of modifications for consideration to support implementation of the policies. Overall, modifications proposed by City Staff are intended to support local plans and priorities by providing the flexibility to plan within the local context of each municipality.</p> <p><b>Background and Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>1.0 Regional Official Plan Review</b></p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>In April 2014, through Report No. LPS28-14, Regional Council authorized the commencement of a statutory five-year review of the Halton Region Official Plan, referred to as the Regional Official Plan Review (ROPR). Regional staff developed a Work Plan, Communications and Engagement Strategy, and Directions Report to guide the ROPR through Report No. LPS110-16 which was delivered to Regional Council in October 2016. The Directions Report was the culmination of Phase 1 of the ROPR and identified a high-level work plan for subsequent phases.</p> <p>The Regional Official Plan Review is being advanced in partnership with Halton's local municipalities and in consideration of local plans and priorities. The Region continues to be responsive to the local vision for growth established by the local municipalities throughout the process.</p> <p>The Regional Official Plan Review (ROPR) in Phase 2 focused on research, analysis and a set of Discussion Papers on five key theme areas. The Discussion Papers were prepared and released for public consultation in July 2020. For more details and to review the comments provided in September 2020, please refer to staff report PL-28-20 titled <i>Submission on Region of Halton's Official Plan Discussion Papers</i>. These City prepared comments highlighted key issues related to the various discussion papers as well as discussing recent changes (August 2020, Amendment 1) to the Growth Plan (2019), and the Burlington City Council Direction to request the Region consider an adjusted Urban Growth Centre boundary.</p> <p>During the consultation period related to the Discussion Papers, Regional Staff prepared staff report LPS84-20 titled <i>Advancing Key Planning Priorities of the Halton Municipalities through the Regional Official Plan Review</i>. The report directed staff to prepare an initial Scoped ROPA, under Section 26 of the Planning Act which would advance select local municipal planning priorities related to urban structure as presented in the Regional Urban Structure and Supplemental Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Report No. LPS84-20 outlined a number of local municipal planning priorities that were to be considered as part of the initial Scoped Regional Official Plan Amendment including boundary and policy changes to Urban Growth Centres, delineation and assignment of density targets for MTSAs, identification of additional growth nodes and strategic growth corridors with a corresponding policy framework and limited employment conversions.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>By way of a letter dated November 12, 2019 the Province confirmed that municipalities may advance a phased approach to municipal comprehensive reviews through multiple official plan amendments.</p> <p>In response to City of Burlington Staff report PL-33-20, a supplemental discussion paper was prepared jointly by Regional and City staff titled "Downtown Burlington Urban Growth Centre and MTSA Supplemental Discussion Paper" which was released in October 2020. City of Burlington comments were provided in staff report PL-59-20 titled <i>Update on the Downtown Burlington Urban Growth Centre (UGC) and Major Transit Station Area (MTSA) Supplemental Discussion Paper</i>. Further discussion of the adjusted Downtown Burlington Urban Growth Centre is provided below.</p> <p>On February 17 Regional Council considered three reports on its agenda related to the Regional Official Plan Review:</p> <p>LPS05-21 – Regional Official Plan Review – Phase 2 Initial Consultation Summary</p> <p>LPS18-21 – Regional Official Plan Review – Integrated Growth Management Strategy – Growth Concepts Discussion Paper</p> <p>LPS17-21 - Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 48 - An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure.</p> <p>The purpose of the subject report is to provide comments on ROPA 48 as presented in LPS17-21 in advance of the Statutory Public Meeting. City staff will also provide discussion and an associated submission related to both the Initial Consultation Summary and the Growth Concepts discussion paper in a forthcoming report.</p> <p>Regional Council amended the recommendations related to LPS17-21. The effect of the modifications were to add a specific geographic area to be considered for employment conversion around the Milton Education Village and to add the following considerations for Regional staff:</p> <p>THAT given the changing nature of employment and the need to understand the role of employment in the mixed use growth nodes, request that Regional staff consider a policy which would allow for changes in the ratio between population and jobs within each of the growth nodes outside of municipal comprehensive reviews. A policy should allow for changes to capture the</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>evolving nature of employment uses which are flexible and responsive to the market and which capture the contribution the mix of employment and residential uses which contribute to the vibrancy and success of the growth nodes.</p> <p>THAT Regional staff consider the local input in the defining the growth node policies.</p> <p>THAT Regional staff comment on the ability of the growth nodes to contribution to higher density employment and how this is factored into the land needs for employment forecasts.</p> <p>City staff look forward to working with Regional staff to review the above noted considerations.</p> <p><b>2.0 Regional Official Plan Amendment 48</b></p> <p>The Region has prepared, in line with the recommendation, a draft Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA 48) which is being advanced under Section 26 of the Planning Act. This amendment, among other things, identifies non-discretionary components of a Regional Urban Structure that support local plans and priorities while ensuring that Regional Council retains its ability to comprehensively and objectively evaluate the full range of Growth Concepts associated with the Integrated Growth Management Strategy.</p> <p>City staff are supportive of the approach to present this first phase amendment to the Regional Official Plan which has been drafted with a focus on settlement areas, specifically within the Urban Area, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• define the Regional Urban Structure;</li> <li>• reinforce Local Urban Structures; and,</li> <li>• enable Local municipalities to move forward with critical work at the local level.</li> </ul> <p>The amendment is well written and easy to understand. The specific details of the amendment are considered below. Detailed comments on the proposed amendment (Attachment 1 to LPS17-21) are included as Appendix A: ROPA 48 Comment Table. While the comments in this report and in Appendix A form the City's comments at this time, staff will monitor the progress of ROPA 48 and will provide further comments, if necessary, in advance of the Region's Statutory Public Meeting.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>The comments below are divided into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 Population and Employment to 2051</li> <li>2.2 Regional Structure               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.2.1 Urban Area and Regional Urban Structure</li> <li>2.2.2 Strategic Growth Areas                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Urban Growth Centres</li> <li>b) Major Transit Station Areas</li> <li>c) Regional Nodes</li> <li>d) Targets &amp; Proportions for UGCs, MTSAs and Regional Nodes</li> <li>e) Employment Uses in Strategic Growth Areas</li> <li>f) Other Regional Urban Structure Elements</li> </ul> </li> <li>2.2.3 Employment Conversions</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>2.1 Population and Employment to 2051</b></p> <p>Draft ROPA 48 implements the Halton Region-wide target to 2051 in Table 1 and replaces 2031 with 2051 in other locations in the amendment. Table 1 includes an asterisk with respect to population and employment forecasts for each of the Local Municipalities to 2051 which refers to the following footnote:        *Distribution of the 2051 population and employment forecasts to the Local Municipalities, forecasts to be determined through the municipal comprehensive review.</p> <p>City staff agree that the Region must apply the forecasts from Schedule 3. Staff also agree that Halton Region can only fully achieve the Growth Plan policy direction through the completion of the municipal comprehensive review. In consideration of the Growth Plan policy 5.2.4.3 which states:</p> <p>The population and employment forecasts and plan horizon contained in the applicable upper- or single-tier official plan that is approved and in effect as of August 28, 2020 will apply to all planning matters in that municipality, including lower-tier planning matters where applicable, until the upper- or single-tier municipality has applied the forecasts in Schedule 3 in accordance with policy 5.2.4.2 and those forecasts are approved and in effect in the upper- or single-tier official plan.</p> <p>Staff Position</p> <p>City staff request that the Region consider modifying the note on Table 1 to clarify that until the completion of the municipal comprehensive review that the</p>	<p>This text has been modified to provide interim clarification that Table 1 is modified in part</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Population and Employment Distributions to 2031 also found in Table 1, and in effect as of August 28, 2020, will apply to all planning matters in Halton Region and within lower-tier planning matters, where applicable. For the specific comment and proposed modification please see Appendix A.</p> <p><b>2.2 Regional Structure</b></p> <p>Limited modifications have been made to the policies relating broadly to Halton's Regional Structure in the phased Regional Official Plan Amendment. Modifications are focused on enhancing the details of the Urban Area and its Regional Urban Structure which is supported by Map 1H, which is included as Appendix B: Regional Urban Structure Map 1H.</p> <p><b>2.2.1 Urban Area and the Regional Urban Structure</b></p> <p>ROPA 48 includes a new goal related to the Urban Area and the Regional Urban Structure which states: The goal of the Urban Area and the Regional Urban Structure is to manage growth in a manner that fosters <i>complete communities</i>, enhances mobility across <i>Halton</i>, addresses climate change, and improved housing affordability, sustainability, and economic prosperity.</p> <p>In support of this goal, Objective 72.1(6) is also modified to clarify that the proposed policies identify a Regional Urban Structure that directs growth to Strategic Growth Areas and protects Regional <i>Employment Areas</i>.</p> <p>New policies 51.3 and 78 are also added to clarify that the lands within the Urban Area are further defined by having a Regional Urban Structure consisting of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Growth Areas</li> <li>• Regional Employment Areas</li> <li>• Built-Up Areas and</li> <li>• Designated Greenfield Areas</li> </ul> <p>The comments in this section are focused on the Strategic Growth Areas and the Regional Employment Areas as no changes have been proposed through ROPA 48 to the Built- Up Areas or the Designated Greenfield Areas. Changes to those features of the Regional Urban Structure will be considered after the completion of the Integrated Growth Management Strategy.</p>	<p>through ROPA 48 and will be comprehensively modified through the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><b>2.2.2 Strategic Growth Areas</b></p> <p>One of the key elements of ROPA 48 is the presentation of a Region-wide approach to responding to the direction from the Growth Plan which requires Upper-tier and Single-tier municipalities to “establish a hierarchy of settlement areas, and of areas within settlement areas” in line with the policies of the Growth Plan.</p> <p>Strategic Growth Areas are a new term, first coined in the Growth Plan in 2017. Strategic Growth Areas are defined in the Growth Plan 2019:</p> <p>Within <i>settlement areas</i>, nodes, corridors, and other areas that have been identified by municipalities or the Province to be the focus for accommodating <i>intensification</i> and higher-density mixed uses in a more <i>compact built form</i>. <i>Strategic growth areas</i> include <i>urban growth centres</i>, <i>major transit station areas</i>, and other major opportunities that may include infill, <i>redevelopment</i>, <i>brownfield sites</i>, the expansion or conversion of existing buildings, or <i>greyfields</i>. Lands along major roads, arterials, or other areas with existing or planned <i>frequent transit service</i> or <i>higher order transit corridors</i> may also be identified as <i>strategic growth areas</i>.</p> <p>In general, the approach that ROPA 48 takes is to propose the former defined term “Intensification Areas” in the Regional Official Plan be replaced throughout with the newly defined term “Strategic Growth Areas”. Staff are supportive of this approach as the defined term from the Growth Plan is implemented and further supported by the establishment of a Strategic Growth Area hierarchy in ROPA 48.</p> <p>ROPA 48 proposes an important clarification related to the agricultural, natural heritage systems and to the Strategic Growth Areas which are all defined as durable elements of the Region’s Official Plan which recognizes that the horizon for these elements is far beyond the planning horizon of 2051. ROPA 48 proposes the following Strategic Growth Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urban Growth Centres;</li> <li>- Major Transit Station Areas;</li> <li>- Proposed Major Transit Station Areas;</li> <li>- Primary Regional Nodes;</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>- Secondary Regional Nodes; and</p> <p>- Regional Corridors</p> <p>Policy 79.2 identifies a proposed hierarchy of Strategic Growth Areas (SGAs) delineated or identified by symbol on Map 1H. The SGAs that correspond to each and, where applicable, to Table 2b as proposed, are included in bold italics within () below):</p> <p>(1) Urban Growth Centres / Major Transit Station Areas on a Priority Transit Corridor; (<b><i>Downtown Burlington UGC / Burlington GO and Midtown Oakville UGC/Oakville GO</i></b>)</p> <p>(2) Urban Growth Centres / Major Transit Station Areas on a Commuter Rail Corridor; (<b><i>Downtown Milton UGC / Milton GO</i></b>)</p> <p>(3) Major Transit Station Areas on a Priority Transit Corridor; (<b><i>Bronte GO and Appleby GO</i></b>)</p> <p>(4) Major Transit Station Areas on a Commuter Rail Corridor; (<b><i>Aldershot GO, Georgetown GO and Acton GO</i></b>)</p> <p>(5) Proposed Major Transit Station Areas; (<b><i>Proposed Trafalgar GO</i></b>)</p> <p>(6) Primary Regional Nodes; (<b><i>Uptown Core, Oakville; Hospital District Oakville; Milton Education Village; Palermo Village; Uptown Urban Centre, Burlington</i></b>)</p> <p>(7) Secondary Regional Nodes; (<b><i>Neyagawa Urban Core, Oakville; Kerr Village, Oakville; Bronte Village, Oakville; Downtown Oakville; Downtown Urban Centre, Burlington; Downtown Georgetown, Halton Hills; Guelph Street Corridor, Halton Hill</i></b>) and,</p> <p>(8) Regional Corridors. (<b><i>Not currently identified in ROPA 48</i></b>)</p> <p>The Regional Urban Structure is supported by the Local Urban Structures identified in Local Official Plans which reflect this hierarchy of Strategic Growth Areas and may include additional Local Nodes, which are not expressly identified as specific Strategic Growth Areas.</p> <p>The City supports the reference to the role of Local Official Plans, Local Urban Structures and associated policies. In addition, City staff confirm that the hierarchy proposed is generally appropriate and reinforces the City's Urban</p>	



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Structure and Growth Framework policies found in the new Official Plan. Burlington-specific comments are provided below related to each of the Strategic Growth Areas.</p> <p><b>a) Urban Growth Centres</b></p> <p>Urban Growth Centres are shown on Map 1H and are included on Map 6, which is made up of a series of maps including the specific details of the proposed boundaries for both UGCs and MTSA.</p> <p>The amendment includes the adjustment to the Downtown Burlington Urban Growth Centre boundary as proposed through the “Downtown Burlington Urban Growth Centre and MTSA Supplemental Discussion Paper”. In addition, boundary adjustments have been made to the Downtown Milton UGC and Midtown Oakville to remove the regulated flood plain in those areas.</p> <p>City staff agree with the proposed boundary adjustment to the Downtown Burlington UGC. The adjustment of the Downtown Burlington UGC brings Regional policies in alignment to Growth Plan Schedule 5: Moving People – Transit. All of the Region’s 3 UGCs are located along Existing Higher Order Transit Corridors. Further, the adjusted Downtown Burlington UGC and Midtown Oakville UGC are both located on Priority Transit Corridors. City staff also agree with the boundary adjustments to the Downtown Milton UGC and Midtown Oakville UGC to remove the regulated flood plain in those areas.</p> <p>City staff recommend that modifications be made to Map 1H to better distinguish Urban Growth Centres that are also Major Transit Station Areas on a Priority Transit corridor from other MTSA. Clarification in the mapping would support a better visual understanding of proposed Strategic Growth Area hierarchy set out in Policy 79.2.</p> <p>New Official Plan</p> <p>The new Official Plan was prepared in conformity with the Region’s current Official Plan (ROPA 38) with a horizon to 2031. The scoped re-examination of the downtown set out policies and vision to guide future growth in the downtown to 2031 while recognizing the wide variety of unique areas that make up the downtown with a focus on strong policies for a retail main streets, urban design, and cultural heritage.</p> <p>A specific “given” was established in the Public Engagement Plan for the scoped re-examination as the following:</p>	<p>Map 1h does currently distinguish between Urban Growth Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, while also distinguishing between the Priority Transit Corridor and Commuter Rail Corridor. Opportunities to enhance the mapping may be considered through the balance of the Regional Official Plan Review.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Planning policy is guided by various legislative requirements and policy documents, such as the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement, provincial plans, the Halton Region Official Plan, Bill 108, and the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <p>These legislative requirements include policies for the Urban Growth Centre (UGC), Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs), and Mobility Hubs. City Council has directed staff to report back on any changes to the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Area designations after the completion of the Official Plan and Interim Control By-law studies. This analysis will not form part of the current project.</p> <p>The policy framework, recently considered through the scoped re-examination project, which informed modifications to the adopted Official Plan, provides a framework for accommodating new growth in a manner that reflects the existing context and identifies potential for growth in accordance with those policies. The new Official Plan Downtown Urban Centre policy framework recognizes the existing boundary of the Downtown Burlington Urban Growth Centre which conforms to the Regional Official Plan. Should ROPA 48 be approved, it is expected that the policies of the Downtown Urban Centre would require only minor changes to the policy framework to bring the policies into conformity with the Regional Official Plan with the exception of establishing affordable housing targets which will be considered through the Housing Strategy currently underway and concluding in mid-2022.</p> <p>Given that the Regional Official Plan Review is considering the future beyond 2031 to 2051, in conformity with the Growth Plan, this is the appropriate time for comments from the City of Burlington to reinforce that the adjustments to the supports the vision established in the Local Official Plan and in the Downtown Urban Centre policies.</p> <p><b>Staff Position</b></p> <p>City staff support the boundary adjustments to the existing Urban Growth Centres in Halton Region. Staff recommend enhancements to Map 1H to reinforce the Strategic Growth Area hierarchy set out in Policy 79.2.</p> <p><b>b) Major Transit Station Areas</b></p>	<p>Opportunities to enhance the mapping may be considered through the balance of the Regional Official Plan Review.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>ROPA 48 identifies and delineates Major Transit Station Areas across the Region. Similar to the comment provided with respect to the Urban Growth Centre, staff support the Major Transit Station Areas identified as part of the Regional Urban Structure on Map 1H.</p> <p>Staff are supportive of the removal of the MTSA designation in Downtown Burlington as discussed in the "Downtown Burlington Urban Growth Centre and MTSA Supplemental Discussion Paper". Similar to the comments related to the adjustment of the UGC, the removal of the MTSA does not impact the high-level direction and policies approved by the Region in the City's new Official Plan. There are likely to be several modifications required to language and mapping in the new Official Plan as it relates to the identification of the lands around the John Street Bus Terminal as a Major Transit Station Area.</p> <p>The New Official Plan maintains and reinforces the transit connection between the Burlington GO Station, downtown and the rest of the City. The City's new Official Plan also identifies long term frequent transit corridors, which reinforce transit connections among key destinations.</p> <p>Staff are supportive of the identification of Major Transit Station Areas as Protected Major Transit Station Areas in accordance with Section 16 (16) of the Planning Act. One of a number of considerations related to Protected Major Transit Station Areas is the potential to develop Inclusionary Zoning By-laws to support the introduction of affordable housing. Staff request further discussions related to the preparation of the required municipal assessment reports as there may be some potential for identifying a shared opportunity among the Region and Local municipalities. The City of Burlington has initiated a Housing Strategy and would like to move ahead with detailed discussions about the development of Inclusionary Zoning.</p> <p><b><i>i) Delineation of Major Transit Station Areas – Map 6</i></b></p> <p>The Growth Plan requires that Upper or Single-tier municipalities are responsible for the delineation of Major Transit Station Area boundaries. Establishing these boundaries within the Regional Official Plan is a critical step in moving forward with the Major Transit Station Area area-specific planning process in Burlington, for which Council approved funding in March. Progress on that work relies upon both the delineation of Major Transit Station Areas and the Regional Employment Area conversions within Major Transit Station Areas.</p>	<p>Regional staff look forward to working with City staff in support of the City's Housing Strategy and in advancing the development of Inclusionary Zoning.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Study area boundaries around the existing GO Stations in Burlington have had a series of different treatments over time. First, the adopted Official Plan (2018) established Mobility Hub study boundaries. The intent of the Mobility Hub study areas was to signal and identify where additional study would be undertaken including a variety of studies like a transportation analysis, noise and vibration studies, archeological assessments to support the development of area-specific plans. When the boundaries were created in 2017 staff included a larger area, capturing existing public service facilities, including parks and open spaces, as well as neighbourhoods within the boundary for the purpose of studying the area holistically. These broader boundaries were established in anticipation of the need to identify connections and any potential impacts from a transportation network perspective such as increased traffic flows to and from the GO Station, opportunities for pedestrian and active transportation connections, as well as matters such as noise and air quality studies.</p> <p>Next, through the Region's consideration of modifications to the New Official Plan "MTSA Special Planning Areas" were established which clarified that the formal delineation of MTSA boundaries would occur through the Region's municipal comprehensive review. To implement Official Plan Amendment No.119 while ensuring clarity and consistency throughout the Official Plan, the City proposed modifications to update the overall nomenclature and policy framework for transit-supportive development, which included the removal of the redundant term "mobility hub" and the introduction of the "MTSA Special Planning Area" concept to replace the former "Mobility Hub Study Area" terminology and align with provincial and regional policy. With one exception in the Aldershot Area, the "Mobility Hub Study Area" and the "Major Transit Station Area Special Planning Areas" are identical.</p> <p>Lastly, the proposed Major Transit Station Areas Boundaries delineated in ROPA 48 are the result of the application of the Region's delineation methodology first described in the Urban Structure Discussion Paper in 2020. City staff are supportive of the Region of Halton's MTSA delineation methodology. Staff note that a primary goal of delineating an MTSA through the Region's process is to identify a minimum boundary density target to be achieved in alignment with the Growth Plan (2019). The earlier Mobility Hubs Study Areas were created to study matters like connectivity, transportation, air quality, noise impacts etc. at a larger scale, and therefore included parks, open spaces and some neighbourhood areas. Based on the Region's methodology, areas such as parks, open spaces and neighbourhood areas are excluded from the MTSA delineation.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>City Staff note that while the MTSA will have a delineated boundary, through area-specific planning staff will continue to consider areas adjacent to MTSA's to identify and strengthen connections, and consider any potential impacts from a transportation network perspective such as potential increased traffic flows from the GO Station, or potential opportunities to support pedestrian connections to the GO Station, as well as technical matters such as noise and air quality.</p> <p>As noted in PL-28-20 "Submission on Region of Halton's Official Plan Discussion Papers", the proposed MTSA boundaries proposed at that time for Burlington GO and Appleby GO vary slightly from their respective former Mobility Hubs study area boundaries. These variations relate primarily to the exclusion of parkland as well as minor refinements in Appleby GO, west of Appleby Line and north of the rail, which were made to align with ownership parcel fabric data. City staff are supportive of the proposed Downtown Burlington UGC / MTSA boundary and the Appleby GO MTSA boundary.</p> <p>Several differences are noted between the Aldershot MTSA Special Planning Area boundary within the new City of Burlington Official Plan and the proposed Aldershot GO MTSA boundary.</p> <p><b>1135 Gallagher Road</b></p> <p>The Region's proposed Aldershot GO MTSA boundary excludes Grove Park, Aldershot Park and the properties located at 1135 Gallagher Road. Staff are supportive of the Region's proposed Aldershot Major Transit Station Area boundary, consistent with the Region's delineation methodology.</p> <p><b>1150 and 1200 King Road</b></p> <p>The Region's proposed Aldershot GO MTSA boundary excludes 1150 and 1200 King Road. As part of the submission related to the Discussion Papers in the Fall of 2020 the following comment was provided: Staff note that the lands at 1200 King Road are addressed in Minutes of Settlement between the City and the owner of those lands, Paletta International Corporation. The City agreed, through the Minutes of Settlement, to conduct a review to determine whether the portion of the 1200 King Road lands located west of Falcon Creek should be developed with MTSA land uses. That review, which includes a</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the delineation methodology used to propose the Major Transit Station Area boundaries set out in Map 6; and</li> <li>- Support the boundaries of the Major Transit Station Areas set out in Map 6.</li> </ul> <p><b>c) Regional Nodes (additional growth nodes)</b></p> <p>ROPA 48 establishes a set of additional growth nodes which form part of the Local Urban Structure. In the City of Burlington two Regional Nodes are identified: the Uptown Urban Centre which is identified as a Primary Regional Node and the Downtown Urban Centre which is identified as a Secondary Regional Node on Map 1H (Appendix B).</p> <p>City staff are supportive of the identification of Regional Nodes. By identifying the Regional Nodes ROPA 48 includes all of the existing Urban Centres and emerging Major Transit Station Areas as Strategic Growth Areas in the City of Burlington. In doing so ROPA 48 includes all areas identified as Primary Growth Areas within the City's new Official Plan.</p> <p>One key policy related to Regional Nodes is the requirement to prepare area-specific plans in accordance with Policies 48 and 77(5). For reference City Staff, in preparing the area-specific policies for the Downtown Urban Centre were guided by the same policy framework and confirm that with the exception of specific targets for Affordable Housing, which is a city-wide issue and will be considered through the City's Housing Strategy, all elements of the area-specific planning policies with respect to a redevelopment of a community were considered as part of the preparation of the modifications to the Downtown Urban Centre policies.</p> <p>Through the development of the new Official Plan a review of the policies in the Uptown Urban Centre was undertaken to recognize the maturity of the Uptown Area which was first subject to Secondary Planning in the 1990's. Staff will work with the Region to review the Uptown Urban Centre policies in the new Official Plan to determine if further area-specific planning or study may be required in the future.</p> <p>While supportive of the Regional Nodes policies, City staff also suggest that several refinements are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clarify the objectives of the Regional Nodes;</li> <li>- distinguish Primary and Secondary Regional Nodes more clearly in policy;</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>- in an abundance of caution, support the policy that encourages and allows for discretion by the Local municipality with respect to the delineation of Regional Node areas and the establishment of density targets.</p> <p>Detailed comments and modifications are proposed in Appendix A: ROPA 48 Comments Table.</p> <p><b>Staff Position</b></p> <p>City staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the identification of Regional Nodes, reflective of Local Official Plans; and</li> <li>- Suggest refinements to the Regional Nodes Policy and related concepts in Table 2b to support Local municipal discretion related to a number of aspects of the policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>d) Targets and Proportions for UGS's, MTSA's and Regional Nodes</b></p> <p>Table 2b in ROPA 48 establishes minimum density targets for the Urban Growth Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, as well as targets for the proportion of residents and jobs in the Urban Growth Centers, Major Transit Station Areas and Primary Regional Nodes.</p> <p>Staff are supportive of the minimum density targets for the UGCs and MTSAs identified in ROPA 48, including the alternative density target of 120 people &amp; jobs per hectare for the Appleby GO MTSA, which is unique in nature given that a significant portion of the MTSA is within the Region's Employment Area. While supportive, staff suggest the following refinements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add a note to Table 2b to identify that the targets are to be considered in the development of local OPAs;</li> <li>- Flexibility at the local level is needed to balance residents and jobs. Modifications to the target proportions of residents and jobs should be allowed through a local process implementing the relevant Regional OP policies;</li> </ul> <p>As previously indicated, staff are supportive of the Region's policy which encourages local municipalities to delineate boundaries and establish minimum density targets for other Strategic Growth Areas which are not directly mandated through Provincial policy, such as Regional Nodes.</p>	<p>See responses below to Appendix A comments</p> <p>An additional objective has been added to the list in Section 82: "To reflect and reinforce Local Urban Structures.</p> <p>Primary and secondary nodes are distinguished in Section 79.2 and elaborated on in Section 82.1.</p> <p>The detailed directions have been replaced with a more general direction that allows for flexibility in local implementation.</p> <p>Given the importance of accommodating employment growth in SGAs to the Region's growth strategy, a target proportion of residents and jobs in Table 2b is maintained in ROPA 48. However, Table 2b is revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarify the general nature of the target (through the addition of the word 'General' and through the addition of the tilde (~) symbol which is commonly read as 'approximately');</li> <li>• update the targets for specific SGAs based on local feedback (Milton UGC, Palermo Village) and/or to achieve a greater level of consistency across the SGAs and to reflect the more general nature of the targets (Aldershot, Acton, etc.);</li> <li>• add a footnote to reinforce the general / long-term / aspirational nature of the target and the latitude for refinements to it through a</li> </ul>



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Detailed comments and modifications are proposed in Appendix A: ROPA 48 Comment Table.</p> <p><b>e) Employment Uses in Strategic Growth Areas</b></p> <p>ROPA 48 provides clear direction and solid expectations for the development of employment uses within Strategic Growth Areas, supported by detailed planning and monitoring.</p> <p>In planning to achieve the target proportion of residents and jobs within Strategic Growth Areas, local municipalities are to establish policies identifying specific employment requirements including the identification of a minimum proportion or threshold of the total gross floor area to be developed for employment uses. Staff are of the opinion that the policy as written is too prescriptive. It may be more appropriate to identify a set of high level criteria to guide the Region when considering local approaches to achieving this balance. This approach would give local municipalities the opportunity to use a variety of tools and allow for flexible and creative approaches to support the broader Regional and Local objective of ensuring a balance of jobs and people in a way that best suits each unique local area.</p> <p>Detailed comments and modifications are proposed in Appendix A: ROPA 48 Comment Table.</p> <p><b>f) Other Regional Urban Structure Elements</b></p> <p>There are two remaining elements of the Regional Urban Structure that will be considered in subsequent amendments and those are Regional Corridors and Local Nodes. On the issue of Regional Corridors City staff look forward to discussing the identification and mapping of Regional Corridors at a later stage of the process.</p> <p>City staff are supportive of the Regional Official Plan reinforcing Local Urban Structure and policies. As the Region moves forward with developing Local Nodes policy City staff recommend distinguishing Local Nodes in the Regional Official Plan. Local Nodes will each have unique local context and will be subject to the policies of Local Official Plans. In addition, staff recommend that Regional policy continue to support that Local Nodes may only be added through Local Official Plan Reviews and that the policy frameworks related to any identified Local Nodes should be exempt from Regional approval. Regional Policy 44 identifies that the “Local Urban Structure of each of the</p>	<p>local process, consistent with Section 55.3, which has also been revised to clarify the implementation of the general target in Table 2b through local planning processes.</p> <p>In terms of Section 79.3(13), the detailed directions in Draft ROPA 48 have been replaced with more general direction that allows for more flexibility in local implementation. This includes the removal of requirements related to specific development criteria or policy approaches</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Local Municipalities, for instance are the responsibilities of the Local Municipalities as long as the overall planning vision for Halton and the policies of this Plan, including the Regional Urban Structure, are adhered to.” Staff support this position and look forward to future discussions.</p> <p><b>2.2.3 Employment Conversions</b></p> <p>As was noted earlier, the City as part of the adoption of the new Official Plan presented Appendix D to PB-04-18 that included the range of employment conversions recommended by the City to be considered through the Region’s municipal comprehensive review. With the exception of 1150 and 1200 King Road (see row E and O of Appendix D) discussed above, all City recommended employment conversions have been supported in the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper. Staff also note that of those supported only one area (see row I of Appendix D) has not been included in ROPA 48.</p> <p>Staff request that the area be brought forward into ROPA 48. Given the nature of the conversion it is appropriate as it has been highlighted in the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper that these decisions to convert do not have an impact on the consideration of the rest of the IGMS.</p> <p>Further details on other employment conversions and comments related to Employment Area additions will be provided as part of the City’s comments on the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper.</p> <p><b>Strategy/process</b></p> <p>ROPA 48 is being advanced under Section 26 of the Planning Act to advance local municipal planning priorities related to defining the Regional Urban Structure and to achieve conformity with the Growth Plan, 2019.</p> <p>Official Plan Amendments made under Section 26 of the Planning Act require approval from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, with the Minister’s decision not subject to appeal.</p> <p>The Planning Act also requires the Region to circulate draft ROPA 48 for the Minister’s review at least 90 days in advance of providing notification of an Open House and Statutory Public Meeting. To that end, on February 17, 2021, through report LPS17-21, Regional Council directed Staff to circulate draft ROPA 48 to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.</p>	<p>The Employment Area lands known as “North Service Road / Industrial Street” are recommended for conversion through the Preferred Growth Concept, Regional staff have not recommended that this conversion be advanced through Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 because it does not meet the criteria for prioritizing inclusion at this time. Where conversion requests are not required to support local municipal plans and priorities they will be addressed through the Preferred Growth Concept. More information on the assessment is available in Appendix C of the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Currently, the Region has indicated that the Virtual Public Information Centres, Open House and Statutory Public Meetings are targeted for June, 2021 with no date formally scheduled at the time of the preparation of this report. Staff note that engagement opportunities will also be available through the Virtual Public Information Sessions for the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper and Phase 2 – Initial Consultation Summary Reports as part of the Region's Integrated Growth Management Strategy work. These Virtual Public Information Sessions are currently targeted for May 2021.</p> <p>At the time of ROPA 48's approval, the City of Burlington will be required to bring its Official Plan into conformity with the Region's Official Plan as amended by ROPA 48. Burlington's Official Plan will be brought into conformity with the Regional Official Plan through a phased approach. In the near-term, Staff will focus on bringing the site specific employment conversions into conformity while the broader conformity issues will be addressed through a series of Official Plan Amendments. It is expected that this will be accomplished in part through the forthcoming MTSA Area Specific Plan study work and in part through a broader amendment to the new Official Plan. Staff will consider approaches in delivering this conformity and will provide update on this process at the appropriate time.</p> <p><b>Options Considered</b></p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p><b>Financial Matters:</b></p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p><b>Total Financial Impact</b></p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p><b>Source of Funding</b></p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p><b>Other Resource Impacts</b></p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p><b>Climate Implications</b></p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>The Region's Urban Structure focuses on growth within the existing Urban Areas of the Region of Halton. The Regional Urban Structure and the identification a hierarchy of Strategic Growth Areas across the Region reinforces the Region's ability to accommodate intensification and encourage and prioritize transit supportive growth.</p> <p><b>Engagement Matters:</b></p> <p>Staff consulted with a number of City Departments as well as Burlington Economic Development to gather feedback on ROPA 48 in the preparation of this report and its appendices. This consultation included an internal virtual meeting with various City departments.</p> <p>Please see the "Strategy/process" section above for information on the Region's engagement process.</p> <p>Regional staff have noted that there will be sufficient time to incorporate the findings from the Statutory Public Meeting into ROPA 48. As noted in the Regional Staff report LPS17-21 it is expected that:</p> <p>Any comments received through the statutory process will be documented on the public record and responded to by Regional staff prior to bringing forward a recommendation report to Council.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>ROPA 48 advances a number of local plans and priorities. Staff are supportive of ROPA 48 and the expeditious approval of the amendment will position the City to move forward on Major Transit Station Area area-specific plans at Aldershot GO, Downtown Burlington UGC / MTSA, and at Appleby GO.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Alison Enns, MCIP,RPP Manager of Policy and Community</p> <p><b>Appendices:</b></p> <p>A. ROPA 48 Comments Table</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response												
		<p>B. Regional Urban Structure Map 1H</p> <p><b>Notifications:</b></p> <p>Curt Benson, Region of Halton</p> <p><b>Report Approval:</b> All reports are reviewed and/or approved by Department Director, the Chief Financial Officer and the Executive Director of Legal Services &amp; Corporation Counsel.</p> <p>Appendix A: ROPA 48 Comments Table</p> <p><b>PL-20-21 Appendix A: ROPA 48 Comments Table</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Pg</th><th>Policy No.</th><th>Comment</th><th>Proposed Modifications to LPS17-21 Attachment #1 (pages 1 through 31) (Additions are indicated in <u>blue underlined</u> text and deletions are indicated in <del>strikethrough</del> text)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2/3 (pdf pgs 5/6)</td><td>Preamble / basis</td><td>The basis should include discussion of the path to full conformity to Growth Plan 2019.</td><td>The contents of this amendment do not compromise the ability of Regional Council to comprehensively and objectively evaluate the full range of growth concepts associated with the Integrated Growth Management and a subsequent Regional Official Plan Amendment. <u>The decision on a preferred growth concept and the finalization of technical...will result in one or more ROPAs to implement the findings of the work.</u></td></tr> <tr> <td>3 (pdf pg 6)</td><td>Contents</td><td>Edit</td><td>...legislative requirements under Section 16(<del>15</del><u>16</u>) of the Planning Act.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Pg	Policy No.	Comment	Proposed Modifications to LPS17-21 Attachment #1 (pages 1 through 31) (Additions are indicated in <u>blue underlined</u> text and deletions are indicated in <del>strikethrough</del> text)	2/3 (pdf pgs 5/6)	Preamble / basis	The basis should include discussion of the path to full conformity to Growth Plan 2019.	The contents of this amendment do not compromise the ability of Regional Council to comprehensively and objectively evaluate the full range of growth concepts associated with the Integrated Growth Management and a subsequent Regional Official Plan Amendment. <u>The decision on a preferred growth concept and the finalization of technical...will result in one or more ROPAs to implement the findings of the work.</u>	3 (pdf pg 6)	Contents	Edit	...legislative requirements under Section 16( <del>15</del> <u>16</u> ) of the Planning Act.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Change made</p>
Pg	Policy No.	Comment	Proposed Modifications to LPS17-21 Attachment #1 (pages 1 through 31) (Additions are indicated in <u>blue underlined</u> text and deletions are indicated in <del>strikethrough</del> text)												
2/3 (pdf pgs 5/6)	Preamble / basis	The basis should include discussion of the path to full conformity to Growth Plan 2019.	The contents of this amendment do not compromise the ability of Regional Council to comprehensively and objectively evaluate the full range of growth concepts associated with the Integrated Growth Management and a subsequent Regional Official Plan Amendment. <u>The decision on a preferred growth concept and the finalization of technical...will result in one or more ROPAs to implement the findings of the work.</u>												
3 (pdf pg 6)	Contents	Edit	...legislative requirements under Section 16( <del>15</del> <u>16</u> ) of the Planning Act.												

No.	Source	Submission				Response
		3 (pdf pg 6)	Contents	<p>“Regional Nodes...already recognized”.</p> <p>This is an appropriate description of the Regional Nodes.</p>	No change suggested.	<p>ROPA 48 has been revised to remove the reference to 2051 and clarify that the distribution to 2051 will be updated through the MCR. This acts as an interim policy, and will eventually be updated to read as originally proposed through the subsequent growth strategy ROPA.</p>
		3 (pdf pg 6)	Contents	Repeated text.	<p>Employment Area Conversions – Provides an initial set of strategic employment land conversions <del>required for fully implementing local municipal plans and priorities related to growth and intensification</del> which meet the criteria identified by the Region in conformity with the Provincial Growth Plan and which support the Regional Urban Structure, Local Urban Structure, and the implementation of local municipal plans and priorities related to growth and intensification.</p>	
			55	<p>The policy as written states that the Regional Structure is accompanied by a growth strategy for Halton based on the distribution of population and employment for the planning horizon year of 2051 as contained in Table 1 and in accordance with the Regional phasing outlined in Map 5 (Regional Phasing Table 2A).</p>	See edit for Table 1 footnote below.	

No.	Source	Submission				Response
				<p>The growth strategy is still underway; with the distribution of population and employment still to come and with the Regional phasing only to 2031.</p> <p>If the amendment continues to include the population and employment forecast region-wide to 2051 city staff request that the Region consider adding additional language to the Table 1 footnote clarify the application of Growth Plan Policy 5.2.4.3. See proposed edit below.</p>		<p>Changes are proposed to provide a greater level of description of the targets identified in Table 2b, including how/when they are to be planned for and achieved. For the density targets, the 2031 / post-2051 timeframes are clarified, consistent with the original footnote to Table 2b in Draft ROPA 48. For the proportion targets, a number of changes are proposed to reflect their role as general, overall targets intended to be achieved over the long-term. In addition, clarification is provided that the overall targets can be refined, subject to Regional approval (i.e., when being implemented through an Area-Specific Plan) provided the change does not compromise the Region's overall growth strategy, which informs the identification of the target in Table 2b.</p>
		6 (pdf pg 9)	55.3	<p>Minimum density targets will be addressed in later sections.</p> <p>Targets for the proportion of residents and jobs to be achieved within specific SGAs will be addressed in later sections</p>	<p>The Regional Structure also sets out targets that apply to certain Strategic Growth Areas as set out in Table 2b. This includes minimum density targets for Urban Growth Centres and Major Transit Station Areas, as well as targets for the proportion of residents and jobs planned to be achieved within specific Strategic Growth Areas, <a href="#">where appropriate.</a></p>	
		7 (pdf pg 10)	Table 1	<p>The policy as written states that the Regional Structure is accompanied by a growth strategy for Halton based on the distribution of population and employment for the planning horizon year of 2051 as contained in Table 1 and in accordance with the Regional phasing outlined in Map 5 (Regional Phasing Table</p>	<p><a href="#">The population and employment forecasts and plan horizon of 2031 contained in Table 1 will apply to all planning matters in Halton Region, including lower-tier planning matters until Halton Region has Distribution of distributed</a> the 2051 population and employment forecasts to the Local Municipalities, <del>forecasts</del> to be determined through the <i>municipal comprehensive review</i>.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response				
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="516 272 611 846"></td><td data-bbox="611 272 743 846"></td><td data-bbox="743 272 1005 846"> <p>2A).</p> <p>The growth strategy is still underway; with the distribution of population and employment still to come and with the Regional phasing only to 2031.</p> <p>If the amendment continues to include the population and employment forecast region-wide to 2051 city staff request that the Region consider adding additional language to the Table 1 clarify the application of Growth Plan Policy 5.2.4.3. footnote</p> </td><td data-bbox="1005 272 1346 846"></td></tr> </table>			<p>2A).</p> <p>The growth strategy is still underway; with the distribution of population and employment still to come and with the Regional phasing only to 2031.</p> <p>If the amendment continues to include the population and employment forecast region-wide to 2051 city staff request that the Region consider adding additional language to the Table 1 clarify the application of Growth Plan Policy 5.2.4.3. footnote</p>		<p>This text has been modified to provide interim clarification that Table 1 is modified in part through ROPA 48 and will be comprehensively modified through the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p>
		<p>2A).</p> <p>The growth strategy is still underway; with the distribution of population and employment still to come and with the Regional phasing only to 2031.</p> <p>If the amendment continues to include the population and employment forecast region-wide to 2051 city staff request that the Region consider adding additional language to the Table 1 clarify the application of Growth Plan Policy 5.2.4.3. footnote</p>					





No.	Source	Submission				Response
		9 (pdf pg 12)	78.1	This policy should be modified to acknowledge that many of the elements of the Regional Urban Structure are considered durable elements of the Region per policy section 35. Strategic Growth Areas are considered durable elements.	(1) To provide a structure and a hierarchy in which to direct population and employment growth within the Urban Area to the planning horizon of this Plan, <a href="#">and beyond</a> ;	No change recommended by Regional staff.
		N/A	79 (1)	Consider reinforcing the importance of the development of and enhancement of existing complete communities. Note: this policy was not included as part of draft ROPA 48.	(1) To provide an urban form that is complementary to existing developed areas, uses space more economically, promotes live-work relationships, fosters social interaction, enhances public safety and security, reduces travel by private automobile, promotes active transportation, and is environmentally more sustainable <a href="#">all in order to promote the development of complete communities</a> .	Recommendation accepted with minor adjustment.
		11 (pdf pg 14)	79.1 (3)	Note that Primary and Secondary Nodes are reflective of Local Official Plan Urban Structures	Primary and Secondary Regional Nodes identified by symbol on Map 1H due to their contribution to the Regional Urban Structure, which have a concentration of residential and employment uses with development densities and patterns <a href="#">reflective of Local Official Plan Urban Structures</a> and supportive of pedestrian traffic and public transit,	No change. The definition of 'Regional Node' includes a reference Local Urban Structure.
		N/A	79 (7)	Reinforce the role of parks and open spaces as part of complete communities. Note: this policy was not	(7) To provide high quality <a href="#">public parks and</a> open spaces with site design and urban design	Recommendations accepted.

No.	Source	Submission				Response
				included as part of draft ROPA 48.	standards that create attractive and vibrant places <a href="#">to promote the development of complete communities.</a>	<p>Noted. This will be considered through a subsequent ROPA.</p> <p>Noted. See comment above.</p> <p>Recommendation accepted.</p>
		9 (pdf pg 13)	79(11)	Consider moving the objectives specific to Regional Corridors to somewhere within 79.1 or into a new policy 83 called Regional Corridors directly following Regional Nodes.	Change suggested.	
		11 (pdf pg 14)	79.2	This policy is very clear about the SGA hierarchy. Consider ways of revising Map 1H to reflect the hierarchy clearly.	See comments on Map 1H	
		12 (pdf pg 15)	79.3(7)	<p>Since this is direction to the Local Municipality it is not appropriate to include a reference to a municipal comprehensive review. Refer instead to an Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The definition of municipal comprehensive review should also be modified to conform to the Growth Plan.</p>	<p>...prohibit site-specific Official Plan or Zoning By-law amendments to reduce <i>development density</i> within a Strategic Growth Area unless it is part of a <del>municipal comprehensive</del> <a href="#">Local Official Plan Review of the Official Plan</a> or a review of the Area-Specific Plan for the Strategic Growth Areas; and</p> <p>Modify 259.4 MUNICIPAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW  <a href="#">A new official plan, or an official plan amendment, initiated by an upper- or single- tier municipality under section 26 of the Planning Act that comprehensively applies the policies and schedules of the Growth Plan.</a></p>	
		14 (pdf pg 17)	79.3(13) a) and b)	Suggest simplifying to more closely match the associated Growth Plan	Require Local Municipalities to plan for employment uses within <i>Strategic Growth Areas</i> by:	

No.	Source	Submission	Response				
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="514 272 621 1360"></td><td data-bbox="621 272 741 1360"></td><td data-bbox="741 272 1003 1360"> <p>policy 2.2.5.14 to allow for greater flexibility.</p> <p>The implementing mechanism is the Local Planning exercise to determine appropriate policies. These policies could instead be considered as guidance for Regional staff when considering local approaches to ensuring that local plans establish means of achieving a balance of residence and jobs.</p> <p>Suggestions include renumbering and deletions.</p> </td><td data-bbox="1003 272 1346 1360"> <p>a) establishing development criteria <u>outside of Employment Areas</u> to ensure that the <del>site specific</del> redevelopment of any <i>employment lands will</i> retains space for a similar number of jobs to remain accommodated on site;</p> <p>b) identify a minimum employment target for the <i>Strategic Growth Area</i>.</p> <p>c) <u>considering a wide range of policy approaches to demonstrate to the Region that the Strategic Growth Areas has been planned to support a balance of residents and jobs appropriate to the growth area determined through area specific planning, or in general alignment with</u> the target proportion of residents and jobs within the Strategic Growth Area as identified in Table 2b. <del>through policies that</del></p> <p><i>delete remainder of 79.3(13)b) policies not included above.</i></p> </td></tr> </table>			<p>policy 2.2.5.14 to allow for greater flexibility.</p> <p>The implementing mechanism is the Local Planning exercise to determine appropriate policies. These policies could instead be considered as guidance for Regional staff when considering local approaches to ensuring that local plans establish means of achieving a balance of residence and jobs.</p> <p>Suggestions include renumbering and deletions.</p>	<p>a) establishing development criteria <u>outside of Employment Areas</u> to ensure that the <del>site specific</del> redevelopment of any <i>employment lands will</i> retains space for a similar number of jobs to remain accommodated on site;</p> <p>b) identify a minimum employment target for the <i>Strategic Growth Area</i>.</p> <p>c) <u>considering a wide range of policy approaches to demonstrate to the Region that the Strategic Growth Areas has been planned to support a balance of residents and jobs appropriate to the growth area determined through area specific planning, or in general alignment with</u> the target proportion of residents and jobs within the Strategic Growth Area as identified in Table 2b. <del>through policies that</del></p> <p><i>delete remainder of 79.3(13)b) policies not included above.</i></p>	<p>The detailed directions have been replaced with a more general reference / direction that allows for flexibility in local implementation.</p>
		<p>policy 2.2.5.14 to allow for greater flexibility.</p> <p>The implementing mechanism is the Local Planning exercise to determine appropriate policies. These policies could instead be considered as guidance for Regional staff when considering local approaches to ensuring that local plans establish means of achieving a balance of residence and jobs.</p> <p>Suggestions include renumbering and deletions.</p>	<p>a) establishing development criteria <u>outside of Employment Areas</u> to ensure that the <del>site specific</del> redevelopment of any <i>employment lands will</i> retains space for a similar number of jobs to remain accommodated on site;</p> <p>b) identify a minimum employment target for the <i>Strategic Growth Area</i>.</p> <p>c) <u>considering a wide range of policy approaches to demonstrate to the Region that the Strategic Growth Areas has been planned to support a balance of residents and jobs appropriate to the growth area determined through area specific planning, or in general alignment with</u> the target proportion of residents and jobs within the Strategic Growth Area as identified in Table 2b. <del>through policies that</del></p> <p><i>delete remainder of 79.3(13)b) policies not included above.</i></p>				



No.	Source	Submission				Response
		16 (pdf pg 19)	81(1)	Reinforce that the definition of public service facilities includes public parks and open spaces.	To leverage infrastructure investments and the development of public service facilities, <a href="#">including public parks and open spaces</a> , to support a significant share...	Noted. No change made.
		16 (pdf pg 19)	81 (2)	Consider the addition of parks.	To provide a range and mix of transit- supportive uses, such as residential, retail, office, <a href="#">parks</a> and public uses that supports the area in a pedestrian-oriented urban environment.	Change made and included reference to public service facilities as well.
		16 & 17 (pdf pg 19 & 20)	81(6)	Significant is not a defined term in the context of this policy.	To protect existing significant employment uses within Major Transit Station Areas by ensuring land use compatibility with adjacent new development is achieved.	Removed word “significant”
		17 (pdf pg 20)	81.2(2) a)	Suggest this policy reference the durable elements of the plan (Policy 35).	The minimum density target for each Major Transit Station Area as prescribed in Table 2b, which may be achieved beyond the planning horizon of this Plan <a href="#">in accordance with policy 35</a> ;	No change made.
		17 (pdf pg 20)	81.2(2) a)	Reframe the target proportion of residents and jobs within each MTSA as considerations.	...plan to achieve... <del>the target proportion</del> <a href="#">a context appropriate balance</a> of residents and jobs within each Major Transit Station Area <a href="#">as guided by Local Area-Specific Planning or as generally established in</a> <del>set out in</del> Table 2b, where applicable	Changes made consistent with other sections of the amendment.
		18 (pdf pg 21)	81.2(4) b)	Reframe as a locally confirmed context appropriate balance of residents and jobs along with appropriate policies and monitoring and other mechanisms.	identifies the <a href="#">locally confirmed context appropriate balance</a> <del>target proportion</del> of residents and jobs <del>that must be planned for in accordance with</del> <a href="#">as guided by</a> Table 2b.	Changes made consistent with other sections of the amendment.

No.	Source	Submission				Response
		18 (pdf pg 21)	81.2(4) e)	Consider adding the need to identify and protect for future transportation infrastructure to support active transportation.	identifies and protects lands that may be needed for future enhancement or expansion of transit <a href="#">operations, transportation and infrastructure</a> , as appropriate.	<p>No change. Definition of “infrastructure” includes transit terminals and rolling stock.</p> <p>Change made.</p> <p>No change recommended. The policy as worded appropriately indicates that the affordable housing targets must be informed by the Regional targets in Section 86, which are positioned as minimums.</p> <p>Change made to add reference to <i>Planning Act</i> and to remove details which can be incorporated based on further discussion / review and incorporated in Section 86 of the ROP through the broader IGMS ROPA.</p>
		18 (pdf pg 21)	81.2(4) g)	The policy could be modified to describe the action that the policies should take.	<a href="#">Identifies transportation and transit networks which</a> are transit-supportive and achieve <i>multimodal</i> access to the stations, ensure connections to all transit service, and provide <i>infrastructure</i> to support active transportation.	
		18 (pdf pg 21)	81.2(4) i)	<p>Section 86 identifies Region-wide Affordable Housing Targets. Given that these are Regional targets it would be more appropriate for the policy to direct the establishment of affordable housing targets to support the Region in achieving its targets. By their nature these intensification areas will far exceed the targets established at the Regional level.</p> <p>Consider distinguishing the affordable housing policy from the inclusionary zoning policy. Is it necessary to include the components of an Inclusionary Zoning Assessment Report in the policy? Should any of the requirements change, it may result in further amendments to the Plan.</p>	<p>establishes <i>Affordable Housing</i> targets <a href="#">to support the achievement of the targets in accordance with the applicable policies</a> of Section 86 of this Plan, and inclusionary zoning policies authorizing a ..</p> <p>The Inclusionary Zoning <i>policies</i> will be based on the completion of an assessment report <a href="#">in accordance with the Planning Act, which is</a> prepared by the <i>Region</i> or Local Municipality, to the satisfaction of the <i>Region</i>.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission				Response
				Consider simplifying the policy by referring to the Planning Act.		<p>Change made elsewhere.</p> <p>No change – content provides necessary description / context.</p> <p>Addition made to reference the Local Urban Structures. The notion of a hierarchy is already present in Section 79.2 and elaborated on in Section 82.1.</p> <p>No change made.</p>
		18 (pdf pg 21)	81.2(4) i)	Subject to suggested changes above. It is possible that this policy would be appropriate should the changes proposed to 79.3(13) be included.	includes detailed policies and development criteria to ensure that the development of employment uses planned within the Major Transit Station Area meet the requirements of Section 79.3(13) of this Plan	
		20 (pdf pg 23)	82(1)	Consider simplifying objective 1.	To recognize <i>Strategic Growth Areas</i> in the Region which are an integral component of the Regional Urban Structure <del>and are historic downtown areas, or contain a concentration of public service facilities (i.e. hospitals, universities) and/or transit-supportive, high density uses.</del>	
		n/a	82 New objective	<p>Since the policies establish a hierarchy of Regional Nodes the objectives should include an objective reflective of that policy.</p> <p>The policy in 82.1 should describe the distinctions among Primary and Secondary Regional Nodes.</p>	<u>(4) To reflect and reinforce Local Official Plan Urban Structures, and to establish a hierarchy of Primary and Secondary Regional Nodes.</u>	
			82.1	Suggested language. The Regional Nodes are recognizing areas that have already are subject to Local Official Plan policies.	The Regional Nodes as identified on Map 1H by symbol are <u>identified in Local Official Plans and have been categorized as either Primary Regional Nodes or Secondary Regional Nodes to reflect each respective node's role in the Region's Strategic Growth Area hierarchy established in policy 79.2.</u>	



No.	Source	Submission				Response
						No change made.
			82.1(1)	Modify wording. Distinguish Primary Regional Nodes from Secondary Regional Nodes.	<p>Primary <i>Regional</i> Nodes <del>that</del> are planned to accommodate growth <u>at a scale appropriate to their context</u> and <u>display two or more of the following characteristics or features:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• contain a concentration of <u>existing or planned</u> public service facilities; or,</li> <li>• <u>contain existing or planned</u> transit-supportive high-density mixed uses,, or,</li> <li>• which <u>are located on a Regionally identified</u> Higher Order Transit Corridor or <u>alternatively will be planned to</u> perform a regional transit network function <del>at a scale appropriate for their context.</del></li> </ul> <p><u>Primary Regional Nodes include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Uptown Core, Oakville;</li> <li>b) Hospital District, Oakville;</li> <li>c) Milton Education Village, Milton;</li> <li>d) Palermo Village, Oakville; and</li> <li>e) Uptown Urban Centre, Burlington.</li> </ol>	

No.	Source	Submission				Response
			82.1(2)	<p>Modify wording.</p> <p>Distinguish Primary Regional Nodes from Secondary Regional Nodes.</p>	<p>Secondary <i>Regional Nodes</i> <del>that</del> are historic downtown areas or villages <del>that are planned to accommodate mixed use intensification growth at a scale appropriate to their context, and/or are intended to be a focus for growth through mixed use intensification at a scale appropriate for their context.</del></p> <p><u>Secondary Regional Nodes include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Neyagawa Urban Core, Oakville;</li> <li>b) Kerr Village, Oakville;</li> <li>c) Bronte Village, Oakville;</li> <li>d) Downtown Oakville;</li> <li>e) Downtown Urban Centre, Burlington;</li> <li>f) Downtown Georgetown, Halton Hills; and</li> <li>g) Guelph Street Corridor, Halton Hills.</li> </ul>	No change made.

No.	Source	Submission	Response				
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 272 621 1289"></td><td data-bbox="621 272 741 1289">82.2</td><td data-bbox="741 272 1003 1289">This set of policies should acknowledge the existing local policy framework. Please note that policy (2) in the tracked changes version of the policies uses the word encourage. City staff are supportive of this policy being framed as encourage to allow for a flexible local approach to determining whether a boundary and target is appropriate.</td><td data-bbox="1003 272 1350 1289"> <p>It is the policy of the Region to:</p> <p>(1) Direct development with higher densities and mixed uses to <i>Regional Nodes</i> in accordance with the hierarchy identified in Section 79.2, <a href="#">reflective of existing Local Official Plan policies</a> and based on the level of existing and planned transit service.</p> <p>(2) <a href="#">Encourage</a> <del>Require</del> the Local Municipalities to delineate the boundaries of <i>Regional Nodes</i>, and identify a minimum density target expressed as the minimum number of residents and jobs per hectare for the delineated area, <a href="#">where appropriate</a>.</p> <p>(3) For applicable Primary <i>Regional Nodes</i> identified in Table 2b, require the Local Municipalities to <a href="#">develop policies in order to</a> plan to achieve the target proportion of residents and jobs specified <a href="#">or identify an alternative proportion reflective of local context while still achieving a balance among population and employment</a>.</p> <p>(4) Require the Local Municipalities to prepare detailed official plan policies or an Area-Specific Plan for <i>Regional Nodes</i>, in accordance with Sections 48 and 77(5) of this Plan.</p> </td></tr> </table>		82.2	This set of policies should acknowledge the existing local policy framework. Please note that policy (2) in the tracked changes version of the policies uses the word encourage. City staff are supportive of this policy being framed as encourage to allow for a flexible local approach to determining whether a boundary and target is appropriate.	<p>It is the policy of the Region to:</p> <p>(1) Direct development with higher densities and mixed uses to <i>Regional Nodes</i> in accordance with the hierarchy identified in Section 79.2, <a href="#">reflective of existing Local Official Plan policies</a> and based on the level of existing and planned transit service.</p> <p>(2) <a href="#">Encourage</a> <del>Require</del> the Local Municipalities to delineate the boundaries of <i>Regional Nodes</i>, and identify a minimum density target expressed as the minimum number of residents and jobs per hectare for the delineated area, <a href="#">where appropriate</a>.</p> <p>(3) For applicable Primary <i>Regional Nodes</i> identified in Table 2b, require the Local Municipalities to <a href="#">develop policies in order to</a> plan to achieve the target proportion of residents and jobs specified <a href="#">or identify an alternative proportion reflective of local context while still achieving a balance among population and employment</a>.</p> <p>(4) Require the Local Municipalities to prepare detailed official plan policies or an Area-Specific Plan for <i>Regional Nodes</i>, in accordance with Sections 48 and 77(5) of this Plan.</p>	<p>No change made.</p> <p>Change made to “Encourage”.</p> <p>No change made.</p>
	82.2	This set of policies should acknowledge the existing local policy framework. Please note that policy (2) in the tracked changes version of the policies uses the word encourage. City staff are supportive of this policy being framed as encourage to allow for a flexible local approach to determining whether a boundary and target is appropriate.	<p>It is the policy of the Region to:</p> <p>(1) Direct development with higher densities and mixed uses to <i>Regional Nodes</i> in accordance with the hierarchy identified in Section 79.2, <a href="#">reflective of existing Local Official Plan policies</a> and based on the level of existing and planned transit service.</p> <p>(2) <a href="#">Encourage</a> <del>Require</del> the Local Municipalities to delineate the boundaries of <i>Regional Nodes</i>, and identify a minimum density target expressed as the minimum number of residents and jobs per hectare for the delineated area, <a href="#">where appropriate</a>.</p> <p>(3) For applicable Primary <i>Regional Nodes</i> identified in Table 2b, require the Local Municipalities to <a href="#">develop policies in order to</a> plan to achieve the target proportion of residents and jobs specified <a href="#">or identify an alternative proportion reflective of local context while still achieving a balance among population and employment</a>.</p> <p>(4) Require the Local Municipalities to prepare detailed official plan policies or an Area-Specific Plan for <i>Regional Nodes</i>, in accordance with Sections 48 and 77(5) of this Plan.</p>				

No.	Source	Submission	Response				
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="514 272 619 1154"></td><td data-bbox="619 272 741 1154">83.2(7)</td><td data-bbox="741 272 1003 1154"> <p>This policy is relevant to the Appleby GO MTSA area as well as the Burlington GO UGC/MTSA.</p> <p>These areas will be subject to future area-specific planning the policy should be framed with that lens. It is also suggested that the policy should describe the general objectives and leave latitude for the development of solutions or approaches that achieve the objective (treating these areas reflective of their dual purpose) that are appropriate to the local context.</p> </td><td data-bbox="1003 272 1350 1154"> <p>Where Employment Areas are located within a Major Transit Station Area as delineated on Map 1H, recognize the dual role and function of these Major Transit Station Areas as mixed use Strategic Growth Areas as well as the location of important existing employment uses, and, require Local Municipalities <u>in accordance with 48 and 77(5) to recognize to plan for these areas by:</u></p> <p><del>a) recognizing the importance of existing employment uses and the potential for employment growth and intensification within the Employment Area and within adjacent mixed use areas; .The policies must consider land use compatibility and must ensure that new uses</del></p> <p><del>b) providing an appropriate interface between the Employment Area and adjacent mixed use areas to maintain land use compatibility; and</del></p> <p><del>c) c) only permitting development within adjacent mixed use areas if land use compatibility can be addressed in a manner that protects existing employment uses in accordance with Section 79.3(12) of this Plan.</del></p> </td></tr> </table>		83.2(7)	<p>This policy is relevant to the Appleby GO MTSA area as well as the Burlington GO UGC/MTSA.</p> <p>These areas will be subject to future area-specific planning the policy should be framed with that lens. It is also suggested that the policy should describe the general objectives and leave latitude for the development of solutions or approaches that achieve the objective (treating these areas reflective of their dual purpose) that are appropriate to the local context.</p>	<p>Where Employment Areas are located within a Major Transit Station Area as delineated on Map 1H, recognize the dual role and function of these Major Transit Station Areas as mixed use Strategic Growth Areas as well as the location of important existing employment uses, and, require Local Municipalities <u>in accordance with 48 and 77(5) to recognize to plan for these areas by:</u></p> <p><del>a) recognizing the importance of existing employment uses and the potential for employment growth and intensification within the Employment Area and within adjacent mixed use areas; .The policies must consider land use compatibility and must ensure that new uses</del></p> <p><del>b) providing an appropriate interface between the Employment Area and adjacent mixed use areas to maintain land use compatibility; and</del></p> <p><del>c) c) only permitting development within adjacent mixed use areas if land use compatibility can be addressed in a manner that protects existing employment uses in accordance with Section 79.3(12) of this Plan.</del></p>	<p>Changes have been incorporated to address the role of future Area-Specific Planning work undertaken by Local Municipalities in implementing these policies. Direction related to the importance of existing employment uses, providing an appropriate interface, and ensuring land use compatibility have been maintained.</p>
	83.2(7)	<p>This policy is relevant to the Appleby GO MTSA area as well as the Burlington GO UGC/MTSA.</p> <p>These areas will be subject to future area-specific planning the policy should be framed with that lens. It is also suggested that the policy should describe the general objectives and leave latitude for the development of solutions or approaches that achieve the objective (treating these areas reflective of their dual purpose) that are appropriate to the local context.</p>	<p>Where Employment Areas are located within a Major Transit Station Area as delineated on Map 1H, recognize the dual role and function of these Major Transit Station Areas as mixed use Strategic Growth Areas as well as the location of important existing employment uses, and, require Local Municipalities <u>in accordance with 48 and 77(5) to recognize to plan for these areas by:</u></p> <p><del>a) recognizing the importance of existing employment uses and the potential for employment growth and intensification within the Employment Area and within adjacent mixed use areas; .The policies must consider land use compatibility and must ensure that new uses</del></p> <p><del>b) providing an appropriate interface between the Employment Area and adjacent mixed use areas to maintain land use compatibility; and</del></p> <p><del>c) c) only permitting development within adjacent mixed use areas if land use compatibility can be addressed in a manner that protects existing employment uses in accordance with Section 79.3(12) of this Plan.</del></p>				

No.	Source	Submission				Response
			240	<p>FREQUENT TRANSIT</p> <p>It will be important to distinguish the <b>Frequent Transit</b> definition from the <b>Higher Order Transit</b> definition and the <b>Higher Order Transit Corridors</b> identified on a variety of Regional Maps.</p> <p>Staff also understand that the identification of Regional Corridors will form part of a future ROPA.</p>	No modification suggested.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Opportunities to enhance the mapping may be considered through the balance of the Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p>The Employment Area lands known as “North Service Road / Industrial Street” are recommended for conversion through the Preferred Growth Concept, Regional staff have not recommended that this conversion be advanced through Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 because it does not meet the criteria for prioritizing inclusion at this time. Where conversion requests are not required to support local municipal plans and priorities they will be addressed through the Preferred Growth Concept. More information on the assessment is available in Appendix C of the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper.</p> <p>.</p>
		Mapping	1H	It is somewhat difficult to distinguish Urban Growth Centres from MTSAs on Map 1H. The hierarchy outlined in 79.2 can be reinforced through Map 1H.	Propose mapping changes.	
		Mapping	1H	All but one of the supported employment conversion requests within the City are being implemented through ROPA 48. Given that the conversion of the employment lands identified as B-09 in Appendix C.1 of the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper are not expected to have an adverse impact on the overall supply of employment lands, this conversion should be included in ROPA 48.	Modify the mapping to include the conversion of these lands through ROPA 48.	

No.	Source	Submission	Response				
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 272 621 493">Mapping</td><td data-bbox="621 272 741 493">6B</td><td data-bbox="741 272 1010 493">Suggest a title change to Map 6B</td><td data-bbox="1010 272 1346 493">           Modify from  <del>Map 6b – Downtown Burlington GO UGC / MTSA</del>            To  <a href="#">Map 6b – Downtown Burlington UGC / Burlington GO MTSA</a> </td></tr> </table>	Mapping	6B	Suggest a title change to Map 6B	Modify from <del>Map 6b – Downtown Burlington GO UGC / MTSA</del> To <a href="#">Map 6b – Downtown Burlington UGC / Burlington GO MTSA</a>	Change made.
Mapping	6B	Suggest a title change to Map 6B	Modify from <del>Map 6b – Downtown Burlington GO UGC / MTSA</del> To <a href="#">Map 6b – Downtown Burlington UGC / Burlington GO MTSA</a>				
12	City of Brampton  E-mail dated May 17, 2021	<p>May 17, 2021            Karyn Poad, RPP MCIP            Senior Planner            Regional Municipality of Halton            1151 Bronte Road            Oakville, Ontario            L6M 3L1</p> <p>Dear Karyn,</p> <p><b><i>RE: DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 48 AN AMENDMENT TO DEFINE A REGIONAL URBAN STRUCTURE HALTON REGION</i></b></p> <p>The City of Brampton received the circulation memo, dated March 9, 2021, wherein the Regional Municipality of Halton requests comments on the Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) No. 48 - "An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure". We also received the proposed <i>Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 - An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure</i> and Halton Regional Council Minutes of February 17, 2021. The purpose of Halton Region's ROPA 48 is to implement the Regional Urban Structure and a hierarchy of strategic growth areas.</p> <p>The City of Brampton is undertaking the Brampton Plan (Official Plan) Review anticipated for adoption in Spring/Q2 2022. The City of Brampton presented the growth trends and growth forecast to 2051 at the Planning and Development Committee Meeting dated December 7, 2020 that anticipates a preferred growth scenario of 1.1 million people and 400,500 jobs. The new draft City Structure, which consists of a series of networks for broad land use designations and where intensification will be directed, was presented at a Brampton Plan Public Workshop on April 10, 2021, and staff are anticipating further comments.</p>					

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Staff have no comments at this time on Halton Region's ROPA 48 and will continue to monitor the ongoing review. The project team is working collaboratively with the Region of Peel to ensure conformity with the ongoing Region of Peel Regional Official Plan Review.</p> <p>For more information, please visit the Brampton Plan (Official Plan) Review project webpage at: <a href="https://www.brampton.ca/officialplan">https://www.brampton.ca/officialplan</a></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on Halton Region's ongoing review and would appreciate to be circulated on future requests for comment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Shahinaz Eshesh Assistant Policy Planner</p> <p>Official Plan &amp; Growth Management, City Planning &amp; Design Planning, Building and Economic Development City of Brampton   2 Wellington Street West   City Hall</p> <p>c. Andrew McNeill, Manager, Official Plan &amp; Growth Management Bob Bjerke, Director, City Planning &amp; Design</p>	Noted
13	Region of Peel  E-mail dated May 21, 2021	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Halton Region's ROPA 48 – Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure. The following encompasses comments from Peel Region Transportation Planning.</p> <p>Overall Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In accordance with Provincial policy, the Amendment should continue to protect for the GTA West Corridor/HPBATS improvements identified on Map #3 (currently under appeal).</li> <li>2. In accordance with Provincial policy, the Region of Peel is including corridor protection policies for the North West GTA Transmission Corridor Identification Study. Clarification is being sought from Halton Region on the status of this corridor and similarly, the inclusion of protection policies.</li> <li>3. Upon further review, Region of Peel Transportation staff note the Amendment does not include road infrastructure needs driven by 2051 growth forecasts. At this time, Transportation staff are unable to provide detailed</li> </ol>	<p>ROPA 48 is being advanced as a phased Section 26 amendment as part of the Region's Municipal Comprehensive Review. The amendment identifies elements of a Regional Urban Structure of strategic growth areas for growth and intensification.</p> <p>The GTA West Corridor/HPBATS corridor protection area continues to be identified on Map 3 (under appeal) as amended through ROPA 48.</p> <p>Through the balance of the ROPR, protection policies for provincial infrastructure will be</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>comments on the transportation network, specifically the regional mid-block right-of-way requirements.</p> <p>4. Prior to finalizing the Amendment, further coordination is recommended between identification of Halton's strategic goods movement network and that of Peel's to address right-of-way requirements as well as designation of the strategic goods movement network.</p> <p>5. To further support coordination of right-of-way requirements, mapping associated with the Amendment should properly identify jurisdiction of boundary roads.</p> <p>Should there be any questions regarding the comments above, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	<p>considered in accordance with Provincial plans and policies.</p> <p>Following the conclusion of the Integrated Growth Management Strategy and identification of a preferred growth concept, the Region will advance a subsequent amendment which will include updates to transportation related policies.</p>
14	<p>Halton District School Board</p> <p>E-mail dated May 31, 2021</p>	<p>May 31, 2021 Karyn Poat Legislative &amp; Planning Services Department - Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville ON L6M 3L1 Dear Ms. Poat:</p> <p><b>Subject: Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 An Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment\ (ROPA) No. 48. It is understood that Draft ROPA 48 is part of the Region's phased approach to a comprehensive review and conformity with the Province's 2019 Growth Plan. Draft ROPA 48 includes minimum density targets and proportional mix targets for residents and jobs in strategic growth areas. Included with the circulation of Draft ROPA 48 is Report No. LPS17-21 and Halton Regional Council February 17, 2021 Minutes.</p> <p><b>General Comments on Student Accommodation in the Region of Halton</b></p> <p>The Halton District School Board for the 2021-22 school year will have 89 elementary schools and sixteen (16) secondary schools over four (4) municipalities in the Region of Halton which</p>	



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>accommodates over 65,000 elementary and secondary students as of October 31, 2020. Public school student enrolment in the Region has increased 4% since 2016. It is projected that student enrolment will increase by approximately 7% over the next ten (10) years. Student projections include completed secondary plans (Boyne, North Oakville) that currently have development applications in circulation and the projected build-out of the Vision Georgetown Secondary Plan.</p> <p>It is anticipated that student enrolment will increase further with the development of Urban Growth Centres (UGC) and Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA) as outlined in Draft ROPA 48.</p> <p><a href="#">School boundary maps</a> and the <a href="#">Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP)</a> which includes the long-range school enrolment projections over ten (10) years and a list of proposed capital projects can be found on the Board's website. The LTAP also outlines areas experiencing student accommodation pressures and proposes school boundary and program reviews for the Board to consider and undertake. Student projections developed in the LTAP rely on historical student yields in established communities and the residential units projected in secondary plans and development plans circulated by the municipalities. School boundary maps and the LTAP are reviewed and updated every year.</p> <p><a href="#">Education Development Charges (EDCs)</a> are a revenue source used by school boards to fund school site acquisitions and other site-related costs. The EDC background study includes demographic projections and residential and non-residential growth forecasts for the Region of Halton over fifteen (15) years from the time of EDC study preparation. Student projections developed in the EDC study rely on residential dwelling unit forecasts which are used to project students from new development.</p> <p><b>Board Comments on Draft ROPA No. 48</b> The Board has reviewed the draft document and has a number of comments as it pertains to education and other matters as it relates to school board facilities. The Board looks forward to participating in future conversations and providing updated comments as the Region's comprehensive review progresses.</p> <p><b>PART II BASIC POSITION</b> <b>Halton's Planning Vision (Sections 25 to 33)</b></p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><b>Planning Horizon (Sections 34 to 35)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board acknowledges the change of the planning horizon from 2031 to 2051 for this amendment.</li> <li>• Please note that the Board conducts long-range projections for a number of background studies and boundary and program reviews usually ranging from 10 to 15 years.</li> </ul> <p><b>Halton and the Province of Ontario (Sections 36 to 38)</b>  <b>Halton and Its Surrounding Region (Sections 39 to 42)</b>  <b>Halton and the Local Municipalities (Sections 43 to 49)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board acknowledges the intent to provide a broad policy direction on strategic matters and recognizes that local municipalities are to deal with their local environments.  The Board will provide comments to the municipalities on their more specific policies and plans moving forward.</li> </ul> <p><b>Halton's Regional Structure (Sections 50 to 56)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These sections list a number of map and table updates to reflect the boundaries of the proposed Strategic Growth Areas and the change in the planning horizon from 2031 to 2051. The Board is interested in viewing an updated <b>Map 5, Regional Phasing</b>, in <a href="#">ROPA June 19, 2018 office consolidation</a>.</li> <li>• <b>Section 56, Table 2, Intensification and Density Targets, and Table 2a, Regional Phasing</b>, show targets up to 2031. Please circulate the Board once the 2051 municipal forecasts are updated.</li> <li>• The Board requests that, where possible, to split the Regional Phasing of Medium &amp; High-Density units in <b>Table 2a</b> into two separate categories of Medium-Density units and High-Density units. The Board develops its long-term enrolment forecasts and school site needs using low, medium, and high-density yields.</li> <li>• The Board acknowledges that <b>Table 2b, Strategic Growth Area Targets</b>, sets out certain Strategic Growth Areas and includes minimum density targets for Urban Growth Centres (UGC) and Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA) and targets for residents to job proportion planned to be achieved. Strategic Growth Areas require further study and targets are subject to change. It is the intent of the Board to participate in future studies for these areas and provide comments.</li> </ul> <p><b>PART III LAND STEWARDSHIP POLICIES</b></p>	<p>Updates to Map 5, Regional Phasing will be considered in a subsequent ROPA and is not being updated as part of ROPA 48.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Halton District School Board will be circulated subsequent ROPAs as part of the ROPR process.</p> <p>Updates to Table 2a are outside the scope of ROPA 48 and could be considered as part of the next Regional Official Plan Amendment to implement the Region's Growth Strategy.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><b>Development Criteria (Sections 57 to 70)</b>  <b>Land Use Designations (Sections 71 to 89, Section 170)</b>  <b>Urban Area and the Regional Urban Structure (Sections 72 to 77)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board acknowledges that the goal of the Urban Area and the Regional Urban Structure is to manage growth in a manner that fosters complete communities, enhances mobility across Halton, addresses climate change, and improve housing affordability, sustainability, and economic prosperity.</li> <li>• The Board is in support of phasing of growth that ensures the logical and orderly progression of development. This ensures timeliness in the Board's delivery of any new capital projects and addressing any student accommodation pressures in existing facilities through boundary and program reviews.</li> <li>• To accommodate the growth in accordance with the Region's desire to improve and maintain regional unity and create complete communities, infrastructure like schools are required to be built and funded in a timely manner. A large portion of the analysis includes the development of student projections and knowledge of the rate and phasing of growth that will occur.</li> <li>• The Board notes that <b>"Intensification Areas"</b> have now been replaced with <b>"Strategic Growth Areas"</b> and <b>"Major Transit Station Areas"</b> and <b>"Intensification Corridors"</b> have now been replaced by <b>"Regional Corridors"</b>.</li> <li>• <b>Section 77</b> mentions a number of reports such as the <b>"Annual Intensification Monitoring Report"</b> made to the Regional Council and the <b>"Joint Infrastructure Staging Plan"</b> to assist in the setting of development charges and to help prepare plans for the provision of Regional services. The Board requests that these reports be circulated.</li> <li>• The Board supports the policy of the Region to create <b>Areas Specific Plans</b> for Strategic Growth Areas and encourages local municipalities to include the Board in their circulations in the development of these policies for major growth areas. It is the intent of the Board to participate in the development of these plans and policies with the Local Municipalities and offer comments as needed.</li> <li>• The Board acknowledges that Halton Region is encouraging public agencies to adopt and use the population and employment forecast. The Board will adopt the forecasts once the population allocation to each municipality is completed as part of the municipal comprehensive review. The Board would benefit from having access to Low, Medium, and High-density unit targets by municipality to complete the student yield analysis more accurately.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Implementation tools and updates to guidelines and annual reporting will be considered as part of the next phase of the Municipal Comprehensive Review</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><b><i>Regional Urban Structure (Section 78)</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is understood that <b>Map 1h, Regional Urban Structure</b>, shows the locations of the Strategic Growth Areas which include MTSA's, proposed MTSA's, UGC's, Primary Regional Nodes, and Secondary Regional Nodes.</li> <li>• The Board notes that the following Board facilities are located within or adjacent to these Strategic Growth Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Milton Education Centre (Milton - Map 6c)</li> <li>o Aldershot High School (Burlington - Map 6d)</li> <li>o Georgetown District High School (Halton Hills - Map 6g)</li> <li>o Gary Allen High School (Wigglesworth) - (Halton Hills - Map 6g)</li> <li>o Robert Little Public School (Burlington - Map 6h)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Board would like to ensure that there are no policy implications with schools being located within or adjacent to the MTSA's that would preclude their redevelopment or alterations for school purposes, as well as their continued operation.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Strategic Growth Areas (Section 79)</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board requests more information on the "<b>Community Planning Permit System</b>".</li> <li>• The Board encourages Strategic Growth Areas to be development-ready. By making water, waste-water, and transportation service capacities immediately available for development and lining up the timing of Local Municipalities of Official Plan and Zoning By-law policies to come into effect at the same time as Regional policies, greatly helps the timing of the Board's strategic implementation of Capital Priority requests to the Province and other related construction requirements.</li> <li>• The Board supports the requirements of achieving land use compatibility between major employment uses and sensitive land uses within or adjacent to Strategic Growth Areas by either avoiding or minimizing and mitigating potential adverse effects.</li> <li>• The Board supports the adoption by Local Municipalities to adopt parking standards and policies to promote the use of active transportation and public transit and to consider planning approval financial and other incentives to promote the development of Strategic Growth Areas. The Board also supports the direction of Regional services and facilities to Strategic Growth Areas.</li> <li>• It is understood that Local Municipalities are required to plan for employment uses within Strategic Growth Areas. The Board supports the proposed conversions of Employment Areas that Local Municipalities have</li> </ul>	<p>Policies in ROPA 48 direct the local municipalities to develop detailed official plan policies or area specific plans for Major Transit Station Areas. Through the detailed local planning work, public service facilities are planned to support the planned growth.</p> <p>A Community Planning Permit System, also known as a Development Permit System, is a <i>Planning Act</i> tool identified under Sections 70.2 and 70.2.1. This tool can be used to streamline development approvals by combining zoning, site plan and minor variance processes into one process with shorter approval timelines. To enable a Community Planning Permit System, municipalities must pass an Official Plan Amendment and associated by-law which together address matters such as permitted uses and standards, review procedures, potential conditions of approval, and the areas to which the Permit System applies.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>





No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><b><i>Employment Areas (Section 83)</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board would like the Region to consider public-funded school board uses as a permitted use in Employment Areas to benefit in having a site located in areas that contribute to transit-supportive densities and to participate in the innovation of education accommodation. Board rationale has been outlined in comments to <b>Sections 80 and 81</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Housing (Sections 84 to 86)</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board requires residential housing details by unit type and phasing information for the study area. This information helps to perform school enrolment projections and to determine school accommodation requirements. This information also helps the Board with long-term planning of capital projects. It should be noted that the Board reserves the right to review its school accommodation requirements in the study area when updated information on housing details and phasing is received.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Urban Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment Services (Sections 87 to 89)</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board requires phasing information for development which assists in the development of school enrolment projections and helps identify school accommodation requirements. The Board recognizes that water and wastewater servicing are the constraints for development. Please continue to circulate the Board with future updates as the Board will continue to monitor and adjust future phasing of potential residential units within the study area.</li> <li>• The Board requests that the “<b>Joint Infrastructure Staging Plan</b>” be part of the circulation list to assist in providing urban services which include the delivery of publicly funded education to the Region and to help identify future educational requirements that are planned out in conjunction with other Regional urban services.</li> </ul> <p><b>PART VI DEFINITIONS (Sections 211 to 295)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Section 212.1</b> defines the term, Active Transportation. Please note that Active Transportation is also a focus for school boards and that the Board prefers students to use Active Transportation to travel to and from school all year round. The Board would like the Region to consider the inclusion of safety features in the definition. Safety features can include enhancement to crosswalks, speed reduction, and streetscaping.</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan directs municipalities to prohibit or limit sensitive land uses in Employment Areas. Schools are not considered an appropriate land use within planned Employment Areas. Further updates to the policy framework for Employment Areas will be addressed as part of the next phase of the Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Implementation tools and updates to guidelines and annual reporting will be considered as part of the next phase of the Municipal Comprehensive Review</p> <p>Crosswalks are included in the existing definition of Active Transportation. Regional staff will consider this request as Transprotation related policies will be addressed as part of the next phase of the Municipal Comprehensive Review</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>● The Board acknowledges the inclusion of <b>Section 269.1</b> where Public Service Facilities are identified which includes lands, buildings, and structures that include education programs.</p> <p>The Board will provide comments as required on any future updates and reviews of the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>Should you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact the undersigned.</p> <p>Sincerely, Frederick Thibeault General Manager of Planning</p> <p>cc Ian Gaudet, Executive Officer of Facility Services - Halton District School Board Laureen Choi, Senior Analyst Planning – Halton District School Board Michelle D’Aguiar, Senior Analyst Planning - Halton District School Board David Colley, General Manager of Halton Student Transportation Services Branko Vidovic, Senior Manager of Planning Services - Halton Catholic District School Board</p>	Comment noted.
15	<p>Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing</p> <p>E-mail dated June 7, 2021</p>	<p>June 7, 2021 <i>Sent via email only</i> Graham Milne Regional Clerk Office of the Regional Clerk 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Dear Graham Milne,</p> <p><b>Re: Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 – Regional Urban Structure MMAH File: 24-OP-217386</b></p> <p>Thank you for providing the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (“Ministry”) with the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Region’s draft Official Plan Amendment 48 (“ROPA 48”).</p> <p>The Ministry understands that draft ROPA 48 implements components of the Region’s Urban Structure, with the balance of the Regional Official Plan Review expected to be implemented through a subsequent amendment presented later in 2021. Draft ROPA 48 proposes to confirm boundaries of the Region’s urban growth centres (“UGCs”); delineate and establish densities for</p>	



No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Major Transit Station Areas (“MTSAs”) along the Region’s priority transit corridor; identify strategic growth areas; and convert employment areas.</p> <p>This draft ROPA was circulated to staff at the Ministry of Transportation (“MTO”); the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (“MECP”); and the Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade (“MEDJCT”). In addition to the high level comments below, please find attached a consolidated table of comments related to conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019 (“Growth Plan”) and Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (“PPS”) on draft ROPA 48 for consideration.</p> <p>In addition to these comments, MMAH staff would appreciate the opportunity to schedule a meeting with your staff prior to the Region’s public consultation on the ROPA.</p> <p><i>Urban Growth Centres</i></p> <p>As part of our one-window review, we note that draft ROPA 48 proposes to relocate the Downtown Burlington UGC to an area substantially different from that previously established by the Minister.</p> <p>In considering this request, we note that Growth Plan policy 2.2.3.1 specifies that UGCs, including the Downtown Burlington UGC, will be planned as the focus of growth and employment while also supporting investments made in the regional transit network. Similarly, the Growth Plan defines UGCs as: “existing or emerging downtown areas shown in Schedule 4 and as further identified by the Minister on April 2, 2008”. However, in considering the Region’s request, we note that Growth Plan policy 5.2.2.1 provides the ability for the Minister to identify, establish or update the size and location of UGCs.</p> <p>Accordingly, after contemplating the policy intent of the Growth Plan in relation to the potential relocation of the Downtown Burlington UGC, the Ministry is interested in understanding Council’s position on this matter and looks forward to receiving the Council endorsed-position related to the location of the UGC.</p> <p><i>Employment Area Conversion.</i></p> <p>The attached comment table outlines specific comments related to proposed employment area conversions. Our comments are included for further discussion with regional staff. Of note, the Ministry would also benefit from reviewing any draft Land Needs Assessment work the Region may have</p>	<p>Comment noted. Regional staff look forward to further discussion with Ministry staff regarding the Region’s Land Needs Assessment and</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>available to better understand the cumulative impact of the conversions on the Region's long-term supply of employment land.</p> <p><i>Protected / Major Transit Station Areas</i></p> <p>Subsection 2.2.4 of the Growth Plan provides direction to identify, delineate and establish minimum density targets for MTSAs. Draft ROPA 48 proposes delineations, minimum density targets and policies for 8 MTSAs in accordance with subsection 16(16) of the <i>Planning Act</i> and proposes to remove the existing Downtown Burlington MTSA. Although not a requirement under the Growth Plan, the Ministry is supportive of the Region delineating and prescribing minimum density targets for 4 of the 8 for MTSAs which are located not on priority transit corridors. However, additional information is needed to demonstrate the need for an alternative minimum density target for Appleby GO MTSA as per Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.4. The table below provides more specific comments related to protected/ major transit station areas for further discussion.</p> <p><i>Engagement with Indigenous Communities</i></p> <p>Both the Growth Plan (policies 5.2.3.4 and 5.2.3.7) and PPS (policy 1.2.2), require planning authorities to coordinate planning matters with Indigenous communities. The Ministry is interested in understanding any engagement efforts that the Region has undertaken on this proposed amendment. Should the Region adopt ROPA 48, it is requested that information respecting any municipal engagement process be provided to the Ministry, including any submissions.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i></p> <p>Thank you again for providing the opportunity to review draft ROPA 48. Our comments contained in this letter, and in the attached table are provided for further discussion with Regional staff. In this regard we look forward to continuing to work with Halton Region staff on this and future work undertaken as part of the Region's official plan review.</p> <p>If you have any questions or wish to discuss these comments in more detail, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at Laurie Miller by email at Laurie.Miller@ontario.ca or by phone at 437-855-6078.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>employment conversion assessments undertaken as part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review..</p> <p>The supporting rationale for the alternative target request fro the Appleby GO MTSA is Included as Attachment #5 to Report No. LPS60-21,</p> <p>The Region is undertaking meaningful engagement with Indigenous Communities and are required to, and will look to go beyond fulfilling Provincial legislative and policies requirements. Section 17(31) of the <i>Planning Act</i> requires a record compiled which includes prescribed information and material to be submitted to the approval authority.</p> <p>The requested mapping can be shared with the Province that presents the UGC boundary</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response												
		<p>&lt;ORIGINAL SIGNED BY&gt;  Laurie Miller, MCIP, RPP  Regional Director, Municipal Services Office  c. Dan Tovey, Manager – Policy Planning, Halton Region  MTO  MEDJCT  MECP</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th><th>OP Sec.</th><th>Prov. Comment.</th><th>Requests for Addtl. Information and Recommended Policy Mods</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Map 1H</td><td> <p>Draft ROPA 48 also proposes changes to the boundaries of the Midtown Oakville UGC and the Milton UGC. It appears, based on Halton Council Report LPS17-21, that these changes are intended to remove areas of floodplain adjacent to Sixteen Mile Creek, as well as a QEW right-of-way and on-ramp.</p> <p>Policy 5.2.5.7 of the Growth Plan clarifies that UGC density targets do not require or permit development that is not permitted by the PPS for special policy areas or other hazardous lands, such as floodplains.</p> </td><td> <p>The Ministry would appreciate receiving additional information from the Region to help understand the proposed delineation of these proposed UGC boundary changes. Specifically, a map overlay of the floodplain, current and proposed boundaries of the UGCs, and the information on the quantity of land proposed to be removed from the UGCs would be helpful.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>79.3 (7) c)</td><td>Densities established in table 2b of draft ROPA 48 cannot be lowered through a site-specific official plan or zoning by-law amendment as</td><td>"prohibit site-specific Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments to reduce development density within a Strategic Growth Area unless it is</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	#	OP Sec.	Prov. Comment.	Requests for Addtl. Information and Recommended Policy Mods	1	Map 1H	<p>Draft ROPA 48 also proposes changes to the boundaries of the Midtown Oakville UGC and the Milton UGC. It appears, based on Halton Council Report LPS17-21, that these changes are intended to remove areas of floodplain adjacent to Sixteen Mile Creek, as well as a QEW right-of-way and on-ramp.</p> <p>Policy 5.2.5.7 of the Growth Plan clarifies that UGC density targets do not require or permit development that is not permitted by the PPS for special policy areas or other hazardous lands, such as floodplains.</p>	<p>The Ministry would appreciate receiving additional information from the Region to help understand the proposed delineation of these proposed UGC boundary changes. Specifically, a map overlay of the floodplain, current and proposed boundaries of the UGCs, and the information on the quantity of land proposed to be removed from the UGCs would be helpful.</p>	2	79.3 (7) c)	Densities established in table 2b of draft ROPA 48 cannot be lowered through a site-specific official plan or zoning by-law amendment as	"prohibit site-specific Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments to reduce development density within a Strategic Growth Area unless it is	<p>changes for the Milton UGC and Midtown Oakville.</p> <p>The Midtown Oakville western boundary was adjusted to consider the floodplain as well as the Region's draft 2019 Natural Heritage System mapping and the 16 Mile Creek.</p> <p>The eastern portion of the Town of Milton's existing Urban Growth Centre is centred on the Milton GO Station. The lands around the GO station consist of extensive areas of low density, low rise and predominantly under-utilized lands and buildings within 800m of the station, along Ontario Street, Main Street and Nipissing Road.</p> <p>The western portion of the UGC overlaps with the historic downtown character area and the Sixteen Mile Creek floodplain. Development in this area needs to be sensitive to the cultural heritage of the historic character area. Within the Regional Storm Flood Plain, intensification is generally not permitted.</p> <p>The floodplain and built heritage limit opportunity for growth in the UGC west of Ontario Street. Intensification is not anticipated in this part of the UGC and the area around the Milton GO has the potential capacity to accommodate a significant portion of population and employment growth supported by transit.</p> <p>The policy as modified, does not permit a lowering of the density target in Table 2b. 79.3(7) b requires local municipalities to prescribe development density for lands in the strategic growth area. There may be lands that are higher density or lower density, but together they must</p>
#	OP Sec.	Prov. Comment.	Requests for Addtl. Information and Recommended Policy Mods												
1	Map 1H	<p>Draft ROPA 48 also proposes changes to the boundaries of the Midtown Oakville UGC and the Milton UGC. It appears, based on Halton Council Report LPS17-21, that these changes are intended to remove areas of floodplain adjacent to Sixteen Mile Creek, as well as a QEW right-of-way and on-ramp.</p> <p>Policy 5.2.5.7 of the Growth Plan clarifies that UGC density targets do not require or permit development that is not permitted by the PPS for special policy areas or other hazardous lands, such as floodplains.</p>	<p>The Ministry would appreciate receiving additional information from the Region to help understand the proposed delineation of these proposed UGC boundary changes. Specifically, a map overlay of the floodplain, current and proposed boundaries of the UGCs, and the information on the quantity of land proposed to be removed from the UGCs would be helpful.</p>												
2	79.3 (7) c)	Densities established in table 2b of draft ROPA 48 cannot be lowered through a site-specific official plan or zoning by-law amendment as	"prohibit site-specific Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments to reduce development density within a Strategic Growth Area unless it is												

No.	Source	Submission	Response								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 267 548 781"></td><td data-bbox="548 267 642 781"></td><td data-bbox="642 267 989 781"> <p>stated in this draft policy. Although the local municipality may consider higher densities than what the Region has established, a lower density would result in a conflict with the Region's official plan.</p> </td><td data-bbox="989 267 1348 781"> <p><del>part of a municipal comprehensive review of the Official Plan or a review of the Area-Specific Plan for the Strategic Growth Areas; and"</del></p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 781 548 1396">3</td><td data-bbox="548 781 642 1396">79.3 (7) c) &amp; 82.2 (2)</td><td data-bbox="642 781 989 1396"> <p>Should minimum density targets be established for strategic growth areas to which targets and delineations are not required under the Growth Plan, they must first be established in the Region's official plan, along with delineations. To implement the minimum density targets applicable to the delineated areas, lower-tier municipalities would then undertake more detailed planning, such as secondary plans, to establish permitted uses and identify densities, heights and other elements of site design.</p> <p>Where the Region has not delineated nor established a minimum density target for a strategic growth area, lower-tier municipalities are able to delineate boundaries and undertake more detailed planning work, although minimum density targets cannot be established.</p> </td><td data-bbox="989 781 1348 1396"> <p>It is recommended that the Region remove policies in draft ROPA 48 which allow lower-tier municipalities to delineate and set minimum density targets for strategic growth areas ahead of the Region, such as draft policies 79.3 (7) c) and 82.2 (2).</p> </td></tr> </table>			<p>stated in this draft policy. Although the local municipality may consider higher densities than what the Region has established, a lower density would result in a conflict with the Region's official plan.</p>	<p><del>part of a municipal comprehensive review of the Official Plan or a review of the Area-Specific Plan for the Strategic Growth Areas; and"</del></p>	3	79.3 (7) c) & 82.2 (2)	<p>Should minimum density targets be established for strategic growth areas to which targets and delineations are not required under the Growth Plan, they must first be established in the Region's official plan, along with delineations. To implement the minimum density targets applicable to the delineated areas, lower-tier municipalities would then undertake more detailed planning, such as secondary plans, to establish permitted uses and identify densities, heights and other elements of site design.</p> <p>Where the Region has not delineated nor established a minimum density target for a strategic growth area, lower-tier municipalities are able to delineate boundaries and undertake more detailed planning work, although minimum density targets cannot be established.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Region remove policies in draft ROPA 48 which allow lower-tier municipalities to delineate and set minimum density targets for strategic growth areas ahead of the Region, such as draft policies 79.3 (7) c) and 82.2 (2).</p>	<p>achieve the target in Table 2b. The policy requires that an amendment to a site-specific development density can only occur as part of a comprehensive process due to the relationship to the targets identified in Table 2b. Any change would occur through a Local Official Plan Amendment or Area Specific Plan to ensure comprehensive consideration and positions the Region as the approval authority. This policy has been maintained with minor adjustments for clarification that reductions in development density can only occur through a comprehensive process/area specific plan, and not a site-specific Official Plan Amendment or Zoning Bylaw Amendment.</p> <p>The policy has been modified to "encourage" rather than "require" the local municipalities to delineate the boundaries of Regional Nodes and identify a minimum density target. Corridors are a key component of the Regional Urban Structure that are not being addressed through ROPA 48, but will be addressed through the overall IGMS. The Region intends to have further consultation with the local municipalities on the merits of the delineation and setting of minimum density targets for Primary Regional Nodes that are on a transit corridor, and this will be addressed through the overall IGMS ROPA.</p>
		<p>stated in this draft policy. Although the local municipality may consider higher densities than what the Region has established, a lower density would result in a conflict with the Region's official plan.</p>	<p><del>part of a municipal comprehensive review of the Official Plan or a review of the Area-Specific Plan for the Strategic Growth Areas; and"</del></p>								
3	79.3 (7) c) & 82.2 (2)	<p>Should minimum density targets be established for strategic growth areas to which targets and delineations are not required under the Growth Plan, they must first be established in the Region's official plan, along with delineations. To implement the minimum density targets applicable to the delineated areas, lower-tier municipalities would then undertake more detailed planning, such as secondary plans, to establish permitted uses and identify densities, heights and other elements of site design.</p> <p>Where the Region has not delineated nor established a minimum density target for a strategic growth area, lower-tier municipalities are able to delineate boundaries and undertake more detailed planning work, although minimum density targets cannot be established.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Region remove policies in draft ROPA 48 which allow lower-tier municipalities to delineate and set minimum density targets for strategic growth areas ahead of the Region, such as draft policies 79.3 (7) c) and 82.2 (2).</p>								

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>4 280.2 It is recommended that the definition for Strategic Growth Areas be modified to better align with the Growth Plan which supports the development of higher-density mixed-uses in a more compact built form, in addition to being the focus for accommodating intensification.</p> <p>5 79.3 (12) To better align with the PPS, it is recommended that this policy use the term "major facilities" instead of "major employment uses" and that a definition be provided which is consistent with the PPS.</p> <p>Alternatively, the Region may continue to use the term "major employment use" and include a definition for the term which is consistent with the PPS definition for major facilities.</p> <p>6 New policy under 79.3 (12.1) The PPS, 2020 introduced a new policy which provides protection for employment uses proposed adjacent to sensitive land uses where avoidance of potential adverse effects from the employment use is not possible. It is recommended that the Region add a new policy to ensure consistency with the PPS, 2020.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Modification has been made.</p> <p>Terminology has been updated to reflect the PPS, 2020.</p> <p>A new Section 79.3(12)b) has been added to implement Section 1.2.6.2 of the PPS, 2020.</p>

No.	Source	Submission		Response
			use are minimized and mitigated; and d) Potential impacts to industrial, manufacturing or other uses are minimized and mitigated."	
7	Map 1h	Draft ROPA 48 proposes to convert 256.8 hectares of lands within employment areas to non-employment uses. It is unclear whether the Region intends to undertake the proposed employment area conversions prior to the completion of the MCR in accordance with policy 2.2.5.10; or as part of the MCR in accordance with policy 2.2.5.9.	If the Region intends to undertake the conversions in accordance with policy 2.2.5.10, please see items 8 - 10.  If, however, the Region intends to undertake the conversions in accordance with policy 2.2.5.9, further information/rationale would be required to demonstrate that the lands are not required over the 2051 planning horizon and that sufficient employment lands will be maintained to accommodate forecasted growth to 2051.	The Region is advancing the conversions identified in ROPA 48 as a phased amendment that forms part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review.  Regional staff look forward to further discussion with Ministry staff regarding the Region's Land Needs Assessment and employment conversion assessments undertaken as part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review.
8	Map 1h	The Region's assessment of the proposed employment area conversions appears to focus mainly on site-specific considerations.	Additional information is needed to better understand whether the achievement of minimum intensification and density targets will be adversely affected by the proposed employment area conversions as per Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.9 d).	
9	Map 1h	Some of the employment areas proposed for conversion through draft ROPA 48 are located within a PSEZ and outside of a delineated MTSA, which is contrary to policy 2.2.5.10 c).	The conversion of 2258 Mountainside Drive and 800 Burloak Drive, in the City of Burlington; and the Meritor Lands (partially), in the Town of Milton. can only be undertaken in accordance with Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.9.	Not applicable
10	79.3 (13) a). Map 1h	Proposed employment area conversions (e.g. 238 Sumach Drive in the City of Burlington and others) would appear to result in the development of residential uses only, and thus an overall loss of jobs on those lands. Developments permitted through conversions approved under Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.10 cannot be purely residential and must include space for jobs to support economic	It is recommended that lands proposed for conversion through draft ROPA 48 be identified and that the development criteria outlined in proposed policy 79.3 (13) a) apply to these lands to ensure jobs are maintained through local official plan designations and zoning.	Not applicable

No.	Source	Submission	Response												
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 267 548 370"></td><td data-bbox="548 267 642 370"></td><td data-bbox="642 267 989 370">growth. This is to be implemented through designations and zoning which provide for jobs, such as mixed-use.</td><td data-bbox="989 267 1348 370"></td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 370 548 711">11</td><td data-bbox="548 370 642 711">83.2 b) and c)</td><td data-bbox="642 370 989 711">To better align with the PPS, it is recommended that "mixed use area" be replaced with "sensitive land uses". The term "sensitive land uses" encompasses uses beyond mixed-use which may require land use compatibility to be addressed. In addition to policy 79.3 (12), proposed new policy 79.3 (12.1) should also be referenced in c).</td><td data-bbox="989 370 1348 711"> <p>"b) providing an appropriate interface between the Employment Areas and adjacent sensitive land uses <del>mixed use areas</del> to maintain land use compatibility"</p> <p>"c) only permitting development within adjacent sensitive land uses <del>mixed-use areas</del> if land use compatibility can be addressed in a manner that protects existing employment uses in accordance with Section 79.3 (12) and (12.1) of this Plan."</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 711 548 1377">12</td><td data-bbox="548 711 642 1377">Map 6</td><td data-bbox="642 711 989 1377">Delineations: The Region's methodology for delineations of MTSAs allows for refinement of the MTSA boundary to exclude "established uses" including "low-density mature residential neighbourhoods", which is not a criterion supported by the Growth Plan. The Region is encouraged to explore whether the delineation of MTSAs on the priority transit corridor could be broadened to include adjacent low-density neighbourhoods to ensure the delineations are capturing the most appropriate number of potential transit users that are within walking distance to the station, as per Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.2.</td><td data-bbox="989 711 1348 1377"> <p>The Growth Plan supports the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets by identifying a diverse range and mix of housing options, including additional residential units and affordable housing (policy 2.2.6). Regional staff should consider including a broader range of low rise housing types in established neighbourhoods such as additional residential units (accordance with subsection 16(3) of the Planning Act), semi-detached, duplex, triplex, and townhomes as infill opportunities to support a modest increase of the existing density of the area while maintaining the character of the existing low rise residential neighbourhoods.</p> </td></tr> </table>			growth. This is to be implemented through designations and zoning which provide for jobs, such as mixed-use.		11	83.2 b) and c)	To better align with the PPS, it is recommended that "mixed use area" be replaced with "sensitive land uses". The term "sensitive land uses" encompasses uses beyond mixed-use which may require land use compatibility to be addressed. In addition to policy 79.3 (12), proposed new policy 79.3 (12.1) should also be referenced in c).	<p>"b) providing an appropriate interface between the Employment Areas and adjacent sensitive land uses <del>mixed use areas</del> to maintain land use compatibility"</p> <p>"c) only permitting development within adjacent sensitive land uses <del>mixed-use areas</del> if land use compatibility can be addressed in a manner that protects existing employment uses in accordance with Section 79.3 (12) and (12.1) of this Plan."</p>	12	Map 6	Delineations: The Region's methodology for delineations of MTSAs allows for refinement of the MTSA boundary to exclude "established uses" including "low-density mature residential neighbourhoods", which is not a criterion supported by the Growth Plan. The Region is encouraged to explore whether the delineation of MTSAs on the priority transit corridor could be broadened to include adjacent low-density neighbourhoods to ensure the delineations are capturing the most appropriate number of potential transit users that are within walking distance to the station, as per Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.2.	<p>The Growth Plan supports the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets by identifying a diverse range and mix of housing options, including additional residential units and affordable housing (policy 2.2.6). Regional staff should consider including a broader range of low rise housing types in established neighbourhoods such as additional residential units (accordance with subsection 16(3) of the Planning Act), semi-detached, duplex, triplex, and townhomes as infill opportunities to support a modest increase of the existing density of the area while maintaining the character of the existing low rise residential neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>Wording was changed to 'non-employment areas' consistent with the Growth Plan. The compatibility policy in 79.3(12) was updated to include the needs test, so the cross-reference is appropriate as is.</p> <p>The Region consulted with the local municipalities on the delineation methodology established in the Regional Urban Structure paper and draft delineated boundaries of the MTSAs. The MTSAs were supported by local plans and studies. The Region's methodology excluded established areas, including low density mature residential neighbourhoods that were not anticipated to accommodate growth and intensification. The areas excluded, based on the local context of the station, were not anticipated to change in a manner that would increase the permeability, accessibility and connectivity to the station. The areas excluded were often constrained due to the existing block patterns (e.g. long blocks with few connections) and built form conditions (e.g. rear lotting). In some cases, including stable residential neighbourhoods that were rear lotted to the station, with no permeability and accessibility would result in a walk greater than a 10-minute walking distance as identified by the Growth Plan.</p>
		growth. This is to be implemented through designations and zoning which provide for jobs, such as mixed-use.													
11	83.2 b) and c)	To better align with the PPS, it is recommended that "mixed use area" be replaced with "sensitive land uses". The term "sensitive land uses" encompasses uses beyond mixed-use which may require land use compatibility to be addressed. In addition to policy 79.3 (12), proposed new policy 79.3 (12.1) should also be referenced in c).	<p>"b) providing an appropriate interface between the Employment Areas and adjacent sensitive land uses <del>mixed use areas</del> to maintain land use compatibility"</p> <p>"c) only permitting development within adjacent sensitive land uses <del>mixed-use areas</del> if land use compatibility can be addressed in a manner that protects existing employment uses in accordance with Section 79.3 (12) and (12.1) of this Plan."</p>												
12	Map 6	Delineations: The Region's methodology for delineations of MTSAs allows for refinement of the MTSA boundary to exclude "established uses" including "low-density mature residential neighbourhoods", which is not a criterion supported by the Growth Plan. The Region is encouraged to explore whether the delineation of MTSAs on the priority transit corridor could be broadened to include adjacent low-density neighbourhoods to ensure the delineations are capturing the most appropriate number of potential transit users that are within walking distance to the station, as per Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.2.	<p>The Growth Plan supports the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets by identifying a diverse range and mix of housing options, including additional residential units and affordable housing (policy 2.2.6). Regional staff should consider including a broader range of low rise housing types in established neighbourhoods such as additional residential units (accordance with subsection 16(3) of the Planning Act), semi-detached, duplex, triplex, and townhomes as infill opportunities to support a modest increase of the existing density of the area while maintaining the character of the existing low rise residential neighbourhoods.</p>												

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>13 Table 2b Alternative Density Target: The MTSA density targets established by the Growth Plan (policy 2.2.4.3) are the minimum density in residents and jobs combined per hectare ("r&amp;j/h") required to be planned for MTSAs located along priority transit corridors or existing subway lines. The Region's priority transit corridor, shown on Schedule 5 to the Growth Plan, is the Lakeshore West GO Transit line, which includes 4 MTSAs. For these 4 MTSAs, the Growth Plan requires municipalities to plan for a density target of 150 r&amp;j/h.</p> <p>Upper and single-tier municipalities may request alternative density targets applicable to areas where it can be demonstrated that the MTSA density target cannot be achieved according to Growth Plan policy 2.2.4.4.</p>	<p>Housing policy directions supporting the provision of a diverse range and mix of housing options, in conformity with Provincial Plans and policies, will be developed to inform a subsequent ROPA for the purposes of the Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p> <p>The supporting rationale for the alternative target request for the Appleby GO MTSA is Included as Attachment #5 to Report No. LPS60-21,</p> <p>This policy has been modified to clarify the intent of future change through the current MCR, which would be subject to Provincial approval as the approval authority. The numbering (2.1) indicates that this is intended as a temporary/placeholder policy to be removed in the next ROPA.</p> <p>Policy has been modified to differentiate between a delineated Major Transit Station <b>Area</b> and a</p>
		<p>14 81.2 (2.1) To ensure that any changes to minimum density targets for MTSA's are subject to provincial approval in accordance with the Planning Act and Growth Plan.</p>	
		<p>15 Map 1H and Map 6 and 81.3 Draft ROPA 48 identifies one Proposed Major Transit Station; the proposed Trafalgar GO in Map 1H.</p> <p>Section 81.3 and Table 2b provide policy direction for Proposed Major Transit Station "Areas" and reference both Map 1H and Map 6.</p>	



No.	Source	Submission	Response			
		<table><tr><td></td><td></td><td>outlined under 81.3 pertain to the Trafalgar GO as identified in Map 1H.  "81.3 The objectives of the Proposed Major Transit Station Areas as identified on Map 1H and Map 6 are:"</td></tr></table>			outlined under 81.3 pertain to the Trafalgar GO as identified in Map 1H.  "81.3 The objectives of the Proposed Major Transit Station Areas as identified on Map 1H and Map 6 are:"	Proposed Major Tranist Station that has not yet been delineated.
		outlined under 81.3 pertain to the Trafalgar GO as identified in Map 1H.  "81.3 The objectives of the Proposed Major Transit Station Areas as identified on Map 1H and Map 6 are:"				
16	Halton District School Board  E-mail dated June 16, 2021	<p>June 16, 2021 Curt Benson Director, Planning Services and Chief Planning Official Legislative &amp; Planning Services Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Dear Curt:</p> <p><b>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48: <i>Halton District School Board Support Letter for Star Oak Developments &amp; Sixth Oak Inc Employment Land Conversion (Request O-17) to facilitate the development of the Oakville NE #1 HS</i></b></p> <p>In January of 2021, the Halton District School Board (HDSB) initiated a due diligence process in order to identify an alternate secondary school site in the North East Oakville Secondary Plan area, after discovering that its initial site that is located northwest of Neyagawa Boulevard and Dundas Street West was no longer viable to accommodate the required Oakville North East #1 high school (Oakville NE #1 hs).</p> <p>As part of its due diligence review, the Board commissioned a study to identify potential sites within the North Oakville East Secondary Plan area that could accommodate a secondary school site of +/- 15.0 acres with access to servicing to achieve a targeted school year opening date of 2024/2025. It should also be noted that the Board has already received the funding to construct Oakville NE #1 hs, and has already received approval to proceed from the Ministry to select an architect and begin design.</p>				

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>A total of three (3) potential sites were identified as part of the due diligence process, and were evaluated based on their developability, serviceability with regards to targeted opening date, and ability to meet the Board's long-term accommodation needs in North Oakville. The properties reviewed included: (i) the second designated secondary school site located southeast of Trafalgar Road and Burnhamthorpe Road; (ii) assembled properties southwest of Trafalgar Road and Burnhamthorpe Road; and (iii) a property northwest of Burnhamthorpe Road and Sixth Line.</p> <p>After completing the analysis, which included meeting with representatives of the Town of Oakville, the Region of Halton, Conservation Halton, and other agencies in the Region, the Board concluded that the third site which is located northwest of Burnhamthorpe Road and Sixth Line (referred to as the "Sixth Line Property" hereafter) is most optimal in meeting secondary school needs in the North East Oakville Secondary Plan area.</p> <p>However, as part of the due diligence process for the Sixth Line Property, we identified a concern regarding the designation of the northern +/- 4.9 acre portion of such property, which is designated Employment Land and Provincially Significant Employment Zone (PSEZ). These designations do not permit a secondary school use. Without the benefit of this 4.9 acre portion of the Sixth Line Property, the Board will face significant challenges in providing the necessary secondary school programming on site for a 1200+ pupil place secondary school. In short, the Board requires that these designations be amended in order to permit non-employment uses so that the property will be viable for educational purposes.</p> <p>We understand that a request has been submitted to the Region to remove the Employment designation from the Sixth Line Property to permit non employment uses thereon (Town of Oakville and Star Oak Developments Sixth Oak Inc Employment Land Conversion Request - Request O-17). Request O-17 includes the 4.9 acre portion referred to above that the Board requires to meet its programming requirements on site.</p> <p>The Board fully supports the conversion as proposed in Request O-17, and therefore requests that such conversion be incorporated into ROPA 48 as part of the first phase of employment land conversions.</p> <p>The lands in question have a strategic importance in advancing elements of the local urban structure, specifically the establishment of a secondary school</p>	<p>This request was identified and supported in the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper, but was recommended to be advanced as part of the Preferred Growth Concept. A submission from the HDSB received June 16, 2021 indicated that HDSB's initial site for a secondary school in the North East Oakville Secondary Plan was no longer viable and that in January 2021 HDSB began a due diligence process to identify an alternate site. Given the public interest in providing and advancing community facilities in the North East Oakville Secondary Plan area and the lack of impact to the overall land supply, it is recommended that this conversion be advanced as part of ROPA 48. More information on how this conversion conforms to the principles of the Region's employment conversion assessment criteria is available in Appendix C of the Growth Concepts Discussion Paper.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>that will serve the current and future residents of the North East Oakville Secondary Plan area.</p> <p>To supplement the above request, we also attach a technical memorandum completed by the Board's consultant, Strategy 4, which provides additional information concerning the Board's needs and the policy framework that further supports the conversion to permit the proposed Oakville NE #1 high School.</p> <p>Should you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact the undersigned.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Frederick Thibeault General Manager of Planning</p> <p>cc Stuart Miller, Director of Education - Halton District School Board Roxana Negoii, Superintendent of Business - Halton District School Board Ian Gaudet, Executive Officer of Facility Services - Halton District School Board Mike Wildfong, Manager - Capital Projects - Halton District School Board Laureen Choi, Senior Analyst Planning – Halton District School Board Gabe Charles, Acting Director - Planning Services - Town of Oakville Jeff Kenny, Partner - Strategy 4</p>	
17	<p>Halton Catholic District School Board</p> <p>E-mal dated June 18, 2021</p>	<p>June 18, 2021 Karyn Poad Senior Planner Halton Region 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Dear Karyn:</p> <p><b>RE: Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 48 Amendment to Define a Regional Urban Structure Your File No.: ROPA 48</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on Draft Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) No. 48 – “An Amendment to Define a Regional</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Urban Structure". It is understood that this amendment identifies non-discretionary components of a Regional Urban Structure through policies and mapping, including minimum density targets and proportional mix targets for residents and jobs, updates municipal growth allocations to reflect Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan, 2019, and advances certain employment land conversions.</p> <p>The Halton Catholic District School Board (HCDSB) delivers high quality Catholic education programs at 45 elementary and 9 secondary schools in the Region of Halton. Together, these Public Service Facilities serve approximately 36,480 students, which represents a growth of 23% since 2010 when the enrolment was a total of 29,597 students. With ongoing growth, it is anticipated that enrolment will increase by an additional 26% by 2030, to approximately 46,086 students. This growth in enrolment considers approved secondary plans in the Region to date and development applications circulated to the Board.</p> <p>To address increasing enrolment demands, the HCDSB has one (1) planned elementary school for 2022 in the Town of Milton and one (1) planned elementary school in the Town of Oakville, as well as one (1) secondary school currently under construction and scheduled to open in the 2023-2024 school year in the Town of Milton. The Board releases a <a href="#">Long-Term Capital Plan (LTCP)</a> on an annual basis, which provides detailed enrolment forecasts over a 15-year planning horizon; identifies accommodation pressures due to new residential development, changing demographics, and program pressures; and identifies proposed capital projects and other recommendations to address accommodation pressures.</p> <p>The following comments are provided on Draft Amendment No. 48 to the Regional Plan, February 2021, circulated on March 9, 2021. The comments pertain to education and other matters of interest as it relates to the HCDSB.</p> <p><b>PART II – Basic Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board acknowledges the change in the planning horizon from 2031 and 2051. Note that the Board typically projects student enrolment for a 15-year planning horizon through the Long-Term Capital Plan and the Education Development Charges By-law background studies.</li> <li>• The Board acknowledges that the Region's primary role is to provide broad policy directions on strategic matters such as land and natural resources, growth strategies, housing, transportation, water and wastewater services, solid waste management, transportation, and health</li> </ul>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>and social services, and that local municipalities will deal with their local environments as long as the overall planning vision for Halton and policies within the Regional Official Plan are adhered to. The Board will continue to provide comments to lower-tier municipalities on specific policies as it relates to matters of interest to the Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is indicated in Section 56, Table 1 Population and Employment Distribution that the distribution of the 2051 population forecasts to the Local Municipalities is to be determined through the municipal comprehensive review. Please circulate the Board when this information is available.</li> <li>• Section 56, Table 2A Regional Phasing indicates the number of units in Designated Greenfield Areas categorized by low-density, and medium and high-density units. The Board uses two separate student yields for medium density units and high-density units to project student enrolment as the Board has historically seen a higher number of students from medium-density units than high-density units. As such, the Board encourages the separation of these two (2) unit types, where possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>PART III – Land Stewardship Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board is supportive of phasing of growth that ensures a logical and orderly progression of development (Section 72.1(5)), as it ensures that there is projected to be a sufficient student population in a community when the Board seeks funding for new schools from the Ministry of Education. This also ensures that new development areas are “complete communities” with most students having access to a school within walking distance.</li> <li>• Section 77 mentions a number of reports such as the “Annual Intensification Monitoring Report” made to Regional Council and the “Joint Infrastructure Staging Plan” to ensure that infrastructure and human services to support development is planned and financing is secured in advance of need. The Board requests that these reports be circulated.</li> <li>• The Board understands that the Regional Urban Structure, which consists of Strategic Growth Areas, Regional Employment Areas, Built-up Areas, and Designated Greenfield Areas. It is also understood that there is a hierarchy of Strategic Growth Areas delineated in Map 1H, which includes Urban Growth Centre/Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), Proposed Major Transit Station Area (MTSA),</li> </ul>	<p>Updates to Table 2a are outside the scope of ROPA 48 and could be considered as part of the next Regional Official Plan Amendment to implement the Region’s Growth Strategy.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Implementation tools and updates to guidelines and annual reporting will be considered as part of the next phase of the Municipal Comprehensive Review</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Primary Regional Node, Secondary Regional Nodes, and Regional Corridors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board is supportive of the integration of Strategic Growth Areas with surrounding areas, as identified in Section 79.3 (6). Students from these areas may attend a school outside of the community due to optional/alternate programming and/or need to access places of employment and community services.</li> <li>• It is understood that a “Community Planning Permit System” is being encouraged to be implemented by local municipalities within Strategic Growth Areas. The Board requests more information on this permit system.</li> <li>• The Board is generally supportive of the parking standards within Strategic Growth Areas that promote the use of active transportation.</li> <li>• The Board is supportive of ensuring that land use compatibility is achieved between employment uses and sensitive land uses, such as schools, within or adjacent to Strategic Growth Areas by minimizing and mitigating any adverse effects, and minimizing the risk to public health and safety.</li> <li>• It is understood that Urban Growth Centres are focal areas for investment in institutional and region-wide public services, and where a significant share of population and employment growth will be accommodated.</li> <li>• The Board understands that the Region requires local municipalities to prepare detailed official plan policies or an <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area-Specific Plan for a Major Transit Station Area that also provides infrastructure that supports active transportation. In general, the Board is supportive of measures that encourage students and families to travel to/from school through active transportation methods, where safely possible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Board is supportive of providing a mix of housing types. However, the Board will require residential housing details by unit type and phasing information for the study area in order to determine school accommodation needs.</li> </ul>	<p>Community Planning Permit System, also known as a Development Permit System, is a <i>Planning Act</i> tool identified under Sections 70.2 and 70.2.1. This tool can be used to streamline development approvals by combining zoning, site plan and minor variance processes into one process with shorter approval timelines. To enable a Community Planning Permit System, municipalities must pass an Official Plan Amendment and associated by-law which together address matters such as permitted uses and standards, review procedures, potential conditions of approval, and the areas to which the Permit System applies.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board intends to participate in the development of Area-Specific Plans for Strategic Growth Areas by the local municipalities. This provides an opportunity for the Board to review school accommodation needs and review other matters of interest for the Board as it relates to school facilities.</li> </ul> <p>The Board will continue to provide comments through on future updates to this Regional Official Plan Amendment and future reviews of the Regional Official Plan. If you have any questions regarding the aforementioned, please contact the undersigned.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <hr/> <p>Dhilan Gunasekara Planning Officer</p> <p>cc: A. Lofts, Superintendent of Business Services and Treasurer of the Board B. Vidovic, Senior Manager of Planning Services, Planning Services C. Palucci, Planning Clerk, Planning Services</p>	