



What We Heard: Written Submissions

City of Peterborough Official Plan Update

October 2021

Contents

Introduction3

Individual Written Submissions4

Bousfields (On behalf of Brookfield)51

Biglieri Group53

Cassels (On Behalf of Brookfield)55

Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board57

Peterborough Bicycle Advisory Committee64

Peterborough Greenspace Coalition & Friends of Jackson Park73

Reimagine Peterborough.....74

Spears + Associates (On behalf of BentalGreenOak)89

Trent University92



What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

Introduction

This is a summary of questions and comments received by City staff after the release of the draft Official Plan in July 2021 and the City's respective responses. Please note that some comments have been listed verbatim and others are summarized and this comment matrix captures those comments received as of October 7, 2021.

Individual Written Submissions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>It would be good to have the area from Parkhill to Dafoe Drive, including Leahy's Lane [to Spencley's Lane] and, the Curtis Subdivision, east of Armour south to Swanston created as a heritage district in the Official Plan. Many homes in this area date to 1860, perhaps earlier. The Curtis Subdivision is quite interesting in that it used War Era house designs but clad these house designs with their own brick from their brick yard. Almost all the houses in this proposed heritage district, especially those on the east side of Armour in a state of threat owing to their large lots. A second heritage district could be considered for that area south of Swanston and Dufferin between the canal and the river. Again, there are a great deal of very early houses from 1860 [maybe earlier] within this area north of Hunter.</p>	<p>Policies enabling the study of heritage resources are included in Section 5.1 (Cultural Heritage) of the Official Plan. The Heritage Preservation Office will determine priorities in consultation with the Peterborough Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee, property owners and residents.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
2	<p>Further to the comments previously written about the consideration of "The Auburn" and Curtis Subdivision, the other immediate heritage district would be Burnham Point. Burnham Point has a deep history in Peterborough, from the time that the Town Council allowed the Burnham's to connect the area with fill connecting small islands into a contiguous point of land.</p> <p>It has been a golf course, and, in the 1900's a sawmill/lumber yard.</p> <p>It is now a mixture of War Era homes. Some were created under the "Wartime Housing Plan" and some under the "Victory Housing Plan". To determine which is which would take an extensive search. It would be just as simple to designate Burnham Point as a "War Era Housing Heritage District".</p>	<p>Please see response #1 of this Matrix.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
3	<p>Could you please help me find the maximum building heights for the Schedule "C" Central Area Plan?</p>	<p>The heights are organized based on general built form, low-rise, mid-rise, and high rise. All development types must meet compatibility policies outlined in this plan, policy 4.3.1 (p)</p> <p>Downtown Core Area Designation (identified in Salmon color) is limited to 8 storeys. Minimum 2 storeys.</p> <p>Business District Designation (identified in blue color) is limited to 6 storeys. Minimum 2 storeys.</p> <p>Industrial Conversion Area Designation is limited to 12 storeys. Minimum 2 storeys.</p> <p>Downtown Neighbourhood Designation is limited to 6 storeys.</p> <p>Little Lake South District Designations: Sub Area 1 – maximum varies between 6 Storeys and 3 storeys based on intersections. Please refer to 4.3.7 for detail. Sub Area 2 – limited to low rise development type only.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
4	<p>I am writing to you because I am concerned that wetland protection is not being taken seriously in the Draft Official Plan 2021.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unevaluated wetlands have lower buffers than provincially significant wetlands in Table A. <p>In addition to this, Dianne Saxe reported that there was a 260-year backlog for wetland evaluations across Ontario. While there is a promise to evaluate all wetlands, this is unrealistic and has not happened because of Council votes on some developments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. I am disappointed to see bogs and fens in category B as they cannot be replaced. 3. A 120-meter buffer around wetlands would provide developers with greater certainty. An example would be the twin pad arena. I do not believe that 15- and 30-metre buffers are adequate for protecting the function of wetlands because of wildlife and habitat protections. <p>I also have concerns that under 4.6.2(b)(i) Natural Areas Designation that habitat of endangered species may be developed or altered including in level A natural heritage areas. There was a study from the University of Waterloo which shows that small wetlands are important in reducing</p>	<p>Table A has been revised to increase the minimum vegetation protection zone for unevaluated wetlands (that have not been rejected from evaluation under the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System) to 30 metres, similar to provincially significant wetlands. The recommendations of an approved site-specific Environmental Impact Study (EIS) will prescribe appropriate buffer widths, which may be no less than the minimum prescribed in Table A. An EIS will be required for any development application located within 120 metres of a natural heritage feature, which may be subject to peer review.</p> <p>Development and site alteration may be permitted in Level A Habitat of Endangered or Threatened Species only in accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>phosphorous however, some of these wetlands are in the lowest category of protection.</p>	
5	<p>I and several my acquaintances (all seniors, all homeowners, all west end taxpayers) are deeply disappointed in the reduction of the recommended 160 km of new bike lanes to just 80 km. Throughout these many months of Covid, bicycle sales have soared, and more people than ever are now utilizing the trails and bike lanes currently in place. The addition of the massive new subdivision on Lily Lake Rd and other proposed building sites around the city are indications of incredible population growth over the next 20 years. It is shortsighted for a community to not provide the infrastructure necessary to meet the obvious demands of such growth and to make the community environmentally progressive, safe, and appealing to those living in, moving to, or visiting the region. Cycling considerations in no way negate the need for well paved roads and sidewalk repairs but instead become part and parcel of what should be considered priorities in the city's development. I appreciate the financial commitment required to meet the needs of the community and can only imagine what those costs will be if deferred. All too</p>	<p>Improvements to the cycling network to be reviewed in the Transportation Master Plan and Cycling Master Plan. Both the Transportation Master Plan and The Cycling Master Plan are still underway and subsequent amendments may be required to the Official Plan to reflect the recommendations.</p> <p>Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) states that the City shall continue to provide for the development of bikeways by implementing the bikeway network as per the recommendations of the Transportation Plan and ensuring that all new development proposals and infrastructure works provide bikeways and support facilities.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>often Peterborough postpones the inevitable and is caught paying far more than necessary when no longer able to delay action. In this regard, the projected new swimming pool at Morrow Park should also be built now, allowing for our new recreational facilities to be completed and opened together.</p>	
6	<p>GE peaked at 6000 employees and now has a very small number employees. Several stoplights were put up in my opinion, to facilitate the large employee base. Please have them evaluated to see if some of them can be removed or replaced with stop signs to improve traffic flow.</p> <p>Secondly, after a certain time at night, I suggest 11 o'clock, could the traffic lights be programmed to flashing red and flashing amber to allow the main routes to flow with traffic in better more efficient manner.</p>	<p>Traffic light control and signals are outside the scope of the Official Plan. Traffic light control and signals as well as changes in population and jobs are considered as part of the Transportation Master Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
7	<p>Could you clarify how you intend to have the 45 angular planes applied for side streets, lanes and corners? There are lots of ways I see different municipalities applying this.</p> <p>I am also not clear on when you anticipate the rezoning of areas to take effect.</p>	<p>Specific interpretation of the use of angular planes and other urban design elements to support compatible development will be established through the creation of Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>The Zoning By-law is required to undergo a comprehensive review, to be brought into conformity with the new Official Plan, within 3 years of the Plan's approval.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
8	<p>The first major flaw is that work on the Transportation Plan is going ahead before completion of the City's overall Official Plan - a good example of putting the cart before the horse!</p> <p>The second flaw is the apparent absence of any consideration of the impact on transportation of Covid-19. For example, more people working at home means less traffic.</p> <p>The third flaw is the apparent assumption of a 50% increase in the City's population – which would be an environmental disaster, in my view. You should be doing all you can to maintain the City's population at its present level, which would be the best way to preserve most residents' presently comfortable lifestyle.</p> <p>Finally, talk about unacceptable traffic congestion in Peterborough is a joke! There is none! Residents of Toronto or Ottawa would love to live with what local planners deem as intolerable congestion. Congestion only needs to be addressed when causing serious economic/financial losses.</p>	<p>All municipalities that are subject to the policies of the Growth Plan are required to complete their Municipal Comprehensive Review, to bring local plans into conformity with the Growth Plan, by July 2, 2022. Staff received direction from Council to complete the Official Plan process by the end of 2021. Policy changes contemplated in the draft new Official Plan have been reviewed by Transportation staff and will be incorporated into their Transportation Master Planning process. Subsequent amendments may be required to the Official Plan to reflect the recommendations of the Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>The Transportation Master Plan will recommend upgrades, improvements or new roads based on projected use and anticipated level of service based on future development patterns. The Transportation Master Plan is intended to be completed by March 2022.</p> <p>The City is required to plan and accommodate the population and employment forecasts in Schedule 3 of A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, at a minimum.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
9	<p>Peterborough's Waterways are a wonderful resource that should be accessible for everyone in the wider community to enjoy, but 6 floors on George or Crescent Streets will destroy the view for many of residents.</p> <p>Many of us are disabled, some of our residents are so disabled that they never leave their apartments. Gazing through a window at the lake is one of the few pleasures that some of us still have left. The loss of our most precious view of the Lake would be traumatizing in the extreme for all concerned here. We love our view of Little Lake and want to keep it.</p> <p>Residents have additional concerns expressing concerns regarding waterfront height limits south of central area of 8 storeys and 6 storeys in the Central Area Designation.</p> <p>84 people signed a petition in this regard.</p>	<p>Little Lake South Designation contemplates a maximum of 6 storeys along George and Lake Streets to a maximum of 3 storeys at the corner of Lock and Romaine Streets. This reflects the height provisions in the Land Use and Urban Design Study adopted by Council for the Special Policy Area identified in the current Official Plan Schedule J.</p> <p>Community consultation was central to the study process and included consultation with City Council, the Downtown Business Improvement Area, committees, telephone interviews with major landowners, City staff and the public. Due to the growing development pressures in the area, the objective of the study was to make recommendations which would direct growth while preserving neighbourhood characteristics that were important to residents and visitors.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
10	<p>I am concerned about the reliance and quality of Environmental Impact Studies especially considering that in the report Back to Basics there was a 260-year backlog of wetland evaluations. Section 4.6.2.d.i says that unevaluated wetlands over 0.5 hectares fit into Category B and not A. There is a disincentive to evaluate wetlands. In addition to this I believe all bogs and fens should be moved to category A.</p>	<p>Please see response #4 of this Matrix. Further, the policies of the Plan do not rely on an Environmental Impact Study for NHS protection. Natural features or functions that meet one of the three level designations receive the corresponding level of protection regardless of an Environmental Impact Study or mapping.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
11	<p>With regards to Schedule D Road Network Map: Armour Road at the north end is designated a high-capacity road and yet farther south, it becomes labelled as a medium capacity road. It is a busy road and becoming busier every year with both TASS cars and buses as well as Trent cars as buses. Wouldn't it make sense to label it a high-capacity road all the way down?</p> <p>And Parkhill Road at the intersection with Armour Road needs to have long left turning lanes in all directions (i.e. from and to north and south as well as east and west) and if possible and advanced green lights as well. That would help alleviate long lines of cars and buses being backed up awaiting turning. You already have that for vehicles coming from south and turning to west, and coming from west and turning to north, why not add in for those going from north turning to east and east turning to south?</p>	<p>A City-wide Transportation Master Plan is to be completed by 2022. Any changes to the proposed road network will be reflected in the Official Plan through an amendment to the Road Network schedule.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
12	<p>What changes are going to be made at the intersection of Armour Road and Hunter Street in preparation for the opening of the new school?</p> <p>There will be dozens of buses as well as parents in cars going through there. It's on a hill so winter snow and ice will complicate things. And that new apartment building on the corner will add cars via its underground parking garage.</p>	<p>Please see response #11 of this Matrix.</p>
13	<p>I was pleased to see the tree canopy growing from 30 to 35% by 2051.</p> <p>Are there details on how we are going to get there?</p>	<p>The minimum canopy target of 35% (or otherwise specified in the Urban Forest Strategic Plan) is supported by the woodland protection policies described under the natural heritage framework in Section 4.6.2 of the draft Official Plan. The draft Official Plan also directs that the City shall implement a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy to guide stewardship activities and priorities, street tree and naturalization programs to increase tree canopy cover, require tree plantings in all City infrastructure-related works and regulate the cutting and replacement of trees. The development of a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy and Land Securement Fund to acquire lands within the Natural Areas designation are identified commitments of the draft Official Plan. Other details will be found in the Urban Forest Strategic Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
14	<p>At yesterday evening's Zoom you mentioned that the new DRAFT OP contains a new schedule for road allowances. Am I correct in assuming that the new schedule assembles existing road allowances, rather than stipulating new ones?</p>	<p>Schedule I: Road Allowance Widths describes the width of right-of-way required by the City to implement the Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>The Planning Act empowers municipalities to acquire land for road widening purposes as a condition of various planning approvals, provided the roadway to be widened and the extent of the widening is described in the Official Plan. As such, where a property is the subject of an application for planning approval and abuts a road right-of-way that does not meet the expected width as described in Schedule I, it is intended that the developer convey sufficient land to the City to meet the described width.</p> <p>Further amendments may be made to this Schedule based outcomes on the Transportation Master Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
15	<p>As per section 3.3.6 can you advise us</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are other community uses? 2. What is Compatible Development? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Other community uses include residential uses as well as non-residential uses which serve the population (e.g., commercial, retail, institutional). It is noted that the Coldsprings Special study area is not a designation, specific uses and designations would be identified through a Secondary Plan. 2. Compatible development is a defined term in this Plan: "Compatible development is not development that is the same as, or even similar to existing development in the vicinity. Compatible development is development that enhances the character of the surrounding community without causing any undue, adverse impacts on adjacent properties including, but not limited to, consideration of Provincial guidelines relating to Land Use Compatibility and Environmental Noise."

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
16	<p>The draft OP Vision Statement, beyond naming the year 2051, omits any qualitative reference to the reality of a very different future given the climate emergency.</p> <p>May I respectfully suggest that including wording such as <i>“a City well-positioned to respond to the climate crisis”</i> be included, for instance, in the Vision Statement (p.9) to strengthen it.</p>	<p>The vision statement in Section 2.1 was revised to elevate the profile of climate change: “Peterborough is a prosperous community, distinctive in its natural beauty, cultural heritage, and strong sense of community. As a leader in [responding to climate change, resilience planning] and environmental sustainability, planning in Peterborough uses infrastructure and land efficiently, promotes healthy lifestyles and incorporates green initiatives to increase the City’s adaptive capacity. The City will continue to develop as a complete and connected community that provides a high quality of life, supports a strong and diverse economy and promotes a unique, vibrant sense of place. Peterborough is equitable and accessible for all residents and visitors and celebrates its engaged, inclusive and diverse community.”</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
17	<p>The OP will influence municipal land use planning for a long time. Does it meet the pending unprecedented food, economic and demographic pressures? In the very Introduction to the Plan (p. 2) for instance, climate change is merely listed equal to cost of living, economic, restructuring and advancements in technology, not acknowledging its unique status as the “turning point” around which all the others move. Climate Change should be positioned as the framework within or priority under which the whole OP is to be considered.</p>	<p>Section 1.1 (Context) was revised to acknowledge the ongoing climate change emergency as challenges being faced by the community. Section 5.7 (Climate Change) includes policies for climate change that will be used to inform the City's decision making.</p> <p>In addition, Section 2.2.2 (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability) states that Peterborough will ensure that development contributes to a more sustainable environment over the long term by “Taking a leadership role in encouraging and promoting green buildings, infrastructure resilience, and sustainable development practices that mitigate and adapt against climate change”</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
18	<p>The food security of any city is threatened by severe climate impacts e.g. prolonged drought, heat. To the criteria of the provincial <i>Growth Plan</i> land use designations, Council might consider adding the criteria of food growing land to land use designations within city boundaries under p. 9, d) “additional criterion/criteria established by Council; and other considerations as a result of public consultation.”</p> <p>Also, language in S. 5.6 that Food Production within the section on Climate Change could be strengthened by saying that the City “<i>shall identify and designate</i>” rather than just “encourage and support” local food activities, urban agriculture and increased production and access to local food sources.</p>	<p>Policies regarding local food production contemplates the expanded use of City land for growing food including edible landscapes (Section 5.6). Agricultural and agricultural-related uses will continue to be permitted on lands within the Rural Transitional Area designation.</p>
19	<p>It is suggested that the lens of climate change be used in land use designations not only to “assess the quantity of land needed to accommodate ... population and employment forecasts” but adding assessment of “accommodating climate impact mitigation.”</p>	<p>Identification of employment and community area land needs are set out by the Land Needs Assessment Methodology issued by the Province as part of the Growth Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
20	<p>S. 5.2.3.a and v (p.140) references “development standards.” Given the City’s own goals in its Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP), development standards could include OP-embedded references for measurable residential emission reductions guided by an updated CCAP and ongoing climate change science.</p>	<p>Cross-referencing has been minimized in the structure of this Plan to support the overall readability of the document. Targets set out by CCAP are subject to change with ongoing climate change science and are instead expressed through a framework of policies set out in Climate Change Section (5.7) as well as collective policies throughout the Plan to achieve intensification, transit-supported development, and protection of existing Natural Heritage System & Source Water Protection.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
21	<p>It is good to see a higher target for affordable housing in the most recent OP draft. However, true affordability will only be greatly assisted locally if Council understands and uses the leverage available in the Implementation “tools” (Section 7.) of the OP.</p> <p>A municipality relies heavily on federal and provincial housing funding and programs as well as their inadequate definition of “affordable”. Secondary Plans, Master Plans, Council-approved policy and the Implementation “tools” of the OP can help bring affordability down to the level where rental housing becomes <i>truly</i> affordable to the incomes of those on Ontario Works and the Ontario Disability Support Program. (Councilor Clarke will be aware of precedent for such an approach in early 2000’s Council “Taking Charge” policies). I urge you to use all these tools of the OP to achieve that level of rental affordability as one of the ways to reduce homelessness.</p>	<p>Definition of affordability is set out by the Provincial Policy Statement.</p> <p>Currently, the Planning Act does not have a tool to allow municipalities like Peterborough to impose affordable housing and/or subsidized housing via inclusionary zoning. Bill 108 limited the application of inclusionary zoning policies to Protected Major Transit Station Areas and an area subject to a Development Permit System – neither of which apply to the City of Peterborough.</p> <p>The Plan encourages affordable housing and sets out a higher target than the previous Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
22	<p>The Plan puts heavy focus on growth and economic factors. Social, environmental, and arts areas continue to be merely “considered” rather than supported with clear standards, targets and commitments.</p> <p>Truly affordable Housing, better public transport, urban intensification with greenspace protection/enhancement, and a loosening of by-laws to allow for home-based business enterprises - especially homegrown food, are all important to us and not clearly prioritized in the plan.</p>	<p>The specific language used throughout the policies of the Official Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing the Plan.</p> <p>Section 2.2.3 (Vibrant and Unique) acknowledges Peterborough is home to a vibrant arts, culture and heritage community that includes a vibrant theatre scene; hundreds of cultural workers, producers, and organizations</p> <p>Official Plan sets out a flexible framework for Home Occupations. Specific regulations related to home occupations will be reviewed as part of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law Update that will occur once the new Official Plan is in effect.</p>
23	<p>An OP is a municipality’s highest and best document. Care should be taken to ensure it contains strong, focused policies to guide us to 2051 and beyond. I feel the OP is too long and there are too many ‘feel good’ statements and not enough policy direction (e.g. “encourage” shows up 63 times).</p>	<p>Every sentence in the draft Official Plan has been reviewed in terms of the strength of the language. Municipalities are given authority in provincial legislation to compel on certain policy statements, but not all statements. It has been the approach of this draft Plan to use the strongest language where it has the authority to do so, and to soften the language (e.g., consider/encourage/may) where no full authority is provided to require or impose an outcome.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
24	<p>I would suggest removing the repetition of minor issues. For example, the OP repeats “home occupation” numerous land use designations (Chapter 4). I would suggest putting a simple policy about where home occupations are permitted in 4.2.2 o. and let the zoning bylaw do the work of saying this or that home occupation is permitted here but not there.</p> <p>I notice a similar repetition about waste collection/storage facilities in various sections in Chapter 4. I would suggest developing this as an urban design policy and put it in section 5.4.</p> <p>Another similar example is “not cause a traffic hazard.” Make that a general policy and say it once. As it is now, the OP reads more like a zoning bylaw than a broad policy document to guide development for the next decades.</p>	<p>Generally, throughout the editing process, effort has been made to consolidate repeating policies and avoiding adding additional explanatory text to reduce length, but allow a balance with detailed direction per each designation.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
25	<p>Being so long with sections that are not policy, the good policies get lost. For example, do we really need 3.2c? or 3.3.7h? 3.3.2d starts out as something fundamental, but then the following two subsections are too wishy-washy ("facilitates" "supports") – what does this mean? Can you hold developers to this? What would happen if 3.3.7f was edited to say "The Urban Growth Centre will further be planned:" and then remove "as" and "to" from each subsection?</p>	<p>Some explanatory text is included in the Plan to support the overall readability of the document.</p> <p>The specific language used throughout the policies of the Official Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing the Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
26	<p>I understand that there is a different process for plans that impact Natural Heritage Systems versus those that impact Natural Heritage features. Would it be possible to enhance the rigor of those plans for areas with or near natural areas to include a review by an advisory committee or sub-committee with naturalist expertise?</p> <p>Given the fact that our Natural Heritage is central to what makes Peterborough unique we need additional oversight and engagement to ensure its conservation.</p>	<p>The scope and mandate of the Peterborough Environmental Advisory Committee was determined through Council and is further defined in the terms of reference established in By-Law Number 19-052. Changes to the terms of reference for that advisory committee or establishment of a sub-committee would need to be discussed and determined through Council.</p> <p>Further, the City may require peer review of any Preliminary Natural Heritage Feature Screening and Environmental Impact Study submitted to the City as part of a development application. The draft Official Plan also contains policy commitments for the preparation of a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy and environmental impact study guidelines in consultation with the Otonabee River Conservation Authority, Indigenous communities and other appropriate stakeholders. One of the objectives to community engagement described in the Plan is to provide equitable opportunity for a wide demographic to be informed and involved on planning matters, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 (Public Consultation and Community Engagement)</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
27	How will the City monitor the achievements and how will the public be kept informed?	<p>Section 7.3.2 (Monitoring) commits to monitoring and measuring performance. That section speaks to monitoring to determine if the implementation of the policies fulfills the overall Vision, Guiding Principles and Objectives of this Plan.</p> <p>The more detailed policy reports and plans that come out of the Official Plan (e.g. Climate Change Action Plan, Urban Forest Strategic Plan) will outline monitoring guidelines related to their specific targets and desired outcomes. A number of targets related to housing are currently monitored and made available in the City's Residential Monitoring Reports on the City's website. The Province of Ontario also periodically monitors the implementation of the Growth Plan through a set of performance indicators.</p>
28	<p>Individual Comment:</p> <p>Although there is no order of priority implied in the order of the policies, place climate change as the first section as climate change adaptation will be critical.</p>	<p>No change recommended. The Plan is not intended to be read as individual, stand-alone Sections addressing specific topics, but rather must be read as a whole to support successful city-building. For any individual part to be properly understood, this Plan must be read as a whole and there is no implied priority in the order in which policies appear in the document.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
29	<p>Climate change, population growth and density, and the economy will be three of the major drivers of a future Peterborough. The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report released in the summer of 2021 is unambiguous that climate change is a 'code red for humanity'. All levels of governments, communities and citizens must take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (mitigation), and just as importantly, prepare for the change that climate will bring (adaptation). There will be warmer temperatures, an increased likelihood of more frequent and intense weather events, and greater natural hazards risks for Peterborough. The City of Peterborough must take climate change mitigation and adaptation actions to reduce impacts to city lands, infrastructure, assets and services, and to ensure the well-being of its residents.</p>	<p>Added reference to Context section to frame the issues around climate change. However, the general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document. Ample discussion around climate change is provided throughout the Official Plan.</p> <p>It is also important to acknowledge that several policy directions like intensification and promoting active transportation seek to make Peterborough a greener city without specifically mentioning the phrase 'climate change'.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
30	<p>On September 23, 2019, City Council declared a climate change emergency that recognized there is a need to achieve a target of 45 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and reach net zero emissions by 2050. The city will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Achieve at least a 45 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, and reach net zero emissions by 2050; b. Report annually to city council and the public, Peterborough greenhouse gas emission levels; c. Implement city actions identified in climate change mitigation and/or adaptation plans, policies, declarations, or strategies adopted by city council; d. Prepare and implement a multi-year city infrastructure, assets and services climate change adaption plan, including a risk assessment, priorities and cost estimates so that city decision makers and the public understand what is required to prepare for climate change impacts; e. Integrate climate change into municipal decision-making processes that inform the way Peterborough is planned, developed, used, rehabilitated and/or maintained. 	<p>Additional policy language was added to give greater prominence to responding to climate change, more specifically, Section 1.1 – Context, vision statement in Section 2.1, and Section 2.2 – Guiding Principles. It is also important to acknowledge that several policy directions like intensification, promoting active transportation and protecting the natural heritage system also supports objectives related to climate change. Section 5.7 also acknowledges the need to adopt climate change mitigation and adaption measures to enhance the resiliency of its built and natural environments.</p> <p>The City's climate change targets have already been endorsed/adopted by Council and it is not necessary to duplicate the targets into the Official Plan. Therefore, it is on the public record that those targets are the City's objectives – there is not any added benefit of adding that same language to the Official Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
31	<p>Recommendation to add the following policy:</p> <p>A commitment to maintaining and expanding parklands and greenspaces within the city limits is critical to the health and well-being of its residents and even more so in light of proposed increases in population size and density, and as a tool to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The city will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Achieve a target of 4 ha per 1,000 residents of parklands by maintaining existing parks and developing new ones; b. Maintain at least 20 percent of its lands as greenspace (i.e., parks, trails, urban forests, natural heritage areas, floodplains); c. Plan and hold lands for regional or community parks in greenfield areas prior to allowing development. 	<p>The Parks Development Standards establishes the appropriate target of parkland in relation to the population. The draft Plan was developed to be consistent with the Municipal Parks and Open Space Study from February 2020, notably the park hierarchy, and planning and design standards. Section 7.12 outlines the requirements regarding parkland dedication in accordance with the Planning Act.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
32	<p>Recommendation to add the following policy: The city will allow community gardens (either vegetable or flower) on any designation of parkland in Peterborough, or in open spaces (with the exception of natural heritage areas) to provide food production spaces, contribute to the well-being of residents, foster a connection to the land, and add to the sense of neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Community gardens are listed as permitted uses in the Major Open Space (Section 4.2.4) and Downtown Open Space (Section 4.3.6) designations. Section 5.3.2 Provision of Parkland also states that the City will provide a public park system that provides opportunities for community gardens. The facilities provided at each park is established through the recommendations of the Strategic Plan for Recreation, Parks, Arenas and Culture/Park Development Standards.</p>
33	<p>Recommendation to add the following policy: The city will examine the feasibility of designated brown field spaces, such as General Electric, becoming parklands.</p>	<p>The draft Official Plan contains language acknowledging key strategic development and investment areas and potential financial and planning tools, particularly the General Electric Lands. A policy was also added in both the Central Area and the Employment Lands Designation sections for the preparation of Urban Design Studies for lands with significant redevelopment potential.</p>
34	<p>Recommendation to add the following policy: To realize its target of 35 percent forest canopy by 2051, the city will implement an accelerated inventory and planting plan for trees on municipal lands during the first 10 years of this plan, and continue to systematically inventory, plan and plant trees in the remaining years.</p>	<p>Section 5.5(c) states that the City will implement the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy and street tree and naturalization programs to increase urban tree canopy cover. Specific details on how the City will work to achieve its target for tree canopy cover will be considered in the Urban Forest Strategic Plan and the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
35	<p>Recommendation to add the following policy: The city will monitor and report on the state of its established natural heritage sites on a ten-year sampling cycle in order to measure the effectiveness of environmental stewardship, and the impacts of climate change on the natural heritage system.</p>	<p>No change recommended - It is generally advisable to avoid stating specific timelines for specific initiatives in the policies. Section 7.3.2 (Monitoring) indicates that the City will undertake performance measurement in a variety of ways including, but not limited to municipal performance measures reporting.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
36	<p>Recommendations that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maniece Avenue be designated as a low-capacity collector or local road because of its design, the number of driveways entering onto the street, and issues with the intersections at both ends of the street, rather than a future high-capacity collector. There will be better traffic flow to use a Maria Street extension, or a high-capacity collector through Ashborough Village to connect Television Road and Ashburnham Drive. Maria Street extension has the space assigned for it, no driveways, width for multi-modal traffic, and no sewer or water lines. 2. A high-capacity collector through Ashborough Village will be designed from the start and take traffic from both this subdivision and Burnham Meadows, allow public transit to enter the area, and build multi-modal connections. 	Please see response #11 of this Matrix.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
37	<p>Petition request:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. increasing minimum vegetation Protection zones of all unevaluated and Provincially Significant wetlands to 120 meters and adding them to Category A in Table A Natural Heritage Feature Minimum Vegetation Protection Zones so that standards for unevaluated wetlands and provincially significant wetlands are identical 2. to move bogs and fens to Category A 3. removing allowances to develop or alter habitat of endangered or Threatened species in Category A protected areas <p>Signed by 61 Peterborough Residents</p>	See response to comment #4.
38	<p>On the south side of the tower, I have an ugly site to look at. The previous "Diversified building" has gone from abandoned dump site that finally was demolished. It is now cleared out, but has large ugly cement blocks to close the entrance and the property unmaintained, with grass and weed never attended for a few years now.</p>	<p>Property standards and maintenance is outside the scope of the Official Plan; the Property Standards By-law enforces a set of general repair and safety standards, which are the minimum physical conditions which private properties and structures must meet for the maintenance of all buildings, dwellings and open spaces within the City of Peterborough.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
39	<p>On the north side of the tower, there is a property owned by a private developer, again unmaintained for years with weeds and grass. it's ugly and a hangout for drug dealers, homeless and teen parties behind the tower on summer days. I know the tower itself is under maintenance and that's fine, it's a two-year project and glad when the work will be completed.</p>	<p>Please refer to response #38.</p>
40	<p>My neighbour to the north (now sold and moved) has not maintained her boulevard for years. There's an old fence outside of the property on the boulevard, overgrown trees and brush, rotted trees, garbage.. I can't see coming out of my driveway and often come close to being hit by oncoming traffic. I made complaints with the city but nothing was done. This is a safety issue and the city ignores it and their reply is "we're very busy".</p>	<p>Please refer to response #38.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
41	<p>Since I moved here in 2008, I heard that the street was going to be rebuilt but it's still in disrepair and not very well maintained in the winter. I was told there is not enough room to put a street with 2 sidewalks, that is correct. What I don't understand is why the city is not looking at putting a one way running south. There would be enough for the street and one sidewalk. If it runs south then there is no left or right turns on Sherbrooke, that would eliminate traffic accidents as well, and people fishtailing coming up the hill. As you are the planning comity, I beg you to put High street on your project list. There is a traffic survey at the moment, I'm very hopeful something will get done, but there was a traffic survey years ago and nothing happened yet, I've been here 13 years.</p>	<p>A City-wide Transportation Master Plan is to be completed by 2022. Any changes to the proposed road network will be reflected in the Official Plan through an amendment to the Road Network schedule.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
42	<p>This area has children walking to Prince of Wales school and Kenner as well. We are close to the hospital and mall which generate a lot of traffic. We have a senior home, and many seniors from Royal garden walk up here for exercise. I see them sometimes waiting by a puddle on the side of the road as there is no sidewalk and have a hard time walking on the unmaintained roadside. This street is a tragic accident in the making, something needs to be done.</p>	<p>The Plan requires sidewalks on all public roads as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. On both sides of Arterial and Collector Roads; ii. On both sides of all Local Roads, including culs-de-sac with 30 or more residential units, and any cul-de-sac having a through pedestrian connection. <p>Sidewalks will also be required on at least one side of new condominium private roads and public or private lanes. Where the City determines that physical or practical circumstances would prohibit or not warrant a sidewalk connection, such facilities may not be required.</p> <p>Where sidewalks are missing along existing streets, new sidewalks are provided according to need as identified in the Sidewalk Strategic Plan. Each year, the City builds about 2 km of new sidewalks along existing streets.</p>
43	<p>Lands north of Hilliard, in my opinion, provides numerous opportunities to take the locational advantages of being on the rivers edge and their near proximity to retail and commercial services to be offered in downtown Peterborough via George and Water Streets to support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -higher residential developments; and, -integrated commercial spaces within some of the residential developments 	<p>The subject area is identified as a Strategic Growth Area which supports higher density residential development and commercial uses.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
44	<p>From my perspective the river's edge provides a unique and wonderful opportunity for Water Street to accommodate more intensive developments on the west side and real potentials for an expanded open space system on the east, or the river side, to create an attractive, rich and inviting boulevard environment north of the intersection of Water and George towards the zoo.</p>	<p>Section 5.4.1 states that "The City recognizes that there are many components that contribute to the City's unique and vibrant sense of place for both residents and visitors to the community. These include Peterborough's riverfront location on the Otonabee River and the Trent-Severn Waterway; its heritage resources, cultural amenities, rolling topography, scenic natural areas and waterfront trails; and the City's distinctive public areas such as Little Lake, the Central Area, the Lift Lock and Jackson Park. In its approval of new development or redevelopment, the City will build on and enhance the amenity of these valued places, wherever possible."</p>
45	<p>In principle 4 to 6 storey residential development should in my view be welcomed and encouraged over much of the developable lands.</p> <p>This would also address the opportunity for existing retirement projects to update and expand those facilities and the redevelopment the single use commercial properties over the longer term.</p>	<p>This is generally captured in the land use designations within Strategic Growth Areas. Policies within the Residential designation also provide considerations for mid and high rise residential development.</p>
46	<p>There are some smaller fragmented properties on the east side of Water that should be acquired by the municipality for the purpose of expanded open spaces.</p>	<p>The lands between Water St and the Otonabee River have been designated Major Open Space and Natural Areas. Section 5.4 (Urban Design) states that the City shall seek opportunities for the acquisition of land abutting its waterways for the purposes of improving public access and enjoyment of the water's edge.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
47	<p>If these ideas were seen to be of merit there should, in my view, be the undertaking comprehensive planning exercise to guide the design and development of this corridor north to the Peterborough Zoo. The opportunities to acquire the few residential properties on the riverside north of the intersection of Water and George should also be examined and adopted as a part of a land acquisition plan. I see the opportunities for Water Street being redesigned as a pedestrian boulevard with mixed uses on the west side and an expansive linear public open space together with pedestrian/cycling link on the river side north of the commercial uses above Hilliard extended . (Canmore has been implementing a simple path system that is of an attractive and very functional design from the perspectives of urban design.) Such a study exercise should also consider including updating the zoning bylaw so as to more readily advance the use and zone provisions where appropriate to see the implementation of the planning study over the life of the official plan.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #46. Water Street North of Central Area is identified as a Strategic Growth Area. It is the intention to develop Secondary Plans for the subject lands as outlined in the Section 7.3.6 (b) (Secondary Plans).</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
48	<p>This comment relates to the removal of Provincially Significant Wetland, as a specific designation, associated with your Official Plan.</p> <p>A Provincially Significant Wetland constitutes part of the Natural Heritage Area. The Official Plan Review suggests that the Provincially Significant Wetlands should not be shown as a specific land use associated with the Natural Heritage features.</p>	<p>Provincially Significant Wetlands are part of the Natural Areas Designation and are not required to be specifically identified on the schedules.</p>
49	<p>Provincially Significant Wetlands have a specific role. In that context, there are different consequences which flow from the designation of property as a Provincially Significant Wetland. The City has had over 11 years to appropriately map and delineate the boundaries and also engage in the appropriate classifications of Provincially Significant Wetlands within the Municipality. That should be undertaken and completed prior to the adoption of the Official Plan. Furthermore, the Official Plan should not be adopted, as proposed, without showing the Provincially Significant Wetlands as a sub-set geographic area in the Natural Heritage designations. For example, Section 2.1.4 of the Provincial Policy Statement notes that development and site alterations shall not be permitted in Significant Wetlands. Significant Wetlands has a specific definition pursuant to the Provincial Policy Statement.</p>	<p>See response to comment #48. Further, the City will conduct evaluation of all wetlands as per Section 4.6.2 (w) to identify their significance.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
50	<p>This commentary relates to Section 6.1.7 Extension Beyond City Limits. The sub-paragraph (a) which contemplates the extension of City services being sanitary sewer, water supply, and other municipal utility services beyond the City boundaries should not be undertaken without an Official Plan Amendment. This also applies within the context of any services incidental to the City owned facilities such as the Peterborough Airport. As a consequence, the proposed change in wording from the existing Official Plan as noted in Section 6.1.7 (a) is the subject of objection. Many parties, including City ratepayers, the Township of Cavan Monaghan, the County of Peterborough, and other Townships would be significantly impacted by the extension of such services beyond the City boundaries.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
51	<p>This letter constitutes an objection to the designation of any of the subject property shown on Schedule "B", west of Chemong Road, and noted as Prestige Employment Designation. This is not an appropriate area for Prestige Employment Designation. It does not satisfy the criteria of both the Growth Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement in that context. The subject proposed area is not in close proximity to major infrastructure. Specifically, it is in the north end of the City of Peterborough, and a substantial distance from Highway 115 which represents the major corridor in reference to heavy truck movement.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>
52	<p>The Transportation Plan Review is being undertaken by the City. It is premature to consider any designation until the Transportation Plan Review is undertaken and completed. Of specific note, the City's designation of the Parkway route as a component of the City's Official Plan and Transportation Plan Review has now been reactivated as a consequence of this proposal. Phasing policies in terms of appropriate orderly and sequential development have not been reflected in terms of this designation, nor has the appropriate criteria for Infrastructure Planning been assessed incidental to this designation.</p>	<p>Please refer to response #8.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
53	It is completely premature to consider this designation [Prestige Employment], and the Parkway route and its completion has been reactivated as a major transportation concern associated with the proposed Prestige Employment Designation, as noted on the attached Schedule.	Please refer to response #8.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
54	<p>This letter constitutes an objection to the Coldsprings Special Study Area as shown in Schedule 'B' to the Land Use Plan of the City of Peterborough. In addition, the concerns extend to Schedule 'A' Urban Structure and the reference to the Coldsprings Study Area and the Policies of Section 3.3.6. Both Schedules 'A' and 'B' are attached hereto delineating the area now proposed for the Coldsprings Special Study Area. The Study area needs to be expanded to include all specific transportation corridors that would relate to the Coldsprings area. This specifically includes the confluence of Bensfort Road, Wallace Point Road, Highway 115, and any service, collector, or local roads to fulfill the appropriate Transportation Plan for this area.</p>	<p>The Growth Plan states that municipalities should designate and preserve lands within settlement areas located adjacent to or near major goods movement facilities and corridors, including major highway interchanges, as areas for manufacturing, warehousing and logistics, and appropriate associated uses and ancillary facilities. The intent of the Special Study Area is to do additional studies to determine the appropriate urban structure and land uses. Through the secondary plan process, there will be additional studies (e.g., soil and water studies, land use compatibility studies, environmental studies) and the buffers between residential and employment uses will be determined. The integration of industrial uses with the surrounding area must be done in accordance with the Province's land use compatibility and noise guidelines. The adoption of secondary plan will require additional public consultation.</p> <p>Section 3.3.6 states that the lands identified as Coldsprings Special Study Area are approximate and does not constitute as a land use designation.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
55	The Policies of Section 3.3.6 are vague. The Policy criteria does not accord with the Growth Plan Policies, nor the Provincial Policy Statement. Specific Phasing Policies need to be identified, and particular concern emphasized in reference to Transportation Planning, and sequential and orderly development.	Please refer to response #54.
56	The Coldsprings Special Policy Area should include a clear prohibition that there will be no Prestige Employment Designation, no General Employment Designation, nor any other Industrial Designation for any lands within the Special Study Area.	The intent of the Coldsprings Special Policy Area is to eventually delineate approximately 80 hectares of Prestige Employment to fulfil employment area land need identified in the Land Needs Assessment. Additional studies are required to delineate appropriate urban structure and land uses.
57	The Study Area should be expanded to include the northeast quadrant in association with Bensfort Road and Wallace Point Road, and also the lands on the east side of Wallace Point Road	Section 3.3.6 states that the lands identified as Coldsprings Special Study Area are approximate and does not constitute as a land use designation.
58	No changes should be implemented by way of Schedule 'D' until the Transportation Plan Review is fully complete and has gone through the full public process.	Please refer to response #8.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
59	<p>The enclosed Schedule 'D' effectively deletes what has been referenced in the past as the completion of the Parkway route. Schedule 'D' provided herein effectively has the old Parkway route end at Sherbrooke Street. The existing designation in the present Plan denotes a road corridor for a future Parkway.</p>	<p>Road improvements will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan. Changes will be made accordingly to the Draft Official Plan - it is not the intent of the Official Plan policies to preconceive the outcomes of the Transportation Master Plan and/or Environmental Assessment process.</p>
60	<p>The existing Parkway route is delineated on Schedule 'B' of the City's existing Road Network Plan. The deletion of the Parkway route is problematic. It is now particularly problematic since the City is proposing an Employment Area Designation to certain lands west of Chemong Road and on the northern boundary of the City's Settlement Area. That particular proposed land use invites the consideration of retaining the Parkway route designation, and actually implementing phasing policies, and infrastructure improvements by way of planned coordination with land uses in the norther quadrant of the Municipality.</p>	<p>See responses to Comments #8 and #59.</p>
61	<p>The existing Official Plan includes Table 1: Residential Development by Secondary Land Use Plan Areas. The draft City of Peterborough Official Plan released July 2021 for consideration appears to delete Table 1. Will Table 1 be deleted?</p>	<p>Relevant secondary Plans have been migrated over from the existing Official Plan to the Section 9.0 Secondary Plans of the new Official Plan. Table 1 is no longer relevant/needed.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
62	In the absence of Table 1, will there be guidance or direction as it would relate to residential development in regard to each Secondary Plan Area?	Please refer to response #61.
63	<p>The special policy should, at a minimum, specify the following for General Electric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Industrial conversion of this property is to be discouraged; b) No use shall be allowed, and reflected in a Zoning By-Law Amendment initiated by the City, until a record of site condition (as defined pursuant to applicable law) is produced demonstrating that the subject property, and any potential migration of contaminants, has been completely and fully remediated; c) Other uses, including open space, natural areas, park land, and compatible activities be encouraged to develop at the subject property. 	<p>The Draft Official Plan describes the criteria required to consider conversion in Section 4.5.3. Section 4.1.2 states that in all designations, excluding the Natural Areas Designation, public parks, playfields, institutional and quasi-institutional uses and other public service facilities which provide services directly to all properties in the City, or to the immediate neighbourhood, shall be permitted, subject to conditions.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
64	<p>The Land Needs Assessment undertaken and released by the City of Peterborough in June, 2021 made note that the future use of the General Electric property is uncertain due to potential environmental contamination, cultural heritage value, and other complexities associated with the site. However, at this point in time, in order to ensure that the property is appropriately remediated, the Special Policy Area should be adopted which could facilitate and encourage the requisite remediation needed for this property.</p>	<p>The subject lands are identified as a key strategic development and investment area which shall be the focus for the implementation of a range of financial and planning tools.</p>
65	<p>3 years ago, the conversations I had with the city was that this area/region [Coldsprings] was going to be designated residential as the city grows. Timing was based on how much the city needed to expand which I understand but this change that's been proposed is absolutely not the same direction I had discussed with the municipality previously.</p>	<p>This is noted.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
66	<p>My overarching belief about the plan is that it should be scrapped. It has much less to do with the people that already live in this city, and much more about what the provincial government wants from us. Its target is people that do not live here much more than people that do live here. This would all be OK, but the problem is that we have been targeted to become suburban.</p> <p>I know there is a transportation plan being developed in tandem to the city plan, but this needs to be said. The plan for development east of East City is disaster in the making. Any access from the east will meet bottlenecks at every turn. It will turn into another North End traffic disaster. How long has it been since the residents there have way more cut through traffic than is reasonable. Do we need more North End Parkway type of problems.</p>	<p>Comment is noted. Please see response #8.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
67	<p>Even if I personally approved of the plan goal to increase our population, this plan does it in a way that is going to have a negative effect on our quality of life. The land available is right under our noses. It is the area around Lansdowne and the Parkway. Right now it is nothing but giant parking lots and relatively small one story buildings. Instead use it for giant high rise structures with malls on the first and second floors. This location is idea for those wanting to commute to Toronto. Additionally Toronto style density with shopping reduces the need for cars. Low income people will have more for rent if they can achieve their mobility goals without a car. It is also better than using the city downtown given the latter can be developed with tourism in mind. The L&P intersection and area is already a mammoth eye sore. No one loses if it is transformed.</p>	<p>The draft Plan identifies Strategic Growth Areas as the focus of intensification, which support the achievement of the prescribed Urban Growth Centre (UGC) density target and annual residential intensification target. Strategic Growth Areas include the Central Area and Mixed-Use Corridors. These areas are identified on Schedule A: Urban Structure and Schedule B: Land Use Plan.</p> <p>There is a focus on alternative modes of transportation and getting people out of cars (e.g., transit, walking and cycling). The Plan also focuses on establishing an urban structure that will support an enhanced transit system over time (e.g., though the identification of strategic growth areas – corridors and centres that form the basis of an enhanced transit system). In addition, there are policies promoting active transportation supportive facilities and transit supportive development.</p>

Bousfields (On behalf of Brookfield)

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>We have concerns with the City's identification of these lands as excess lands and the application of the Rural Transition Area designation. Brookfield/BPH intends to develop these lands for residential and mixed uses within the horizon of the plan. With respect to residential or Community Area growth, the City's Land Needs Assessment assumes that the City will only grow to the minimum population forecast of 125,000 by 2051, whereas the Growth Plan directs that these forecasts are a minimum (Policy 5.2.4.2). Further, the Land Needs Assessment assumes that residential growth from 2021 to 2051 will be accommodated through 50% intensification in the delineated built-up area and 50% in designated greenfield areas. Our clients and their consultants have concerns with the reliance on current development trends to develop a future forecast as well as the blending of trends for development in the delineated built-up area and the Designated Greenfield Areas to justify an increase in apartment units for the future housing supply (despite referencing high demand for single-detached dwellings).</p>	<p>The land needs assessment has been completed in accordance with the minimum requirements of the Growth Plan and the identification of employment and community land needs meets the requirements of the Land Needs Assessment Methodology.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
2	<p>In the City's June 2021 Land Needs Assessment report, the conclusion is that the City will have a deficit of employment lands over the horizon of the plan (Section 3.6). As such, <i>excess lands</i> would only be a consideration for residential lands and not employment lands. Employment lands, including Brookfield/BPH's lands, should not be considered <i>excess lands</i> and not redesignated Rural Transitional Areas.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>

Biglieri Group

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>The location [Chemong Area] of the Prestige Employment Designation will permit the orderly, sustainable, and appropriate development of prestige employment and general employment land uses through appropriate buffering and separation provided by existing environmental features and future mitigation measures;</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>
2	<p>The location [Chemong Area] of the Prestige Employment Designation allows for access to the Future Municipal Roadway Corridor, as identified on Schedule D Road Network Plan of the Draft OP. Access to Fairbairn Street and Line Road 3 from the North Parcel can be achieved to enhance access to both the local and regional economies without negatively impacting more sensitive land use typologies that exist and are planned for the nearby community;</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

3	<p>[Chemong Area] designated as <i>Neighbourhoods Designation</i> and may allow the orderly development of community and neighbourhood land uses that support the development of a sustainable, walkable, and complete community that will maintain a good transition to the community and neighbourhood uses currently existing</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>
4	<p>[Chemong Area] holds opportunity for intensification along Chemong Road. This future intensification can be complimented by a mix of land uses in the interior of the block, including a mix of residential typologies and open spaces;</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>
5	<p>The future development of the [Chemong Area] will assist in reaching the population and employment targets as set out by the City of Peterborough Official Plan Draft (July 2021) and A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Office Consolidation, August 2020).</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>

Cassels (On Behalf of Brookfield)

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>We are aware that the City released its Land Needs Assessment report, dated June 2021. In Table 27 of the report, a summary of the development under construction, draft approved and under review is provided for Designated Greenfield Areas. It is not clear if Brookfield's application has been included as a project under review.</p>	<p>Applications that have been deemed complete are considered in the land needs assessment.</p>
2	<p>In context of the City's draft policy direction on Rural Transitional Areas, the location of these lands is appropriate for development and development would not be constrained by physical features. For these reasons, these lands should not be redesignated as Rural Transition Area.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
3	<p>Further, we have concerns with the analysis in the Land Needs Assessment, including how the amount of <i>excess lands</i> in the City has been determined. With respect to residential or Community Area growth, the Land Needs Assessment assumes that the City will only grow to the minimum population forecast of 125,000 by 2051, whereas the Growth Plan directs that these forecasts are a minimum (Policy 5.2.4.2). Further, the Land Needs Assessment assumes that residential growth from 2021 to 2051 will be accommodated through 50% intensification in the delineated built-up area and 50% in designated greenfield areas. Our clients and its consultants have significant concerns with the reliance on current development trends to develop a future forecast as well as the blending of trends for development in the delineated built-up area and the Designated Greenfield Areas to justify an increase in apartment units for the future housing supply (despite referencing high demand for single-detached dwellings).</p>	<p>The land needs assessment has been completed in accordance with the minimum requirements of the Growth Plan and the identification of employment and community land needs meets the requirements of the Land Needs Assessment Methodology.</p>
4	<p>We request that the City revise the draft Official Plan to revise the <i>excess lands</i>.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>

Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>4.2 Neighbourhoods</p> <p>It is noted in the preamble to this designation that Neighbourhoods is focused on residential land uses, but also includes public service facilities, parks, institutional uses (emphasis added) and supportive local retail and service commercial uses. Neighbourhoods includes a number of land use designations, specifically Residential Designation. The majority of KPR schools are located within the Residential Designation. Further, KPR owns property (1555 Glenforest Boulevard) within this designation which is intended for a school to be built upon.</p>	<p>In Section 4.1.2(a), schools and institutional uses are listed as permitted uses, subject to criteria, in all designations except for the Natural Areas Designation.</p>
2	<p>4.2.2 Residential Designation</p> <p>According to Section 4.2.2 the Residential Designation is intended to accommodate a wide range of housing forms as well as other land uses that are integral to, and supportive of a residential environment (emphasis added).</p> <p>Permitted uses within this designation does not specifically identify institutional uses (i.e., secondary and elementary schools). This designation does</p>	<p>Please see response #1 of this Matrix.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>include neighbourhood supportive uses, which is defined as “uses which are complementary, serve the needs of local residents and support the development of a walkable and complete community and which do not create an adverse impact on the surrounding residential uses.” It is KPRs opinion that this does not include institutional uses (i.e., secondary and elementary schools).</p> <p>KPR respectfully requests that the City consider the addition of “secondary and elementary schools” as a permitted use within the Residential designation. This addition would be supported by Section 4.2.2 p. (referenced below).</p> <p>KPR also supports the notion of active transportation and transit while mitigating the adverse impacts on traffic and the surrounding transportation system (Section 4.2.2 c. iv.) Further, KPR supports the notion of schools being accessed via active transportation routes from all parts of the surrounding residential area (Section 4.2.2. p. vi.)</p>	

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
3	<p>Section 4.2.2 p. - Policies for Secondary and Elementary Schools KPR is pleased to see policies specific to secondary and elementary schools; and have no issues of concerns related to the specific policies. We have noted that there is no specific reference to secondary and elementary schools as a permitted use within the residential designation.</p>	<p>Please see response #1 of this Matrix.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
4	<p>Sections 4.4 Mixed-Use Corridors & 4.4.2 Major Mixed-Use Corridor Designation KPR has noted that Section 4.4.1 a) and b) references institutional uses as appropriate land uses within this designation. Mixed Use Corridors are further subdivided into Major Mixed-Use Corridor Designation and Minor Mixed-Use Corridor Designation.</p> <p>According to Schedule C, two (2) of KPRs schools, Adam Scott Collegiate Vocation Institute and Adam Scott Intermediate School, are situated within this designation.</p> <p>According to Section 4.4.2 b) permitted uses do not include secondary or elementary schools. This is of concern to KPR as the existing school uses have not been recognized. We respectfully request that the City consider the addition of “existing secondary and elementary schools” as a permitted use, noting that, “where permitted, secondary and elementary schools shall be in conformity with the respective policies of the Residential Designation of this Plan.”</p>	Please see response #1 of this Matrix.
5	4.3 The Central Area & 4.3.2 Downtown Core Area Designation KPR notes that within the Central Area, new development which accommodates a mix of	Please see response #1 of this Matrix.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>uses, including a range of housing types, institutional (emphasis added), community and service commercial uses, to support the development of a complete community easily accessible to the surrounding communities by a range of transportation modes is encouraged. KPR would interpret institutional uses to include secondary and elementary schools.</p> <p>The Central Area is further divided into several designations including the Downtown Core Area Designation.</p> <p>According to Schedule C, one (1) of our schools, Kaawaate East City Public School, and the Peterborough Alternative Education Centre are both situated within this designation.</p> <p>Permitted uses with the Downtown Core Area do not include secondary and elementary schools. This is of concern to KPR as the existing school use has not been recognized. We respectfully request that the City consider the addition of “existing secondary and elementary schools including alternative education centres” as a permitted use, noting that, “where permitted, secondary and elementary schools shall be in conformity with the respective policies of the Residential Designation of this Plan.”</p>	

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
6	<p>4.7 The Rural Transitional Area Designation. According to Schedules A & B, one (1) of our schools, James Strath Public School, is situated within this designation. Permitted uses with the Rural Transitional Area Designation do not include secondary and elementary schools. This is of concern to KPR as the existing school use has not been recognized. KPR would respectfully request that the City consider the addition of "existing secondary and elementary schools" as a permitted use, noting that, "where permitted, secondary and elementary schools shall be in conformity with the respective policies of the Residential Designation of this Plan."</p>	<p>Please see response #1 of this Matrix.</p>
7	<p>Lily Lake Secondary Plan. KPR has optioned a site within the Lily Lake planning area which appears to be designated residential. As noted on page one of this letter - secondary and elementary schools should be permitted within this designation.</p>	<p>Please see response #1 of this Matrix.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
8	<p>Specific Land Use Designation. Can the City please confirm the designation Kawartha Heights Public School (11 Kawartha Heights Blvd.) as it appears it may be situated with in the Minor Mixed-Use Designation. KRP would respectfully request it be situated with in the Residential designation. KPR thanks you for considering our comments.</p>	<p>The Kawartha Heights Public School Lands are situated in the Major Mixed Use Designation. As per response #1, Schools are permitted in all designations except for Natural Heritage System Designation.</p>

Peterborough Bicycle Advisory Committee

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>When reading the vision statement, one obtains the impression it could reflect the aspirations of any city in Ontario. It is not place-based, nor does it reflect those attributes, challenges, and qualities that are specific to Peterborough. For example, attributes that bless our city—the presence of rivers and canals and dramatic views (thanks to the drumlin topography of our “City of Seven Hills”) are nowhere to be seen in the vision. How do we celebrate and conserve these features that individually and collectively define no other city? The Vision should embrace them. The vision should also build on those trends, opportunities, and challenges that we recommend be identified in a more rigorous Context section.</p>	<p>No change recommended - The vision speaks to all residents and visitors. The approach here is to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document. The vision statement speaks to the City as “distinctive in its natural beauty.”</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
2	<p>The draft plan features many policies conditioned (and made conditional) with such wording as “may,” “should,” and “consider.” Most glaring in this regard is the climate change section, where three of four policy areas contain no commitment to the actions listed. We find this approach to be seriously lacking, and particularly so for a crisis of such urgency as climate change—one for which the City declared a climate emergency in November 2019. This urgency has only accelerated with the recent IPCC report. We provide more detailed suggestions to correct these deficiencies in the points below.</p>	<p>The specific language used throughout the policies of the Official Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing the Plan.</p>
3	<p>We support the provision of active transportation to schools (p vii, pg. 51 top), and recommend this commitment to active transportation extend to post-secondary institutions as well.</p>	<p>Policy 4.2.3.(e)(iv) speaks to providing access to public transportation and/or active transportation routes when evaluating applications for post-secondary institutions.</p>
4	<p>We would like to see more robust policies concerning bicycle parking in key areas, such as the downtown, major cultural hubs, institutions, large employers, and destination shopping areas. Some facilities (such as shopping centres, big box stores, mixed-use corridors, and grocery stores) should accommodate cargo bikes and trailers to encourage the transport of goods by active transportation.</p>	<p>Policy 6.2.7 speaks to provision of adequate bicycle parking for all permitted uses. Policy 6.2.2 (i) (General Policies) speak to provision of short-term bicycle parking for new development to accommodate the emerging online retail and transportation trends.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
5	For example, "adequate parking" as highlighted in policy j) for Major Mixed-Use Corridors (pg. 90) should apply equally to bicycle parking as it does to automobile parking and should be made explicit in the policy. The same applies to policy h) on pg. 94 under Minor Mixed-Use Corridors, and for policy i) (pg. 97) under Employment Districts.	Please see response #4.
6	Key employment nodes as represented by large business and institutional centres should be required to provide change-room facilities for active transportation commuters	Standards for building interiors are outside the scope of the Official Plan; however, the Official Plan would not preclude this type of initiative.
7	Under policy d, v) (pg. 96) under Employment Districts, we recommend a requirement for adequate bike parking and change rooms for larger businesses.	Please see responses #4 & #6.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
8	<p>The lack of any policy requiring active transportation access in the Prestige Employment District is mystifying; it applies in all other employment areas. This omission is more perplexing given the fact policy i) (pg. 101) requires transit access. As many knowledge workers value active transportation, we urge the City to include requirement for active transportation, adequate bicycle parking, and change room facilities in Prestige Employment District policies. We expect such a policy would be viewed favourably by prestige businesses to attract high quality employees.</p>	<p>Please see response #4.</p>
9	<p>One policy addition P-BAC suggests in relation to “sliver parks” is the removal of small righthand ramp lanes to create such parks—as was undertaken at the Armour and Queen intersections with Hunter St. on either side of the Hunter Street Bridge. We see an opportunity at, for example, the intersection of Queen and Simcoe streets. Other opportunities may exist.</p>	<p>The draft Plan was developed to be consistent with the Municipal Parks and Open Space Study from February 2020, notably the park hierarchy, and planning and design standards. The determination of need and location for more parks and outdoor recreation facilities will be established through the recommendations of the Parks Development Standards/Strategic Plan for Recreation, Parks, Arenas and Culture.</p>
10	<p>In Section 5.7, Climate Change (pg. 165), we are perplexed by the lack of any reference to the City's November 2019 declaration of a climate emergency. We strongly believe this declaration should be a major driver of official plan policy. We</p>	<p>Section 1.1 (Context) has been revised to acknowledge the declaration of a climate emergency.</p> <p>Targets are set out by more specific policies such as Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP). Targets set out by</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>elaborate below as active transportation provides a low-cost, effective way to help make the transition to a low-carbon economy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The preamble speaks of having to “consider” climate impact; this is much too weak a statement. It is imperative that we do so. 2. The climate plans referenced date from 2012 and 2015. Given the rapidity of change in the climate—one emphasized in the recent IPCC report—we urge a policy mandating an update or overhaul of existing climate change plans to help adapt to and mitigate the accelerating deterioration of stable climate conditions. 3. Policy b) states the City “should consider” a number of measures; policy c) is not a policy and does nothing to commit the City to undertaking the actions that follow; and policy e) states the City “may consider” several actions. The result? Three of the four climate policies may never be implemented. Given the gravity of the climate crisis, the City should commit to the actions described under these policies. 	<p>CCAP are subject to change with ongoing climate change science and are instead expressed through a framework of policies set out in Climate Change (Section 5.7) as well as collective policies throughout the Plan to achieve intensification, transit-supported development, and protection of existing Natural Heritage System & Source Water Protection.</p> <p>The specific language used throughout the policies of the Official Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing the Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
11	We note that Section 6.2, Transportation, makes no reference to the Transportation Master Plan or the Cycling Master Plan. Both should be referenced as the guiding documents for official plan policy in this area	Disagree with this comment – the Transportation Master Plan and Cycling Master Plan are referenced in the document. However, additional references to the Cycling Master Plan has been added.
12	We consider the list of factors driving multi-modal transportation listed under Objective d ii (Pg. 188) incomplete. We recommend the following factors be added: climate change, air quality, physical and mental health, and social and economic equity.	The approach has been to avoid additional explanatory text for a more concise document. However, Section 6.2.1 (iv) speaks to having regard to the quality of life for all residents and visitors with respect to providing multi-modal transportation.
13	To objective iii, we recommend adding “intermodal” to “balanced.” Connections between modes will be a key ingredient in both encouraging and facilitating a reduction in automobile use.	No changes recommended. There is language throughout the document which speaks to connectivity (e.g., Section 6.2.2 “The City’s transportation system will be planned to: Provide connectivity among transportation modes for moving people and goods”.
14	Policy 6.2.2.a.i (pg. 189) describing the attributes of the city’s transportation system should add the following: socially and economically equitable; and serve all ages and abilities.	No changes recommended. Current policy language achieves recommended intent.
15	Policy iii [6.2.2.a]. This section should replace “between” with “among.”	No changes recommended. Current policy language achieves recommended intent.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
16	We appreciate the direction of the active transportation policy section (pg. 192). We recommend the system not only be balanced as described under policy b), but that it be integrated as well.	See response to #13.
17	<p>The Municipal Active Transportation Plan described on pg. 193 should reference the Cycling Master Plan as a key building block.</p> <p>Policy vi should require change room facilities in larger buildings.</p>	<p>The City's Cycling Master Plan is already underway. The policy speaks to creating a Municipal Active Transportation Plan.</p> <p>In regard to sub-policy vi, this is generally outside the scope of the Official Plan; however, the Official Plan would not preclude this type of initiative.</p>
18	The active street tree program referenced under policy l) (pg. 194) is not very "active" given the conditional "should" stated in the policy. The policy should commit the City to undertake the plan; consider relocating this policy to the Climate Change section.	The specific language used throughout the policies of the Official Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing the Plan.
19	The Cycling Infrastructure section (pg. 196) should reference the Cycling Master Plan as its foundation.	Additional references to the Cycling Master Plan have been made to the Cycling Infrastructure section.
20	Policy r.ii should add the Cycling Master Plan to the Transportation Master Plan already referenced.	Reference to the Cycling Master Plan has been added.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
21	Likewise, policy s) (pg. 197) referencing design guidelines for cycling infrastructure should also reference the Cycling Master Plan.	No changes recommended.
22	<p>P-BAC is pleased to see the commitment to the “Complete Streets” concept. We have some suggestions to strengthen the implementation of this concept:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy c) should reference the Cycling Master Plan in addition to the Transportation Master Plan. 2. Policy d) should not “balance” the needs of different road users, but “integrate” these needs into the design and operation of complete streets. 3. P-BAC strongly supports the commitment of policy e) to embed Complete Streets design into all rebuilt and new arterial, collector, and local roads. We further suggest that the Complete Streets approach incorporate context-sensitive design that accounts for, respects, and seeks to improve the public realm environment next to abutting land uses. 4. We are pleased to see reference to “travelers of all ages and abilities” in policy e (pg. 198) but believe there should be a stronger commitment than “consider.” We 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see response #17. 2. Please see response #13. 3. The plan states that the road network serving the Peterborough community will be developed under the principle of complete streets, with appropriate facilities which balance the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists. 4. Please see response #12.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>suggest wording along the lines of “accommodate the needs of travelers of all ages and abilities wherever possible.” We also suggest convenience and safety be incorporated as factors underlining this policy.</p>	

Peterborough Greenspace Coalition & Friends of Jackson Park

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>Specifically, Peterborough Greenspace Coalition and Friends of Jackson Park ask that the Official Plan include the below statement in the <i>Interpretation Section 8.1 paragraph (a)</i> of the Official Plan: "Nothing in this Plan authorizes the extension of the Parkway."</p>	<p>The need for a new roads will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan and changes will be made accordingly to the Official Plan. It is not the intent of the Official Plan policies to preconceive the outcomes of the Transportation Master Plan and/or Environmental Assessment process.</p>

Reimagine Peterborough

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>We were expecting a more comprehensive public engagement at this stage with an opportunity to have community input considered, including on new policies. We note that Council approved the “engage” level of consultation and, while documents seemed largely ready in May, this draft OP was released in the heart of the summer while Council and so many of us were on vacation and preparing for the fall. The City’s website invites feedback and “conversation” from the public, yet it indicates no timeline for doing so and informally is characterized simply as “information”. There are new or significantly altered pieces in the Plan which have not had any previous public review (including deletion of most Secondary Plans), and there are new Natural Heritage Study and Land Needs Assessment documents with extensive detail and background. In light of the substantial amount of information released at the end of July, Reimagine sought review by various local leaders and organizations. We have integrated their input with our analysis in this preliminary submission, possibly to be supplemented later.</p>	<p>The City hosted four online community information sessions on September 1 and 2, 2021. The City is also hosting another public open house on October 21, 2021.</p> <p>Comments can be sent to the Planning Division up to and including the date of the statutory public meeting on November 1, 2021. Any person may make written or verbal representation to Council either in support of or in opposition to new Official Plan as part of the statutory public meeting prior to a final decision being made.</p>



What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
2	<p>There are many positive aspects to this July 2021 Plan. Although more than 300 pages, the Plan presents an improved style and format. The Plan incorporates greater recognition and emphasis on the important relationship with Indigenous peoples, a deliberate pivot to plan in a more compact manner with the intent of achieving complete communities and complete streets, identifies mixed-used corridors for strategic growth, supports infill and mixed uses, and expansion to two additional residential units. Additionally, the Plan values local food production, the urban forest, and promotes green building and infrastructure and urban design guidelines. Especially positive and cost-effective for taxpayers is avoiding a boundary expansion, rooted in clear evidence and despite likely myriad pressures on the City to do so.</p>	<p>This is noted.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
3	<p>Despite these positive aspects, there are significant -- and in some cases bewildering -- missed opportunities to deliver the Plan the Peterborough community wants, needs, and deserves. The Plan puts significant focus on growth and economic factors and is mostly built around the provincial growth targets, while the social, environmental, and arts policy areas are left largely to be "considered" rather than supported with clear, unqualified standards, targets, and commitments. As a result, this is a Plan that in much of its tone and content falls short of the Plan's Vision Statement, principles and the public's values and input. Thus this is a Plan that may continue the same style, approach, and outcomes of planning experienced during the past few decades in Peterborough: a clear and well-understood path for carbon-heavy growth and infrastructure expansion contrasted with only broad and generally optional paths for achieving a low-carbon, sustainable, equitable and more desirable community. Similarly, the Plan continues the approach of acknowledging that the arts and culture economy is important to Peterborough's unique identity, yet it remains under-supported in this policy.</p>	<p>The Plan aims to achieve various goals through balanced policies between intensification, economic growth, preservation of natural heritage and other social objectives.</p> <p>Every sentence in the draft Official Plan has been reviewed in terms of the strength of the language. Municipalities are given authority in provincial legislation to compel on certain policy statements, but not all statements. It has been the approach of this draft Plan to use the strongest language where it has the authority to do so, and to soften the language (e.g., consider/encourage/may) where no full authority is provided to require or impose an outcome.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
4	<p>The Plan's Vision Statement is sensible and reflects considerable community input. As recommended by Reimagine in our 2016 and 2019 submissions, the Plan needs to provide a stronger upfront context to convey the present-day lens through which the Official Plan's principles and policies were developed. For example, the context could note some of the societal shifts occurring in response to the changes wrought by COVID, including a greater recognition that planning and equitable access to high quality greenspaces are inherently linked to mental and physical health.</p>	<p>The vision statement was revised to elevate the profile of climate change. The vision was developed based on the input received through the public consultation activities, particularly the online surveys. Other sections of the Plan provide the intent to the policies of the Plan in further detail.</p> <p>The City will develop a network of active and passive open space and recreation facilities to prevent a deficiency in park area and provide adequate opportunities for residents of the City (Section 5.3). Further, the Official Plan establishes five categories of parks including Urban Park Spaces, which was developed to respond to the shift towards intensification in the downtown and corridors.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
5	<p>The Plan is lacking the foundational data, analysis, and assumptions that inform its directions and justify the content, aside from the need to meet Provincial policy standards. Similarly, implementation of the Plan should include a publicly accessible plan evaluation model and process, one that is based on a solid foundation of meaningful and informative indicators. Without this key information, the Plan misses the opportunity to strongly encourage planning visions and approaches that could surpass the minimal provincial requirements and instead strive to meet more progressive, sustainable, and even aspirational targets. For example, greenfield intensification targets of higher than 60% to reduce taxpayers' long-term fiscal burdens, as recommended by Reimagine in 2019. Such directions have been called for by the Ontario Professional Planners Institute, Peterborough Public Health, Trent University researchers and other local voices, among others, for many years.</p>	<p>The data and analysis of the Land Need Assessment has been completed in accordance with the Province's requirements. Intensification targets established by the Growth Plan and set out in the Official Plan are minimum targets and may be surpassed over the horizon of this plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
6	<p>Planning to address Equity, Poverty, and Inclusion: The Plan does not adequately reflect the dire state of affordable housing in Peterborough and the associated consequences for a significant portion of residents. We are in a prolonged poverty, addiction, and housing crisis. The 2016 Census for Peterborough CMA indicates that 70% of residents have an annual income of less than \$50,000, the United Way Peterborough reports that 20% of children under the age of 6 live in poverty and that there are some 1,700 applicants on the social housing waiting list. Given these and other pronounced equity and poverty challenges in Peterborough, the Plan must strengthen targets, mechanisms, and requirements to achieve a greater number of diverse, accessible, and more affordable housing units, including for the lowest income earners and by private developers.</p>	<p>Section 5.2.2 (Housing Supply) speaks to the City permitting and facilitating all forms of housing to meet the needs of current and future residents, including affordable, assisted and special needs housing. Specific programs and housing needs may be established through the Housing and Homelessness Plan.</p> <p>Prior to Bill 108, the province provided a tool in a form of inclusionary zoning that would have allowed us to mandate the type of housing. However, with the latest revisions to the Planning Act, encourage/consider is the strongest language at our disposal today. In addition to the policies around affordable housing, we also have policies for allowing up to two additional residential units (i.e., secondary suites) to help mitigate affordable housing.</p>
7	<p>Planning for the Climate Crisis: In the wake of mounting evidence and now the IPCC's "Code Red for Humanity" report, it is extremely disappointing that the Plan fails to highlight and put significant priority on taking action to address the climate emergency. In planning to 2051, the Plan should set low-carbon and sustainability targets for development, infrastructure, and transportation projects. Targets</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the Sections for the Context, Vision and Guiding Principles of the Plan to elevate the profile of climate change.</p> <p>Targets set out by more specific policies such as Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP). These targets are subject to change with ongoing climate change science and are instead expressed through a framework of policies set out in Climate Change (Section 5.7) as well as collective</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>could start at a moderate level and increase according to a schedule. For example, there is the City of Toronto's Green Standard that sets out four tiered levels of sustainable design requirements to address/implement Toronto's stated environmental priorities. The wide range of impacts from extreme weather and the urgent need for our community to mitigate and adapt will increasingly be the single most important factor in planning and local decision-making. This worrisome and accelerating crisis will affect every aspect of life and the economy in Peterborough and, by extension, every policy in the Official Plan. Many of our city's youth -- for whom we are planning these next decades -- are daunted by the climate prospects. Despite this, and following years of statements by the City with regard to climate action, the Climate Change section of the Plan makes no mention of Council's 2019 declaration of the climate change emergency and presents only non-policy "shoulds," "mays," "considers" and other nebulous language so as to perpetuate the present incremental course, rather than the bold actions needed.</p>	<p>policies throughout the Plan to achieve intensification, transit-supported development, and protection of existing Natural Heritage System & Source Water Protection.</p> <p>Every sentence in the draft Official Plan has been reviewed in terms of the strength of the language. Municipalities are given authority in provincial legislation to compel on certain policy statements, but not all statements. It has been the approach of this draft Plan to use the strongest language where it has the authority to do so, and to soften the language (e.g., consider/encourage/may) where no full authority is provided.</p>
8	<p>Add Further Context: add the following paragraphs or similar to commentary in 1.1 Context in order to identify the significance, urgency and rationale on</p>	<p>Text has been added to the Context section to outline future challenges and acknowledge the climate emergency declaration. However, it is noted that the general approach</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>the ongoing climate, addiction and housing crises for subsequent policies: The City has experienced hotter, more extreme weather, extensive and costly flooding in 2002 and 2004, impacts to local biodiversity including invasive species, and Council declared a Climate Emergency in 2019. Staged international targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions have been set alongside evidence-based warnings that, both globally and locally, we must urgently implement climate mitigation and adaptation measures to avoid drastic and costly changes affecting our very future. Land use planning is central to a community's climate mitigation and adaptation strategy.</p> <p>As Peterborough increasingly finds itself in the orbit of the Greater Toronto Area and sees associated rising real estate and rental costs, our local planning must ensure the needs of our most vulnerable residents are given even greater priority. Too many residents, including children, remain under-housed or homeless, experience food insecurity, and live in poverty. Given these challenges, planning for our City's growth, development, and prosperity must also carefully consider and address the need to achieve accessible and affordable housing for all residents.</p>	<p>has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text for a more concise document.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
	<p>The COVID-19 crisis that began in 2020 firmly demonstrated the need to protect sufficient and high quality natural heritage and greenspace within the city's built-up area and that this is critical for the mental and physical health of all residents. This is especially true for our children and youth who are growing up in a time of rapid change and anxiety, including from the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, technology and social media, and the climate and biodiversity crises.</p> <p>Peterborough, as with many municipalities in Ontario and across North America, is experiencing an epidemic of fatal overdoses due to a poisoned illicit drug supply. This Plan can take steps to address this crisis by prioritizing the creation and retention of accessible spaces for the provision of harm reduction and treatment services for drug users and accommodating harm reduction infrastructure (e.g. needle disposal units) within municipal facilities and open spaces.</p>	

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
9	<p>Enhance Affordable Housing: Strengthen and apply affordable and accessible housing approaches in creative ways, in part by being more direct:</p> <p>Strengthen discretionary language from “Encourage” to “Require” in policy 5.2.4.e. (iv) to read: “Require the inclusion of affordable and accessible housing units within subdivisions and other developments.”</p> <p>Strengthen discretionary language from “Encourage” to “Require” in policy 5.2.4.e. (v) to read: “Require the renovation and rehabilitation of residential uses above commercial use in and around the Central Area and intensification corridors”.</p>	<p>The specific language used throughout the policies of the Official Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing the Plan.</p> <p>Words like ‘encourage’ and ‘consider’ are used in instances where the City does not have the authority to require or impose an outcome, although said outcome is desired.</p>
10	<p>Add policy to 4.6, 5.3 and/or 7.21.2 j/k to require advisory committee and public review and input on environmental impact studies and development and infrastructure proposals that affect the Natural Heritage System, important natural features and functions, open space and parkland</p>	<p>The establishment of a committee of Council is outside the scope of the Official Plan. The draft Official Plan does, however, include policies for consultation with Indigenous communities and community engagement. One of the objectives to community engagement described in the Plan is to provide equitable opportunity for a wide demographic to be informed and involved on planning matters, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 (Public Consultation and Community Engagement).</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
11	<p>Revise the repeated phrase “in the Natural Heritage System ...” by adding to it “and other natural features and functions” in order to ensure that such features and functions identified outside the NHS are also duly considered and conserved, as in policy 5.3.2e (for example, revise policies 3.2 d, 3.3.2 a, 4.1.2 e, 4.2.2 c, 4.2.4 i,l, 4.3.1 b, 4.4.1 f, 4.4.3 g, and 4.5 m).</p>	<p>No changes recommended. Current policy captures the recommended intent of preservation of natural features and functions.</p>
12	<p>Include, strengthen and unqualify environmental criteria and review considerations in order to better and consistently achieve Objective 2.2.2 for Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability; do so by inserting brief “environment” references in, among others, the following policies: 2.2.2, 3.2 d, 3.3.2 a,d, 3.3.3 a,f, 4.1.2 e, 4.1.3 c,l, 4.2.3 d, 4.2.4 f,k, 4.3.1 b,c, 4.3.2 c, 4.3.3 c,f, 4.4.1 d, 4.4.3 g, 4.5 d, 4.5.3 e, 5.1.1 d, and 5.3.3 a.</p>	<p>Generally, throughout the editing process, effort has been made to consolidate repeating policies and avoiding lists and adding additional explanatory text to reduce the length of the document.</p>
13	<p>Add an objective in policy 3.3.2 to recognize a fuller concept of qualitative and sustainable growth, to read: “Besides quantitative growth, this Plan will also support qualitative growth, such as in quality of life, equity, relationships, health, sustainability, resilience, and more efficient, less consumptive patterns.”</p>	<p>These qualitative objectives are already captured throughout the Plan. Generally, throughout the editing process, effort has been made to consolidate repeating policies and avoiding adding additional explanatory text to reduce length.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
14	Strengthen the commitment to climate crisis action in policy 5.7 by indicating priority and applying a directive/imperative choice of words to each paragraph, or separate out those few that remain to be "considered".	Please see response #7.
15	Add a new subsection(s) to Cultural Heritage policy 5.1 to bring forward a community development policy for the arts sector.	The Cultural Heritage section is not an appropriate location to include mention of the "arts". Cultural heritage and arts are not necessarily always aligned and cultural heritage is specifically addressed under the Ontario Heritage Act, which is the basis for most of this section.
16	Add policy in 5.4 to ensure application of the updated and additional guidelines in the near future in key areas: Urban design guidelines will be completed for different areas of the city in advance of development, particularly for mixed-use corridors, strategic growth areas, the Central Area, and larger subdivisions.	No change recommended. Current policy captures the consideration for the development of Urban Design Guidelines for the aforementioned areas.
17	Include in 6.2.1 Introduction and Objectives language that prioritizes travel mode shift, safe transportation systems, reduced capital costs, and meeting climate change mitigation targets.	This language is already captured in the draft Plan. Generally, throughout the editing process, effort has been made to consolidate repeating policies and avoiding adding additional explanatory text to reduce length.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
18	Replace the frequently used term "energy efficient" with "reduced carbon emissions".	No changes recommended - Both are referenced throughout the document.
19	Instead of the term "balanced transportation system," indicate clear priorities by mode, i.e. walking, cycling, transit, then automobiles.	No change recommended. Current policy captures the recommendation to enhance the active modes of transportation.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
20	<p>Add the following policy [to Section 7.2]: Early, timely, transparent, and effective public engagement is fundamental to sound planning and democracy for our entire community and will be sought at every reasonable opportunity, whether or not required by law or policy. The City's practice of public consultation and engagement will effectively embody the core values set out by the International Association for Public Participation and related principles, including that: those affected by a decision will be involved in the decision-making process, the process will seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in the decision, the needs and interests of participants are recognized, input will be sought from participants in designing how they will participate, participants are provided with timely and needed information in a form to participate in a meaningful way, the public's contribution will influence the decision, and the process communicates how participants' input has affected the decision.</p>	<p>No changes recommended. Cross referencing has been minimized in preparation of this Plan; however, the Plan sets out a framework that enables for a wide public participation. One of the objectives to community engagement described in the Plan is to provide equitable opportunity for a wide demographic to be informed and involved on planning matters, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 (Public Consultation and Community Engagement).</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
21	<p>Revise/add to policy 7.3.3 the following to track progress and adjust planning over time to achieve results:</p> <p>Maintain a public list of objectives and targets in the Official Plan and how they will be measured; require establishment of baseline data by the end of 2022; require timely public reporting of the monitoring data on a 2-5 year basis; require timely public reporting of analysis of the results, including policy and other responses that may be considered for enhanced implementation.</p>	<p>No changes recommended. Section 7.3.3 (Monitoring) commits to monitoring and measuring performance. That section speaks to monitoring to determine if the implementation of the policies fulfills the overall Vision, Guiding Principles and Objectives of this Plan. Sustainability is already captured through the vision and guiding principles.</p>

Spears + Associates (On behalf of BentalGreenOak)

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	I don't see a Large Format Food Store (5,000 m2) as a permitted use in the draft July 2021 OP policies for a Major Mixed-Use Corridor - why was this not permitted?	The intention is that a large format food store is considered a "Retail use" and identified as a permitted use in the Major Mixed Use Corridor which is where this property would fall. Section 4.1.4 indicates that large format food stores are directed to 'Strategic Growth Areas' (Schedule A – Urban Structure) which includes the Major Mixed Use Corridors (Schedule B Land Use Plan). Planning Staff will review your request for clarity and consider the appropriateness of identifying both Small Scale Food Store and Large Scale Food Stores within any applicable designations, subject to the policies of Section 4.1.4.
2	Would an existing food store be permitted to expand just slightly under the cap as a Retail Commercial use?	Under the current OP – the property is located within the Special Purpose Retail Designation and despite the prohibition of Supermarkets within this Designation, the existing store is recognized and capped in size via Zoning since it existed at the time of the adoption of the Special Purpose Retail policies via the City's Comprehensive Policy Review in 2001. The introduction of a new Supermarket under the current policies is directed towards 'Major Shopping Centres' or the 'Central Area'. The enlargement of the supermarket space would trigger an amendment to the current OP as well as the Zoning By-law.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

		<p>The proposed Draft OP directs Large Scale Food Stores to Strategic Growth Areas and includes language around requirements in Section 4.1.4 (i.e. justification that the proposed food store floor space is appropriate within the sub-area based on population) to ensure that new large food stores fall within the parameters outlined in the Draft OP for food store distribution. In the case of the proposed expansion of the existing food store on the subject property, the locational criteria is met (located within a Strategic Growth Area and designated Major Mixed-Use Corridor) and an amendment to the OP would not be required. The Zoning would need to be looked at either by MV or ZBLA to appropriately address the proposed expansion and increase the cap. The proposed Major Mixed-Use Corridor Designation policies support the expansion of the existing food store within the Strategic Growth Area in accordance with the Development policies outlined in Section 4.4.2 of the Draft Official Plan. The proposed definition of a Large-scale food store includes any food store with a GFA greater than 1500m². Major Retail Facilities with a GFA of greater than 5000m² are also contemplated within the Major Mixed-Use Corridors Designation. As such, the proposed total GFA of 4729m² would be considered appropriate.</p>
3	<p>I read the comments below to be inconsistent with my understanding of the current OP - they would not be able to obtain a minor variance or rezoning as the current OP does not permit a Supermarket or food store expansion.</p>	<p>It should be clarified that an application for an expansion under the current framework would have to be consistent with the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan and since the proposed addition did not exist in 2001 when the Special Purpose Retail Designation was assigned, an expansion to the existing food store would trigger an</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

		<p>amendment to the current Official Plan in addition to a Zoning By-law Amendment.</p> <p>In general, there is more leniency with the new OP with respect to the proposed food store expansion in particular and its location within the land use framework, subject to the policies for Development.</p>
--	--	--

Trent University

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	<p>Recommendation to modify Policy 4.2.3.d: <i>d. Permitted uses on lands within the Major Institutional Designation, as identified on Schedule B: Land Use Plan, may include the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Research and development facilities; ii. <i>Manufacturing and employment uses that are related to a research and development facility or are compatible with the intent of this Designation;</i> iii. Places of worship; and, iv. <i>Complementary uses, such as residential, convenience retail, restaurants small-scale office, day care facilities, service commercial, financial and personal service, hotel, motel and other hospitality services, and recreational and cultural facilities uses may also be permitted provided those uses primarily serve the needs of those persons associated with a major institution and its associated facilities.</i> 	<p>The list of permitted uses in the Major Institutional Designation has been revised to better reflect uses permitted under the current Official Plan by including food service and other hospitality services as well as recreation and cultural facilities associated with a major institution</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
2	<p>Playing fields (Parcel 4B) – these lands, located east of University and Nassau Mills Road and south of Pioneer Road, where there are current playing fields, are identified as Campus Core in the TLNAP. In particular, the lands are identified for Indigenous Spaces and Placemaking including a potential traditional lodge. It is the opinion of the University that the language of the Open Space designation is not sufficiently permissive as it relates to structures to facilitate this vision.</p>	<p>The Major Open Space Designation and Major Institutional Designation has been revised for the subject lands.</p>
3	<p>Experimental Farm (Parcel 4B) – Located on the south side of Pioneer Road and west of Douro Ninth Line, these lands have been identified in the TLNAP as the new location of the Trent Experimental Farm which is currently located north of Pioneer Road within the MTO Provincial Highway Reserve. Due to the increased interest in the Sustainable Agriculture program at Trent and the proximity to the newly installed servicing along Pioneer Road, the lands directly south are particularly well suited for not just accessory buildings but also classroom and laboratory space. The permitted uses of the Major Open Space designation would hinder the growth and evolution of this educational direction.</p>	<p>The experimental farm lands have been revised from Major Open Space to Major Institutional, which permits a wider range of uses that are complementary and associated with a major institution.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
4	<p>East Bank Peninsula Lands (Parcel 1B) – these lands, located on the east bank of the Otonabee River and north of Nassau Mills Road are identified as Future University Lands in the TLNAP, indicating the University's desire to direct future growth to this location given its walkability to existing university facilities and proximity to servicing. Detailed environmental studies on the parcel indicate that the Natural Heritage System (NHS) on the property are smaller than portrayed on Schedules "B" and "F" of the Draft Official Plan.</p>	<p>The Plan states that minor adjustments to the boundary of the Natural Areas Designation in accordance with the Level classification may be facilitated through an Environmental Impact Study without the need to amend the Plan. Where a minor adjustment to the boundary of the Natural Areas Designation is approved by the City, in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction, the adjacent land use designation as identified on Schedule B: Land Use Plan shall apply, without the need to amend this Plan.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
5	<p>While the schedules that were released in July 2021 updated draft of the Official Plan show the northern stretch of Armour Road as Major Mixed-Use Corridor, the most current schedule "B" on the City website now shows this stretch as Minor Mixed-Use Corridor. While Trent University acknowledges the flexibility indicated in the intent language of the Official Plan for the Mixed-Use Corridors, we have concerns regarding the limited uses permitted within the designation. The Minor Mixed-Use Corridor designation does not allow the retail and commercial uses, restaurants, hotels, motels and tourism facilities, and recreational and cultural facilities that are permitted in the Major Mixed-Use Corridors. Given the current absence of these uses in the North End of the City of Peterborough and the areas proximity to Cleantech Commons, Trent University requests that these uses either a) be added to the Minor Mixed-Use Corridor or b) the City restore the Major Mixed-Use Corridor designation to Armour Road. Trent University further requests that this designation be extended over the east bank peninsula lands and terminate at University Road.</p>	<p>The northern portion of Armour Rd, north of Nassau Mills Rd has been removed from the Minor Mixed-Use Corridor designation and designated as Major Institutional.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
6	<p>The intersection of Nassau Mills Road/University Road/Pioneer Road. The Rural Transitional Area shown in this location contains the existing operations yard and workshop for the University and may be relocated in the future. These lands are identified as Campus Core in the TLNAP and can be expected to in some fashion to continue Major Institutional uses in the future.</p> <p>The block of land northeast of Water Street, north of Woodland Street and West of the Otonabee River. The Official Plan identifies an existing open area and stormwater management facility as Rural Transitional Area.</p> <p>In both locations, the Rural Transitional Area appears to be the underlying designation to the Natural Heritage System (NHS), which means that should the NHS delineation be shown to be inaccurate, the lands would revert to the Rural Transitional Area designation. Trent University requests that no lands on the University's Symons Campus be designated Rural Transitional Area and instead be designated Major Institutional.</p>	<p>Comment is noted.</p>

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
7	Trent requests confirmation from City staff that the Protected Provincial Highway Corridor shown on Schedule "D" is conceptual in nature.	The Plan states the general location of Long Term Corridor Protection Areas is identified on Schedule D: Road Network Plan as opportunities for maximum, long-term route planning. Final alignments will be determined on the basis of corridor protection studies and Class Environmental Assessments.
8	Based on Schedule "A" and "B" the lands fronting on 3819 Water Street have an underlying Major Mixed-Use Corridor designation. Trent requests confirmation from City staff that this is correct.	3819 Water Street is a large parcel of land and has three types of designations: Major Mixed-Use Corridor, Major Institutional, and Natural Heritage System. Northern portion of the lands fronting on Water Street is identified as Major Mixed-Use corridor as per Schedule 'B'.

What We Heard: Written Submissions Post Draft OP Release

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
9	<p>Trent University requests that transitional policies be put in place to acknowledge current applications that have been deemed complete and could have reasonably expected to received approval in normal circumstances.</p>	<p>No changes recommended. Once the new Plan is in effect, any by-law passed by the City, such as a Zoning By-law, must conform with the Plan. Accordingly, should an application that has been deemed complete under the current Official Plan not receive a decision until after the new Official Plan is in effect, any decision on that application will need to conform with the new Plan unless Council deems it appropriate to consider an amendment to the new Plan within two years of it coming into effect. Conversely, should an application in progress receive a decision prior to the new Official Plan coming into effect, that decision will be made in accordance with the existing Official Plan. Should a property receive a decision under the current Plan that will conflict with the new Official Plan, the City will be obligated to update the Zoning By-law on that property within three years of the new Plan coming into effect.</p>