

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
5291 Bethesda Road Mathew Cory, Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (MGP)	November 28, 2022	Requesting site-specific policy exemption that recognizes and permits accessory open storage uses on subject property.	Continuation of existing uses will continue per Section 7.18 of the Draft Official Plan. A Special Provision is not required.
Bonnie Whaley, Resident	December 10, 2022	Greenbelt development	Development and the use of land is subject to the policies of the Greenbelt Plan and Chapter 4 of the Draft Official Plan.
Aiden Serjeant, Resident	December 13, 2022	Comments on the development along Cam Fella Blvd.	This is a site specific request that should be considered in the context of the development application and in consultation with the Town Staff overseeing the file. Current applications are subject to the policies in force the time the application was made. Refinements have been made to the Neighbourhood Area designation (S. 6.4.1) to promote compatible development with adjacent land uses.
Mark Carroll, Resident	December 14, 2022	Comments on the Oak Ridges Moraine, sustainability, environmental policies for the preservation of natural heritage, tree canopy, and green and other initiatives.	Refer to Chapter 3.
5291 Bethesda Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville Angela Fang, Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (MGP)	January 13, 2023	Requested a site-specific policy exemption that recognizes and permits accessory open storage uses on the subject property.	Continuation of existing uses will continue per Section 7.18 of the Draft Official Plan. A Special Provision is not required.
Nathan Robinson, Southlake Regional Health Centre	January 17, 2023	Comments on hospital infrastructure.	Section 3.4.2 implements policies related to access to community services, including health services.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
11659 McCowan Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville Al Ruggero, InfoPlan	January 18, 2023	Requesting consideration for appropriate land use designation for subject lands.	The subject land is currently designated as Agricultural with the New Urban Area Overlay. In addition, it is subject to Special Provision SP-RA9. New Urban Areas are subject to the preparation of a Secondary Plan as per the requirements of S. 2.5.
2811 Stouffville Road, Whitchurch-Stouffville Kayly Robbins, Weston Consulting	January 19, 2023	<p>We would like to express specific concerns and recommended modifications with regards to the following policies to provide additional flexibility and clarification that we believe are appropriate:</p> <p><u>4.1.7.6 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within 120 metres of the key natural heritage features and areas unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated through an Environmental Impact Study and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. The Environmental Impact Study shall identify a minimum vegetation protection zone in which development shall be prohibited.</u></p> <p>Unlike Policy 6.1.2.10 in the First Draft OP, <u>Policy 4.1.7.6 as outlined in the Second Draft OP does not contemplate development and site alteration within the 120 metres Area of Influence of both Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features within Settlement Areas, only the former is considered.</u> We request that Policy 4.1.7.6 be modified to include Key Hydrologic Features. This modification would result in a balanced mechanism to maximize developable area on a site-specific basis subject to the results of an Environmental Impact Study, which we believe constitutes good planning. To clarify, we are supportive of this policy’s intention to consider development within 120 metres of Key Natural Heritage Features and Areas, and are simply requesting the Town to extend this consideration to Key Hydrologic Features as well.</p> <p>For reasons similar to our recommended modifications to Policy 4.1.7.6 above, we suggest that that Policy 4.1.9.3 be modified to explicitly state that <u>development and site alteration within the 120 metres Area of Influence of hydrologic features, including streams, are permitted subject to the results of an Environmental Impact Study.</u> To provide an appropriate balance between development interests and natural heritage protection in this policy mechanism, we suggest the following additional wording (see bolded text):</p>	<p>Per Section 3.4.9 of the York Region Official Plan, an application for development and site alteration within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature or key hydrological feature shall be accompanied by an environmental impact study.</p> <p>Policy 4.1.7.6 of the Draft Official Plan has been updated to ensure conformity with the ROP (“...key natural heritage feature or key hydrological feature).</p> <p>Table 4 of the Draft Official which outlines the minimum areas of influence is consistent with the York Region Official Plan and provincial requirements. Therefore, the minimum areas of influence as outlined in Table 4 will remain.</p>

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>4.1.9.3 Prohibit development and site alteration in any wetland, permanent stream or intermittent stream, lake, including kettle lake, and their littoral zones, seepage area and springs, except as explicitly permitted by this Plan, and in accordance with all Provincial policy. <u>Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within 120 metres of the noted hydrologic features unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated through an Environmental Impact Study and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. The Environmental Impact Study shall identify a minimum vegetation protection zone in which development shall be prohibited.</u></p>	
<p>15781 Ninth Line</p> <p>Kayly Robbins, Weston Consulting</p>	<p>January 19, 2023</p>	<p>That said, we would like to express specific concerns and recommended modifications with regards to the following policies to provide additional flexibility and clarification that we believe are appropriate:</p> <p>4.1.7.6 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within 120 metres of the key natural heritage features and areas unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated through an Environmental Impact Study and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. The Environmental Impact Study shall identify a minimum vegetation protection zone in which development shall be prohibited.</p> <p>Unlike Policy 6.1.2.10 in the First Draft OP, Policy 4.1.7.6 as outlined in the Second Draft OP does not contemplate development and site alteration within the 120 metres Area of Influence of both Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features within Settlement Areas, only the former is considered. We request that Policy 4.1.7.6 be modified to include Key Hydrologic Features. This modification would result in a balanced mechanism to maximize developable area on a site-specific basis subject to the results of an Environmental Impact Study, which we believe constitutes good planning. To clarify, we are supportive of this policy's intention to consider development within 120 metres of Key Natural Heritage Features and Areas, and are simply requesting the Town to extend this consideration to Key Hydrologic Features as well</p> <p>For reasons similar to our recommended modifications to Policy 4.1.7.6 above, we suggest that that Policy 4.1.9.3 be modified to explicitly state that development and site alteration within the 120 metres Area of Influence of hydrologic features, including streams, are permitted subject to the results of an Environmental Impact Study. To provide an appropriate balance between</p>	<p>The Town's Official Plan policy 4.1.7.6 current says: Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within 120 metres of the key natural heritage features and areas unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated through an Environmental Impact Study and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.</p> <p>Per Section 3.4.9 of the York Region Official Plan, an application for development and site alteration within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature or key hydrological feature shall be accompanied by an environmental impact study.</p> <p>Policy 4.1.7.6 will be updated to ensure conformity with the ROP ("...key natural heritage feature or key hydrological feature).</p> <p>Table 4 of the Draft Official which outlines the minimum areas of influence is consistent with the York Region Official Plan and provincial requirements. Therefore, the minimum areas of influence as outlined in Table 4 will remain.</p>

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>development interests and natural heritage protection in this policy mechanism, we suggest the following additional wording (see bolded text):</p> <p>4.1.9.3 Prohibit development and site alteration in any wetland, permanent stream or intermittent stream, lake, including kettle lake, and their littoral zones, seepage area and springs, except as explicitly permitted by this Plan, and in accordance with all Provincial policy. Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within 120 metres of the noted hydrologic features unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated through an Environmental Impact Study and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions. The Environmental Impact Study shall identify a minimum vegetation protection zone in which development shall be prohibited.</p>	
		<p>We recommend that Policy 4.1.10.8 include a sub-policy (4.1.10.8.d.) stating that a woodland would not be defined as a Significant Woodland if it is located within a Settlement Area. As it is, it is unclear if Policy 4.1.10.8 is to be considered equally with 4.1.7.3 as outlined above, or if the former could supersede the latter. We believe that the intention of the Second Draft OP is to permit additional development flexibility for Settlement Area lands with on-site woodlands. As a result, we believe that adding 4.1.10.8.d. as outlined below would provide additional clarity and internal consistency with Policy 4.1.7.3:</p> <p>d. A woodland, or portions thereof, greater than 0.2 hectares which would be defined as Significant Woodland in accordance with the above criteria, is not considered significant if the woodland is within a Settlement Area.</p>	<p>Per the Town’s Natural Heritage Resource Study, inside settlement areas woodlands greater than 0.2 ha are identified as Woodlands rather than Significant Woodlands. This is because within the settlement areas development may still be permitted within woodlands under certain circumstances subject to an EIS. Outside settlement areas no development is permitted within significant woodlands or their minimum vegetated buffers.</p>
<p>268, 276, 284, 296, 316, 328, 340, 352, 364, 376 and 386 Cam Fella Blvd</p>	<p>January 20, 2023</p>	<p>As part of the proposed tree canopy policies, draft policy 3.2.6.5 requires no net loss of trees as a result of development. While our redevelopment plans do provide a net gain for the subject land, with more street trees proposed to be planted compared to existing trees removed, it is our opinion that the draft policy should be revised in case there is a development or redevelopment site where a net gain in trees is not feasible. As such, we respectfully request that Staff add to this policy wording to allow for compensation, such as cash in lieu or off-site plantings for development or redevelopment sites where net gain is not feasible or achievable on the site.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.6.5 has been revised to encourage no net loss or compensation off site.</p>
<p>Mark McConville, Frontdoor Developments</p>		<p>We also note that Policy 3.4.1.18, which relates to parkland acquisition, indicates a maximum alternative rate for acquisition of 1 hectare per 300 dwelling units. Based on Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, we understand that this has been decreased to 1 hectare per 600 dwelling units. As such, we respectfully request this draft policy be updated to reflect the alternative rate specified in Bill 23.</p>	<p>OP has been updated to implement Bill 23.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
<p>6431 Bethesda Side Road</p> <p>Don Given, Malone Given Parsons</p>	<p>January 20, 2023</p>	<p>The owners are supportive of the Town's efforts to include these lands as part of the Urban Boundary and urge Staff to plan for these lands in the new Official Plan. We request that new designations for the expansion lands be added to the Stouffville OP, including "Future Major Transit Station Area" for the expansion lands within 800 metres of the Old Elm GO Station and "Future Designated Greenfield Area" for the remaining expansion lands.</p> <p>As York Region has been deemed an "upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities" through Bill 23, they will likely not be the approval authority for the new Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan (the "Stouffville OP"). The Town should prepare their Official Plan in a manner that reflects this change, as they will soon be able to amend the Regional Official Plan to fit within the Stouffville OP. We request that new designations for the expansion lands be added to the Stouffville OP, including "Future Major Transit Station Area" for the expansion lands within 800 metres of the Old Elm GO Station and "Future Designated Greenfield Area" for the remaining expansion lands. These new designations could include a condition that they are subject to future secondary planning</p>	<p>Town staff concur that the Bethesda Lands are strategically important for future urban expansion. The Town has strongly supported these lands to be included as a 'New Community Area' within the York Region Official Plan, notwithstanding, the Provincial modifications to the York Region Official Plan, 2022, removed these lands from the New Community Area, furthermore, the Province also removed other lands that were identified for Future Urban Areas (beyond 2051) from the York Region Official Plan.</p> <p>While Town staff acknowledges that these lands are a logical area to provide higher density and more affordable housing, in staff's view it would be premature (and in non-conformity with the York Region Official Plan and Provincial Plans) to identify these lands for "Future Major Transit Station Area" and "Future Designated Greenfield Area", until such time as the Province were to amend the ORMCP Countryside Area designation, either through amendments to the ORMCP or through a future ERO decision.</p> <p>The Official Plan is being prepared based on the in force and effect policies, and it would be premature to consider this at this time.</p>
<p>15 Ringwood Drive</p> <p>Aston Shuen, Sterling Karamar Property Management</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>Concerns on neighbouring property – 5505 Main Street. Neighbouring property has expressed interest in redeveloping property into a gas station.</p>	<p>Property is designated as Western Approach – Mixed Use area and gas stations are prohibited.</p>
<p>Wyview Group, Plazacorp, Torca I Inc., Flato Development s Inc.</p> <p>Evan Sugden, Bousefields Inc.</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>General comments on inclusion of Bill 23. Specific policy comments on protected major transit station areas, gentle density, encumbered parkland & stormwater management, parkland dedication & cash-in-lieu, and site plan control.</p>	<p>The Draft Official Plan has been revised to include the in force and in-effect provisions related to Bill 23.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
<p>12762 Tenth Line – Ambria (Lincolnville) Limited ZBA20.013 & 19T(W)-20.007</p> <p>Paula Agostino, Ambria (Lincolnville) Limited</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>Comments on stormwater management, affordable housing, parkland, land use and density, and block plans.</p>	<p>The Draft Official Plan includes policies related to Stormwater Management (Section 2.11), Affordable Housing (Section 3.2), Parkland (Section 3.5), and Block Plans (Section 7.3.2). The Draft Official Plan has been revised to include the in force and in-effect provisions related to Bill 23.</p>
<p>Charlene Jones, Resident</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>Comments on Bill 23, Ballantrae Park sports dome, natural environment, Community of Ballantrae, ORMCP, and future development.</p>	<p>The Draft Official Plan has been revised to include in force and in-effect provisions related to Bill 23.</p>
<p>5426, 5452, and 5584 Lakeshore Road</p> <p>Randy Alcorn, Alcorn & Associates Limited</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>Comments related to OPA 136.</p>	<p>OPA 136 is pending mediation and the Official Plan will be updated upon settlement.</p>
<p>SmartCentre Lands</p> <p>David A. McKay, MHBC</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>There are minimum intensification densities assigned to the Designated Greenfield Area in the Growth Management section. However, given that the Regional Retail Area is a Strategic Growth Area on Schedule A, should it not have specific (and higher) minimum density targets?</p> <p>We had noted previously that phasing and tying population growth to the establishment of new retail centres should be included in the overall growth management policies to ensure the existing Regional Retail Area is not unduly undermined through the introduction of new retail opportunities when population growth and market demand is not correlated accordingly. While Policy 6.4.8.3 f) does speak to market impacts on existing facilities, we believe this policy should be more explicitly stated that new Regional Retail Areas can only occur where there supporting population growth occurs.</p>	<p>Section 6.4.8 – The Regional Retail Area implements height limits and minimum/maximum FSI permissions rather than density targets. This approach is consistent with the Town’s direction and Highway 48 Framework Study. The draft OP provides for increased development densities than what is permitted in the current OP.</p> <p>As required in Section 7.5.2, the intent is that a Market Impact Study would be required to support the additional commercial growth, reference the applicable policies.</p>


**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		We note that the current draft does not reflect the parkland dedication policies set out in Bill 23, including the rates to be applied, parkland caps and strata parkland provision. These should be incorporated into the next draft.	Bill 23 requirements related to parkland dedication have been included in Section 3.5.1, in so far as the requirements are in effect.
		The side bar in Section 3.5.1 on Page 117 describing built form should be revised to eliminate the maximum height (20 storeys) for tall buildings, especially given the increased emphasis and mandates for intensification and provision of housing recently set out by the Province. Maximum heights can be guided by urban design polices and guidelines instead of a specific limitation.	The Draft Official Plan has been updated throughout to include 'generally 20 storeys' as a maximum height.
		It appears that Schedule K-9a as misidentified a man made stormwater management facilities (it was constructed as part of the initial development of the SmartCentres property in 2006 / 2007) at the southeast corner of the SmartCentres lands as a "lake" and has applied influence area to this "feature". It appears that this has occurred with a number of stormwater management facilities on this schedule. We request that this misidentification be corrected.	Completed.
		Flexibility should be given to a numeric requirement, especially when dealing with building design. We request that "generally" be included accordingly throughout the Plan (i.e. Policy 6.4.10.3 n) "...should be generally a minimum of 3 to 4 storeys...") to ensure that flexibility in design is not adversely hampered by overly restrictive policies.	The terms 'generally' or 'approximately' have been added where appropriate.
		While we appreciate the broadening of uses in the Regional Retail Area and removal of unnecessary restrictions and gross floor area caps. However, it appears that other designations (notably the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area) contains a broader range of commercial and retail uses (for example the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area includes specific uses such as commercial recreation, grocery stores, supermarkets and food stores, while the Regional Retail Area does not). Other employment uses (data processing, research and development, light industrial innovation makerspaces, convention and banquet facilities) are also specifically listed in the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area but not the Regional Retail Area. In our opinion, the Regional Retail Area, being at the top of the Town's retail hierarchy should have the broadest range of use permissions, especially in terms of commercial and retail uses. We would request confirmation from the Town that a full range of commercial and retail uses are permitted in the Regional Retail Area at a minimum. Ideally, this clarification should be placed within the Regional Retail Area policies and / or a full list of uses added.	Permitted uses have been reviewed to ensure greater consistency and expanded where possible, with a focus on regional retail and larger format retail uses.
		While we appreciate the addition and focus on mixed use development being provided within the Regional Retail Area, there is a <u>lack of policy direction on Regional Retail development (i.e. low rise retail development)</u> . For example, low rise retail development, on its own, will not meet the minimum 2.5 FSI	Per Section 6.4.22, FSI only relates to mixed-use development. Standalone commercial and retail development is permitted with less than 2.5 FSI.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>requirement. Furthermore, the reading of the policies would suggest that stand alone retail buildings are not appropriate or are discouraged. We suggest that the policies respecting mixed use development and low rise retail development be separated to provide clarity to the policy regime.</p>	
		<p>It is noted that mid-rise and high-rise residential dwelling units within mixed use buildings are permitted within this land use designation which we support. Further Policy 6.4.8.3 a) requires commercial and retail uses at grade within these buildings. This may not be appropriate in all cases (i.e. on a site which is in the interior of a redeveloped Regional Retail Area). We would therefore request flexibility be added such that stand alone residential mid-rise and high-rise buildings can occur. Policies 6.4.8.3 k) and m) should likewise be modified to provide flexibility. It appears, for example, that this flexibility has been provided in the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area by requiring at-grade commercial and retail uses along the Highway 48 and Hoover Park Drive frontages (Policy 6.4.10.3 a) – this type of flexibility should be provided for in the Regional Retail Area (i.e. if the residential building is located away from Hoover Park Drive and Highway 48, at-grade commercial uses are encouraged, but not required).</p>	<p>The OP establishes that future growth can be accommodated in mixed-use buildings where the retail functions are accommodated and required at-grade. To manage the evolution of the Area to ensure that its retail and service commercial function can be maintained and significantly expanded over time. Future growth can be accommodated in mixed-use buildings where the retail functions are accommodated and required at-grade. Retail and service commercial uses, as well as office uses would be permitted in stand-alone buildings. Therefore, Stand-alone residential buildings should not be permitted.</p>
		<p>We request that the maximum height of 20 storeys be removed in order to support further intensification and provision of housing within the Town (Policy 6.4.8.3 b). Maximum heights can be guided by urban design polices and guidelines instead of a specific limitation.</p>	<p>The built form height maximums are consistent with the Hwy 48 Framework Study and direction from Town.</p>
		<p>We support the minimum density requirement of 2.5 FSI (Policy 6.4.8.3 d) for mixed use development, but as noted above, this sets an unrealistic requirement for low rise retail development by itself.</p>	<p>Per Section 6.4.22, FSI only relates to mixed-use development. Standalone commercial and retail development is permitted.</p>
		<p>Policy 6.4.8.3 c) and e) i) appear repetitive. Further requiring full replacement of retail space is not realistic or feasible, especially given the large anchor tenants located in the Regional Retail Area. Should these sites be redeveloped into a mixed use format or a tenant change their business model (i.e. reduce in size) these policies would require full replacement which is not often achievable, especially given recent trends in the retail marketplace and smaller parcel sizes created when urbanizing malls into mixed use centres. We therefore request that flexibility be given in this policy by replacing “is required to be, at a minimum” with “is strongly encouraged to be”.</p>	<p>The Hwy 48 Framework Study recommended the Town implement a policy “that requires any lost retail Gross Floor Area within the Regional Retail Area to be, at a minimum, replaced on the same site, or on another site within the Regional Retail Area. The introduction of residential uses must also include contributions to retail and service commercial developments.”</p> <p>The term ‘generally’ has been included where appropriate.</p> <p>Policy 6.4.8.3 c) will be deleted to avoid repetition.</p>
		<p>Policy 6.4.8.3 e) is requested to be deleted. This requirement was set out for the conversion lands (Area 2) as part of the conversion request process. <u>This was never meant to apply to the Regional Retail Area and has no basis in Provincial or Regional policy nor the policy / development history respecting these lands.</u> Combined with Policy 6.4.8.3 c) and e) i) this places a significant impediment on</p>	<p>6.4.8.3 e) has been removed.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>mixed use intensification of Regional Retail Areas, which is unwarranted and onerous.</p>	
		<p>We suggest that requirements of Policy 6.4.8.3(h) be set as being features to be encouraged in the design of retail development, rather than as a requirement, as these features can be achieved in different ways.</p>	<p>As mentioned in Policy 6.4.8.3(h), it is only required “if deemed necessary by the Town”. This is discretionary wording and should remain.</p>
		<p>The lands to the east of Rougeview Avenue north of Sam’s Way have been designated as Highway 48 Mixed Use in the Stouffville Community Policies, reflecting the conversion request approved by the Region. However, the lands south of the Highway 48 Mixed Use designation, east of Rougeview Avenue and north of the storm pond remain designated as Business Park Area. These lands were included in the approved conversion request (see below – circled in red) and therefore should be similarly designated Highway 48 Mixed Use.</p> 	<p>Mapping has been updated per the approved employment area conversion and designated Highway 48 Mixed Use Area.</p>
		<p>Given the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area is a newly formed designation in the draft Official Plan, it is peculiar to see that <u>there is already a differentiation between the uses and policies covered by OPA 151 / SP-S11 (which is also Highway 48 Mixed Use Area) and the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area on the SmartCentres lands.</u> If anything, these newly formed designations should be generally reflective of each other in terms of uses, policy requirements, etc. For example “townhouses” are permitted in SP-S11 (Policy 6.10.1.11 u) but are restricted to “live-work townhouses” in the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area. Similarly, the requirement for 38 sq m of non-residential space per dwelling unit is required in the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area but not in SP-S11, despite the fact that both areas were subject to employment conversion requests (the requirement was tied to the perceived loss of employment resulting from the employment conversions). Should the policies for this newly formed land use designation not be generally consistent with each other, with only minor differences being set out for specific circumstances (such as for the Schlegel Retirement Facility subject to SP-S12)?</p>	<p>Special Provision SP-S11 has been updated to include the requirement for 38 sq m of non-residential space per dwelling unit, as per the approved OPA.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		Further to #2 we request, to <u>provide further flexibility in the provision of housing that all forms of townhouses, not just live-work townhouses, be permitted in the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area.</u>	SP-S11 has been updated consistent with OPA 151 to permit medium density residential in the form of townhouses.
		Further to #2, should the Town not <u>require the 38 sq m of non-residential space per dwelling unit requirement for the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area lands north of Hoover Park Drive, then this requirement (Policy 6.4.10.3 m) should be deleted.</u>	This requirement will be included on SP-S11 as per OPA 151 and will also apply to the smart centres (employment conversion lands) in the Hwy 48 MU Area. This was a requirement endorsed by Council in support of the conversion request.
		As noted above, we believe the maximum height limit of 20 storeys should be removed, with the maximum height being guided by urban design polices and guidelines (as is set out further in the policies).	The built form height maximums are consistent with the Hwy 48 Framework Study and direction from the Town. We have included the term ' generally' to allow for flexibility of building heights where appropriate.
		Policy 6.4.10.3 j) and l) appear to mistakenly refer to Main Street in the Highway 48 Mixed Use Area. The Town should fix this mistake or clarify the reference.	Policy 6.4.10.3 j) will be removed and put into Section 6.4.9 – Gateway Mixed Use Area. Policy 6.4.10.3 j) will be updated to remove 'Main Street West' and replace it with 'Stouffville Road'. The intersection will be clarified as Hwy 48 and 'Main Street/Stouffville Road'.
		Policy <u>6.4.10.3 m) appears to include two unrelated policy requirements. We suggest separating them for ease of future reference</u> and understanding of the policy.	The policy is consistent with the Hwy 48 Framework Study: Non-residential uses should be accommodated within the design of the ground floor of buildings, including a minimum floor to ceiling height of 4.5 metres. Per Council direction, minimum of 38 square metres of non-residential gross floor area required for each new dwelling unit will not be removed.
		While we appreciate the need to differentiate between employment areas (Business Park Area and Industrial Area), <u>the Industrial Area designation is too restrictive. In our opinion this area should permit compatible employment uses that are found in the Business Park Area (i.e. office, medical office, data processing centres) and then go further to also allow the industrial uses noted (i.e. manufacturing, outside storage, etc).</u> This appears to be the case, for example, for <u>the Gormley Industrial Area policies where uses such as professional and medical offices, hotels, data centres and other uses remain.</u>	The Community of Stouffville Industrial Area designation has been removed and replaced with the Business Park Area designation to provide more flexibility, and restrict heavier industrial uses adjacent to this evolving mixed use area.
		By providing such flexibility, this will maximize the ability of the Town to attract new businesses to any number of properties within in the Town. To this effect, our client has a user purchasing property in the Industrial Area (medical office) which is permitted now in the Industrial Area in the current Official Plan, but would not be permitted in the new Official Plan. This would result in this tenant looking elsewhere, likely outside of the Town, to locate their business. This is counterproductive to the Economic Development policies as well as overall	

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		growth management where health services are required to service existing and future populations.	
		To provide flexibility in terms of attracting major employment tenants, we would request that the height limitation of 20 metres in the Business Park designation (Policy 6.4.5.4 k).	See Section 6.4.24.4.k as the height limit has been altered to 'a maximum of generally 9 storeys'.
12689 10 th Line Michael Smith Planning Consultants	January 23, 2023	Given the proximity of the Owner's property to the proposed higher density uses to the north and south, my client requests that the <i>Urban Medium Density Residential</i> designation be expanded easterly to encompass approximately 75% of the subject lands, which is consistent with Map 3 attached to this letter.	OPA 155 (Old Elm) was recently adopted and has now been consolidated. These lands are in the study area and designated Old Elm Residential which permits a wider range of uses/densities. OPA requirements have been updated.
		On Map 3, the Owner proposes back-to-back townhouses on Blocks 7 and 8. Further, the Owner proposes a Laneway which provides an appropriate buffer to the Conservatory Lands to the east. We believe this form of housing is suitable in the neighbourhood context given the setback to the Conservatory Lands and proposed land uses to the north and south. The proposed <i>Neighbourhood Residential</i> component shown on Map 3 would have an average FSI of 1.68 for the two blocks, which exceeds the maximum FSI of 1.5. Alternatively, if the total area of this portion of the subject land is used (i.e., 0.473 ha), the FSI would decrease to 1.12 and conform to the maximum FSI of 1.5	Section 6.4.1 has been amended to note 'approximately an FSI of 1.5'.
		That the Town <u>increase the maximum FSI from 1.5 to 1.7 depending on the method of FSI calculation, for the subject lands.</u>	Section 6.4.1 has been amended to note 'approximately an FSI of 1.5'.
		That the Town increase the maximum net density from 30 units per net hectare to 50 units per net hectare for the subject lands.	The density range has been increased to 60 units per net hectare.
		That the Town reduce the minimum FSI from 2.5 to 1.5 or from 2.5 to 0.85, depending on the method of FSI calculation for the subject lands. Note: if the road widening and/or parkette are included in the calculation, the FSI would be lower.	This is a site specific request that should be considered in the context of a development application. See above comment.
TArbor Memorial (Gormley)	January 20, 2023	The Draft WSOP 2022/23 <u>incorrectly identifies and designates two waterbodies along the southern boundary of the Highland Hills Funeral Home & Cemetery property as "Lakes and Ponds" in Schedule K-3a – Natural Heritage Water Features, and defines a 30 Metre Minimum Vegetative Protection Zone and a 120 Metre Area of Influence around them in reference to various provincial plans/documents.</u> However, both these water features are man-made stormwater management ponds, constructed in accordance with the approved site plan for the property (dated August 1998, shown in the figure below) and hold no "natural"	The mapping is based on the currently available information provided by the Conservation Authorities and the Region. Section 3.5.1.1.x recognizes SWM Facilities as infrastructure as opposed to natural features.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>significance otherwise. <u>This issue was raised with the York Region planning team during their recent Official Plan review process, and were informed that the hydrology-related designations and the related GIS data were from the TRCA and that our comments would be incorporated into the final mapping and also forwarded to the TRCA for updates. However, this data has not been updated by the TRCA as shown in the WSOP 2022/23 mapping as well.</u></p>	
		<p>In addition to impacting Arbor’s property by adding an unnecessary layer of environmental regulatory requirements, the 120 Metre Area of Influence also extends into the northern section of the Gormley Secondary Plan Area and causes adverse impact on neighbouring properties abutting to the south, as shown in Schedule K-7a Gormley Natural Heritage Water Features.</p>	<p>Refer to comment above.</p>
		<p>We request that the Town’s staff update the draft mapping in Schedule K-3a to remove the “Lakes and Ponds” designation on the stormwater management ponds, and also review other data from external municipal authorities and/or agencies for accuracy.</p>	<p>Refer to comment above.</p>
		<p>The policies within the Preamble begin with the digit 1 although there is no chapter number assigned to the Preamble. These may be confused when referencing the policies within Chapter 1 – Re-Imagine Stouffville, which also begin with the digit 1.</p>	<p>Numbering in the Preamble has been removed.</p>
		<p>There also sections in the policy text where there is <u>repetition of the introductory text language as a specific policy number. Specifically, Section 4.1.18 Environmental Impact Studies where the second paragraph of the introductory text is repeated as Policy 4.1.18.1.</u></p>	<p>Second introductory paragraph of Section 4.1.18 will be removed.</p>
		<p>Please verify the language of what the Town will or will not do as it specifically relates to the policies listed. For example, in Section 4.2.3 Source Protection Plans, the introduction says “The Town will:” and in 4.2.3.4 says “Approve an application.... unless:”. The word unless should actually be replaced by after, subsequent to, only if, or wording similar to show that the following the conditions a through c are required prior to/for approval. The current language reads as if the Town will not approve if the applicant submits the required documentation!</p>	<p>Section 4.2.3.4 will be changed to: “Consider approval of an application for major development within the ORM, subsequent to”</p>
		<p>More generally, for the OP Schedules, please show the parcel lines on all maps. Having the parcel lines is very helpful in referencing specific properties, as you have shown on some maps but not all. We also suggest that the document would benefit from a more consistent formatting across all chapters such as matching fonts of section headers and table titles, removal of blank pages, aligning paragraph and table row breaks, etc. to make the final version easier to read.</p>	<p>Its not legible to include property lines on all the Town-wide maps. Digital on-line mapping will be made available. Formatting comments have been noted.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
12942 York Durham Line Joan MacIntyre, MCP	January 23, 2023	<p>We request that the Old Elm OPA Area be outlined on Schedule D. <u>We request that Schedule D be amended to identify the entire Old Elm OPA area, rather than solely the MTSA.</u></p> <p><u>The Urban Medium Density Residential Area designation should be removed from the Stateview lands in the Draft OP Schedule.</u> The Stateview lands adjacent to Bethesda Road are designated as Urban Medium Density Residential Area in the in-effect Official Plan and in the Draft Official Plan. However, under the Draft Old Elm OPA, the entire property has been designated as Old Elm Residential which encourages development to achieve a density of 35-75 units per net hectare (Policy 12.7.27.3 iv)). This designation and density range is more appropriate and achievable for the property and Stateview has based its plans and applications development applications on the Old Elm OPA draft and discussions with Town staff. <u>We request that the Draft OP schedule be amended on the Stateview lands to match the Old Elm OPA designations.</u></p> <p>We <u>request that the minimum FSI of 2.5 be removed from the Urban Medium Density Residential Area designation.</u> Under Policy 6.4.3.1, townhouses, live-work units, mixed use buildings and Mid-Rise apartment buildings are unit types permitted within the Urban Medium Density Residential Area Designation. Policy 6.4.3.2 c.'s requirement for a minimum FSI of 2.5 within this designation will prohibit townhouse condominiums which, even in stacked, back-to-back format, can barely achieve 1.0 FSI.</p>	<p>Adopted OPA 155 has been consolidated and implemented in the Draft Official Plan. See Sections 6.4.18 to 6.4.20.</p> <p>Adopted OPA 155 has been implemented.</p> <p>Section 6.4.3.2.c has been revised to require an FSI of generally 1.5.</p>
6031-6037 Main St, 6400-6408 Main St Lincoln Lo, MGP	January 23, 2023	<p>We recognize Staff's efforts in "re-imagining" the Western Approach Mixed Use Area designation, which permits additional heights and density to support the anticipated investment and revitalization of Main Street. <u>We respectfully ask that the townhouse permission under the Core Area – Main Street designation be clarified and the minimum FSI permission be revised to support mixed use townhouse developments along Main Street.</u></p> <p>The owner of 6400-6408 Main Street has submitted a pre-consultation request for stacked back-to-back townhouses with mixed use units along Main Street. From the notes provided following the pre-consultation meeting, staff generally support the proposed built form. However, <u>the Core Area – Main Street designation has been revised to only permit townhouse development on the edge of this designation. It is unclear what the "edge of the Core Area – Main Street designation" refers to,</u> as the subject lands and surrounding properties to the east, south, and west border the Core Area as a whole. We would further ask Staff to clarify whether the prohibition applies to an entire property or is determined on a building location basis. We agree that a standalone residential townhouse form would be counter to the vision for the Core Area – Main Street designation; however, a mixed-use townhouse would be consistent with the</p>	<p>6400-6408 Main Street: See comments below.</p> <p>Section 6.4.11.3 has been revised to require an FSI of generally 1.5.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>vibrant, pedestrian-friendly intent for this area. Therefore, we ask that the caveat that townhouse development “may be permitted on the edge of the Core Area – Main Street designation” under Section 6.4.11.1.b) be removed as Section 6.4.11.2.a) effectively restricts standalone residential townhouses along Main Street. In addition, we note that the minimum 1.0 FSI required in Section 6.4.11.3c would not be consistent with a townhouse development, which typically has a density of under 1.0 FSI. Therefore, we ask that the minimum FSI be revised to 0.5 to potentially facilitate townhouse products, which continue to be a permitted use.</p>	
<p>15450 Woodbine Avenue Lincoln Lo, MGP</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>We respectfully <u>ask that Servicing Study Area policies within the Community of Vandorf are amended to provide additional flexibility, recognizing that servicing needs can be highly variable from site to site.</u> In addition, we would support the designation of portions of the Community of Vandorf as a Community Planning Permit System Area to expedite growth in this area.</p> <p>We recognize that Section 2.8.3.6 of the Draft OP is intended to reflect the existing purpose of the Servicing Strategy (Section 13.5) of the in-effect OP, which requires “a detailed assessment of servicing options prior to permitted any significant new development [emphasis added]”. However, <u>three additional lots appear to be an arbitrary threshold to trigger the need for an MESP or quadrant-wide FSR. Three additional lots would not create a significant grouping of lots, in our opinion.</u></p> <p><u>We would recommend associating the need for such studies with significant Draft Plans of Subdivision of a greater quantum, at least ten (10) lots. This would mirror the number of units for which the Province has recently exempted the need for Site Plan approval.</u> Alternatively, in recognition that the servicing needs for development are highly variable, the proposed policy section can incorporate greater flexibility by noting that the need for an MESP or quadrant-wide FSR will be assessed on a case-by-case basis without requiring an amendment to this Plan.</p> <p>In our opinion, the Town should <u>consider designating areas in smaller community areas such as Vandorf as a CPPS area.</u> This tool will serve as a catalyst for employment growth to expedite and encourage employment development in the Vandorf area, which has long been identified for development. Extending the permitting process to employment areas will ensure that the Town promotes population growth together with the efficient creation of jobs, which is consistent with local, regional and provincial planning policy.</p>	<p>The Community of Vandorf servicing policies have been revised to provide greater flexibility. Refer to Section 2.8.3.</p> <p>The existing policies would not provide for the creation of any new lots in the absence of the Servicing Study being undertaken. The proposed policies are intended to provide some greater flexibility to accommodate new development and lot creation in the interim, subject to Regional approval. The threshold of three additional lots was identified as an appropriate threshold as any further lot creation would typically necessitate the need for Draft Plan approval to accommodate more intensive development. Furthermore, an interim servicing solution may be considered through a Functional Servicing Study for the respective quadrants prior to the completion of the MESP which may accommodate lot creation in excess of three lots. The Town is planning to undertake the MESP in 2024.</p> <p>Refer to above comments.</p> <p>The new Official Plan includes policies for the Town to consider undertaking a CPPS in the future, however this work is outside the scope of the OPR project.</p>
<p>Stouffville Phase 3 East</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p><u>Sections 2.7.6 and 2.8 should be revised to incorporate wording permitting publicly owned underground stormwater management tanks and dual-use and stratified park/stormwater management facilities, for when this requirement of Bill</u></p>	<p>Bill 23 requirements which are not in effect will be addressed at a later date. Further direction from Council is required regarding strata parks/swm ponds. The recommendations are anticipated to be addressed in the next draft Official Plan.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
Landowners Group Don Given, MGP		<u>23 comes into effect, as well as the acceptance of such lands for full credit towards parkland dedication requirements.</u>	
		Parkland Policies in Section 3.4 should be revised to reflect changes made to Sections 42 and 51.1 of the Planning Act by Bill 23.	Parkland Policies in Section 3.4 will be updated to reflect the in effect changes from Bill 23.
		Potential credits for encumbered parkland such as dual-use stormwater tanks and public or private parklands should be addressed in the OP for consistency with the Planning Act.	Bill 23 requirements which are not in effect will be addressed at a later date. Further direction from Council is required regarding strata parks/swm ponds. The recommendations are anticipated to be addressed in the next draft Official Plan.
		Remove Policy 3.4.1.20 requiring developers to be for the one-time replacement of original parks equipment.	This has been removed.
		The term “large-scale development” should be defined in the Official Plan.	Not a defined term in the Official Plan, and will be assessed at the discretion of staff.
		A more comprehensive explanation should be provided detailing when the requirement for a Block Plan is triggered, such as approximate area, among other potential triggers.	Completed. See Section 7.2.
		We request that Policy 7.2.1.1 be revised as follows: 7.2.1.1 The Town may will exercise discretion to require a Block Plan as part of the following development applications, except in instances where a comprehensive study such as a Secondary Plan or Master Environmental and Servicing Plan has been prepared: a. Official Plan Amendment; b. Zoning By-law Amendment; c. Draft Plan of Subdivision; and d. Site Plan Control; and, e. As part of a Secondary Plan for New Community Area	“The Town may require a Block Plan...” allows for some flexibility and achieves the same meaning.
		We request that <u>the minimum FSI of 2.5 be removed</u> or reduced for the Urban Medium Density Residential Area Designation.	FSI requirements throughout the Official Plan have been amended to include ‘generally or approximately’ in relation to FSI’s.
		It is unclear if the policies of the Draft Old Elm OPA conform to the Draft OP. As a second draft of the Old Elm OPA has yet to be released, it is unclear if the Draft Old Elm OPA has been updated to reflect the recently approved York Region Official Plan and the Draft OP. Given comments on the Town’s second draft of the OP are due January 23rd and the second draft of the Old Elm OPA has yet to be released to the public and Landowners Group, we request that the commenting period for the Town’s second draft OP be extended to allow for a reasonable amount of time for the Landowners Group to review the Draft OP and the Draft Old Elm OPA concurrently to ensure consistency with each other.	The Adopted OPA 155 has been consolidated into the Draft Official Plan.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		The Section 7.16 Site Plan Control policies require updates to comply with Bill 23.	Section 7.16 has been updated to comply with Bill 23.
		Please clarify if street townhouses will be subject to Site Plan Control. Policy 7.16.1.1 d. states that single detached, duplex, or semi-detached dwelling units are exempt from the Site Plan Control Process, in accordance with the Town's Site Plan Control By-law. Under Section 4(a) of the Town's Site Plan Control By-law, link residential development and street townhouse development are also exempt from the Site Plan Control Process. We request that Policy 7.16.1.1 be revised to also exempt all residential development containing 10 residential units or less from Site Plan Control, in conformity with the Planning Act, as amended by Bill 23	Consistent with Bill 23, Street townhouses containing 10 units or less will be exempt as per the By-law.
		We continue to request a boundary change for the Old Elm MTSA on Schedule D. As discussed in our letter to the Town dated March 1, 2022, the proposed modification to the Lincolnville/Old Elm MTSA will result in a net reduction of about four (4) hectares. Approximately 2.1 ha of this reduction is attributable to undevelopable land. Additionally, since the location of the proposed collector road has not yet been finalized, <u>we are recommending a 164 metre setback from the 10th Line right-of-way up to the north end where it will align with the collector road just south of Bethesda Road.</u>	OPA 155 has been consolidated into the new OP as adopted. The MTSA boundary reflects the boundary as delineated in the ROP to which the Town's Official Plan must conform to. The Town is not contemplating any further changes to adopted OPA 155 at this time.
		We request that Schedule D be amended to identify the entire Old Elm OPA area, rather than solely the MTSA.	OPA 155 has been consolidated into the new OP as adopted.
		<u>We request that the Natural Heritage Boundaries be amended to reflect the OPA 137 and draft Old Elm OPA boundaries. The Natural Heritage Boundaries on Schedules K-9a and K-9b are incorrect and should be updated to reflect the staked limits agreed upon by the TRCA and MNRF.</u> In particular, the limits of development on 12875 Tenth Line as currently shown on Schedules K-9a and D-4 of the second draft of the Town's OP do not reflect the boundary that had been approved by the Toronto Region Conservation Authority ("TRCA") and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry ("MNRF"). It was confirmed that there was no natural heritage feature in this location. The Town subsequently updated the schedules for the Old Elm study to reflect the limits supported by the TRCA and MNRF. We request that the natural heritage limits shown on Schedules K-9a and D-4 be revised to match the natural heritage limits shown on the Old Elm GO Draft Land Use Schedule (April 2022) which is a more current depiction of the staked environmental limits within the Draft Old Elm GO OPA area	OPA 155 and all Old Elm requirements have been consolidated into the new OP as adopted.
		We request that the colours for Urban Arterial and Rural Arterial roads be changed to provide more contrast.	Noted.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		We request that the Urban Area boundary be changed so that it is visible in all locations.	Mapping on applicable schedules will be updated to ensure visibility of the urban boundary.
17321 Woodbine Avenue Calvin Lantz, Stikeman Elliot	January 23, 2022	<p>Our client is troubled by the Draft OP's <u>proposal to re-designate the Property from Commercial Recreation Area to Agricultural Area</u>. Such a change represents a <u>down-designation that is inappropriate considering the transition policies that have existed since the introduction of the Greenbelt Plan in 2004</u>, as well as the Property's long history of being used and approved for a range of commercial recreation purposes.</p> <p>For these reasons, the proposed re-designation of the Property to Agricultural Area, and the restrictive language introduced under Special Policy SP-RA7, are not in conformity with the Greenbelt Plan. The Draft OP should be revised to re-instate the Commercial Recreation Area designation for the Property, with a policy framework that is no more restrictive than what presently exists under the Current OP.</p> <p>The Draft OP is deeply problematic in that it disregards the long history of as-of-right commercial recreation permissions and uses on the Property, which are enshrined in the Current OP and the Zoning By-law. Instead, what the Draft OP proposes to do is phase out the commercial recreation uses by changing the Property's base designation to Agricultural Area, with a commercial recreation exception that, over time, envisages the uses on the Property as being brought into greater conformity with the Draft OP's agricultural policies and the Greenbelt Plan.</p>	Commercial Recreation Area designations were carried forward as site specific permissions. This is now shown as SP-RA7 which affords similar permissions to what currently exist. In staff's view, this is an appropriate approach to implementing the Greenbelt policies and is consistent with the Town's ORMCP conformity exercise. Furthermore, in staff view it provides greater flexibility as it specifically recognizes the existing permitted uses and provides for additional commercial recreation uses that are similar to or more in conformity with the provisions of this Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. The provincial and regional mapping of the agricultural system identifies these lands as agricultural area.
5481 and 5551 Bethesda Road Joan MacIntyre, MGP	January 23, 2023	<p>Section 2.8 should be revised to incorporate wording permitting publicly owned underground stormwater management tanks and dual-use park/stormwater management facilities, for if/when this requirement of Bill 23 comes into effect as well as the acceptance of such lands for full credit towards parkland dedication requirements.</p> <p>Remove the requirement for a portion of dwelling units to be provided in a single storey form. Policy 3.1.3.2 provides a list of items that development applications will be evaluated against, to help promote home-based care to allow older persons to stay in residential units as they age.</p> <p>The requirement of no net loss of trees is not possible onsite in some instances and requires clarification. Policy 3.2.6.5 Requires that there be no net loss of trees as a result of development for all development applications within Settlement Areas, including Site Plans, Plans of Subdivision and severances. This requirement is more restrictive than that of the Region's OP as it implies that compensation would be required onsite. Compensation onsite may not be</p>	<p>Section 2.11.6 – Stormwater Management provisions of Bill 23 are still not in force and affect. Once this occurs and Council input has been received, the provisions will be implemented into the Official Plan.</p> <p>Single storey form of dwellings requirement will be removed in Section 3.1.3.2. Policies have been included to encourage accessible and ground related units, etc.</p> <p>Section 3.2.6.5 has been revised to encourage no net loss or compensation off site.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		possible within smaller scale development. It is also unclear if street trees can be included in the compensation calculation. We request that the Town considers using a policy more in line with Policy 3.4.32 of the Region's new OP.	
		Potential credits for encumbered parkland such as dual use stormwater tanks and public or private parklands should be addressed in the OP for consistency with the Planning Act. Policy 3.4.1.13 outlines the circumstances under which the Town will not accept the conveyance of land for parkland dedication. Subpoint "f" precludes "any land containing an easement, encumbrance or right-of-use that Restricts the Town's use of the land" from being conveyed. Under the proposed changes of Bill 23, encumbered parkland will be eligible for parkland credits, which would include parkland constructed on top of underground stormwater tanks, or dual-use facilities. This portion of Bill 23 is not yet in effect, but we request that Draft Official Plan be modified to prepare for these portions of Bill 23 coming into effect.	Parkland Policies in Section 3.4 have been revised to reflect changes made to the Planning Act Policies 42(6.0.1) and 42(3) by Bill 23.
		Remove the requirement for developers to be responsible for the one-time replacement of the original parks equipment. This is a new policy introduced as part of the Draft OP process. Policy 3.4.1.20 establishes control over the timing of development of parks achieved through dedication as a condition of development approval.	Policy will be removed.
		The term "large-scale development" should be defined in the Official Plan.	Not a defined term in the Official Plan, and will be assessed at the discretion of staff.
		A more comprehensive explanation should be provided detailing when the requirement for a Block Plan is triggered, such as approximate area, multiple owners needing to share external service, etc. Section 7.2 relates to Block Plans. Policy 7.2.1.1 states that the Town will exercise discretion in requiring a Block Plan as part of the following applications: Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision, Site Plan Control, and as part of a Secondary Plan for New Community Areas	Section 7.2 has been updated for criteria related to Blocks Plans.
		We request that the minimum FSI of 2.5 be removed from the Urban Medium Density Residential Area Designation.	FSI requirements throughout the Official Plan have been amended to include 'generally or approximately' in relation to FSI's.
		The Urban High Density Residential designation should be changed to Urban Medium Density for the lands located at 5481 and 5551 Bethesda Road if Townhouses and MidRise buildings are no longer a permitted use within the designation.	This is a mapping error, and the designation will be updated on applicable schedules to show the property as Urban Medium Density designation.
		Please clarify if street townhouses will be subject to Site Plan Control. Policy 7.16.1.1 d. states that single detached, duplex, or semi-detached dwelling units are exempt from the Site Plan Control Process, in accordance with the Town's Site Plan Control By-law. Under Section 4(a) of the Town's Site Plan Control By-	Section 7.16.1.1 will be updated to be consistent with Town's Site Plan Control By-law and to implement what is in force and effect from Bill 23.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		law, link residential development and street townhouse development are also exempt from the Site Plan Control Process. Street townhouse and link residential development should be included within the list of exempt unit types in Policy 7.16.1.1. d. We assume that Section 7.16.1.1 will also be updated to exempt developments of up to 10 residential units from Site Plan Control, in accordance with the changes of Bill 23.	
12131 Woodbine Avenue Nick Pileggi, MACAULAY SHIOMI HOWSON LTD.	January 23, 2023	Rather than repeating the same permitted uses from Section S.6.5.2, we suggest that Section S.6.5.3.1 be revised to state “Uses permitted within the Business Area designation”, and then additional uses permitted under the Industrial Designation, including heavy industrial uses as noted above.	There are uses within the Business Park Area that are not permitted in the Industrial Area being why some have not been repeated.
		Section 6.5.2.1 (k) states: “Ancillary uses such as small scale retail and service commercial uses that primarily serve the business functions of permitted uses.” Further subsection (b) (note there are two (b) subsections, this is the second), states: “Maximum 20% gross floor area devoted to retail sales of a minor portion of the goods manufactured, processed, assembled, or packaged on the industrial premises.” We generally agree with the premise that the lands designated Business Park should allow for limited retail and commercial uses, however, it is our view that the policies should allow for more flexibility in this regard. Retail and commercial uses should be permitted, provided the property is used largely for employment or industrial uses.	The policy has been updated to state that the uses need to be ancillary to the primary permitted uses.
		Section 6.5.3.1.j. states: “Accessory restaurant uses serving the business park uses may be permitted as part of the facility;” As noted above, this is within the “Industrial” designation section and should not reference business park uses. Further, we suggest that stand alone restaurants are appropriate and should be permitted within the Industrial Area, including drive-thru facilities.	This has been refined. See Sections 6.5.2 and 6.5.3.
		Development Policies Section 6.5.3.2.c. states: “Limited outdoor storage accessory to permitted industrial uses may be permitted, provided it is located only in rear yards, is effectively screened from public view, and is fenced where required to ensure safety.” Some properties within the area are quite large encompassing more than one street frontage; and, placement of buildings within the site may not be suitable closer to the property line. There is opportunity to have outdoor storage within the front yard but set back a significant distance from the street frontage. We suggest the wording be revised as follows:	The policy has been revised to encourage locating outdoor storage in the rear yard.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>Limited outdoor storage accessory to permitted industrial uses may be permitted, and is encouraged to be located within rear yards, is effectively screened from public view, and is fenced where required to ensure safety. Where outdoor storage is proposed within front or side yards due to site specific circumstances, appropriate screening from public view is required.</p>	
		<p>Schedule O Transportation Plan, identifies a “Potential Road” within the Gormley Community. This ‘Potential Road’ is not located correctly on the Schedule. As noted, Draft Plan of Subdivision 19T-90001 is approved for the site and depicts the road location. We have also had numerous discussions with the Town and Region of York on the location of the road and signalization at Woodbine Avenue. It is our request that Schedule O be corrected to show the location of the ‘Potential Road’ as shown on Draft Plan of Subdivision 19T-90001. In addition, the policies should allow that the road location can be further refined through the development application process., without amendment to this plan.</p>	<p>Schedule O - Transportation Plan has been updated to correctly show the ‘Potential Road’. In addition, Chapter 7 has been updated to allow minor refinements, at the discretion of the Town, without an Official Plan Amendment.</p>
<p>4721 and 5061 Stouffville Road</p> <p>Nick Pileggi, Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd.</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>Policy Section 6.4.9.3 (a) states: “Mid- and high-rise residential uses will be permitted throughout the Gateway Mixed Use Area designation. For lands which front on Main Street/Stouffville Road or Highway 48, residential uses will only be permitted when located above commercial at-grade, having regard for the applicable Urban Design.” While Policy (f) states: “Retail and service-commercial uses will be required at grade in all mixed use buildings fronting on Main Street within the Gate-way Mixed Use Area designation.”</p> <p>Comment – there is duplication in these policies and policy (f) is more appropriate. For example, the Times site proposes buildings along Main Street with commercial at grade. However, there is a second row of buildings, where commercial uses would not be feasible. Policy (a) would not be appropriate in this scenario.</p> <p>Policy Section 6.4.9.3 (b) states: “Mid-rise buildings shall be between 5 and 9 storeys and will achieve a minimum FSI of 2.5.” Further Policy Section 6.4.9.3 states: “High-rise buildings higher than 9 storeys up to a maximum of 20 storeys may be permitted provided the following considerations are implemented per the Highway 48 Framework Plan and Urban Design policies of this Plan. A minimum FSI of 5.0 will be required.”</p> <p>Comment – Times is in general agreement with the height range proposed, including high-rise buildings up to 20 storeys. However, the proposed ‘minimum’ FSI’s may not be achievable. We would recommend lower minimum FSI of 1.0 for mid-rise and 2.0 for high-rise.</p> <p>Policy Section 6.4.9.3 (k) states: “Substantial portions of the lands designated Gateway Mixed Use Area are influenced by the proximity of the Tributary to the Little Rouge Creek. Where a development property is located within or adjacent</p>	<p>Section 6.4.9.3 (f) will be deleted as it is a duplicate and 6.4.9.3 (a) will be clarified to state that retail and service-commercial uses will be required at grade in all mixed use buildings fronting on Main Street and Hwy 48.</p> <p>FSI requirements throughout the Official Plan have been amended to include ‘generally or approximately’ in relation to FSI’s.</p> <p>The requested wording has been implemented. See Section 6.4.5.1.m</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>to the Natural Heritage System, the proposed development must not impact the ecological or hydrological function of the natural feature(s). The Town will encourage open view corridors and pedestrian linkages to the adjacent Natural Heritage System to be incorporated into the design of the development, where appropriate.”</p> <p>Comment – Times has been in discussions with Town staff about the relocation of a portion of wetland on the property. This will assist in enabling the creation of an appropriate gateway development on the subject lands (and at the southwest corner of Stouffville Road and Highway 48). We would suggest the policy include wording similar to the following: “The Town will consider revisions to the Natural Heritage System, as part of a site specific development application and Environmental Impact Study, where is can be demonstrated that the Gateway Mixed Use area is unduly impacted by features which can be relocated or compensated for.”</p>	
		<p>Maps K-9a and K9b show labelling for Stouffville Road that do not allow us to see the underlying designations. We may have further comments on these maps, once these are clearly depicted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>12041 Woodbine Ave Jeff W. N. Leung, JET</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>Can our client’s lands be put on a hold/deferred as we believe these should also be included into the proposed future Community Area of Gormley’s expanded OP region. These lands are located directly to the south of the proposed OP boundary. Directly south and adjacent to our client’s land is Don Mills Steel and Metal which has been operating as industrial site for many years and including our client’s land and enabling the use for employment lands will be appropriate.</p>	<p>The subject lands are located outside the Gormley settlement area within the ORMCP and designated Agricultural Area. The Town’s Official Plan is required to conform to and implement the ROP and provincial policy.</p>
<p>6394 Bethesda Rd Reza Motedayen, Loyalto</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>With regards to the expansion of the Lincolnville to the North, East and South, We would like to suggest that the quadrant to the West should also be included in the proposed future Urban Area boundary.</p>	<p>The subject lands are located outside the Community of Stouffville settlement area within the ORMCP and designated Agricultural Area. The Town’s Official Plan is required to conform to and implement the ROP and provincial policy.</p>
		<p>Delineating protected major transit station areas (“PMTSA”), identifying the minimum residents and jobs per hectare to be accommodated, and introducing policies that establish minimum and maximum densities and heights in the PMTSA areas</p>	<p>Please see Section 2.2.2.</p>
		<p>the introduction of “gentle density” policies that permit two residential units in house-form buildings (including single-detached semi-detached buildings, and townhouses), plus a third unit in an ancillary building</p>	<p>The notion of gently density, consistent with the ROP, has been included.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		Expanded opportunities for stratified and encumbered parkland dedications as well as the parkland dedication rates implemented through Bill 23	Bill 23 requirements related to parkland dedication have been included in Section 3.5.1 (only in-force and in effect).
		The exemption of residential buildings with 10 units or less from site plan control.	Bill 23 requirements related to parkland dedication have been included in Section 7.3.9.1.a.
		<u>There does not appear to be any further reference differentiating PMTSAs from MTSAs, and therefore, we request clarity on where PMTSAs are within the Town,</u> both in the policy language and in the schedules. If a subset of or all the MTSAs are be identified as PMTSAs where a Council-approved inclusionary zoning policy framework can be implemented, then the Official Plan should clarify where these are.	Both MTSAs are Protected MTSAs, and have been noted. As per the ROP: 4.4.37 That all major transit station areas identified on Map 1B, are protected under the Planning Act and that policies 4.4.38 to 4.4.46 provide additional direction for development within major transit station areas identified on Map 1B, and should be read together with other similar policies regarding major transit station areas in the Plan.
		Our Requested Policy Modification: 3.1.2.2 Permit Additional Residential Units (up to 3 independent units total per property) subject to the following development policies: a. One Additional Residential Unit may be located within the principal residential dwelling if no accessory or ancillary building elsewhere on the property contains no more than one residential unit; b. One Additional Residential Unit may be located within an accessory or ancillary building elsewhere on the property; c. Two Additional Residential Units may be located within the principal residential dwelling if no accessory or ancillary building elsewhere on the property contains any residential units.	Policies in Section 3.1.2 related to additional residential units have been updated in accordance with Bill 23.
		The proposed policies contained within 2.7 (Infrastructure) and 2.8 (Community Specific Infrastructure & Servicing Requirements) should be updated to reflect the legislative changes introduced through Bill 23, specifically with respect to the parkland dedication rates, parkland dedication and cash-in-lieu caps, and the acceptance of parkland credit for encumbered parkland and stratified and dual-use parks.	The policies in Sections 2.7 and 2.8 have been updated in accordance with Bill 23.
		Bill 23 sets out a framework for owners of land to identify land to be conveyed for parkland purposes which includes, among other things, encumbered lands, stratified and dual-use parkland, and privately owned publicly accessible spaces (“POPS”). Although the regulations in the Planning Act, amended by Bill 23, pertaining to the acceptance of encumbered lands are not yet in-effect, the 2nd Draft of the OP does not address these regulations.	Bill 23 requirements that are in force and effect related to parkland dedication have been included in Section 3.5.1.
		Similarly, Section 3.4 (Developing Vibrant Parks, Trails & Open Spaces) should be updated to reflect the expanded opportunities for stratified and encumbered	Bill 23 requirements that are in force and effect related to parkland dedication have been included in Section 3.5.1.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		parkland dedications, providing new policies that permit stratified parks described in the example above.	
		Policy 3.4.1.13(f), which states that the Town may outline that “any land containing an easement, encumbrance or right-of-use that restricts the Town’s use of the land” will not be accepted with respect to parkland conveyance. This policy is contrary to Bill 23.	This policy has been updated to align with Bill 23.
		Policies 3.4.1.16, 3.4.1.17, and 3.4.1.18 of the 2nd Draft OP still follows the previous iteration of the Planning Act, prior to the legislative changes introduced through Bill 23, and should be updated accordingly. The same updates would need to be carried over into the Town’s Parkland Dedication By-law	Policies 3.4.1.16, 3.4.1.17, and 3.4.1.18 will be updated in relation to Bill 23.
		<p>Policy 3.4.1.20 provides that the Town would like to establish control over the timing of development of parks achieved through dedication as a condition of development approval. Specifically:</p> <p>The dedication by-law and policy should establish the expectation of developer contributions to the development of park services and installations (including responsibility for the one-time replacement of the original parks equipment at the end of its service life, as part of a site plan approval and development agreements as may be executed by the Town).</p> <p>We kindly request clarity on the purpose and intent of this policy, as the current wording of the policy is such that there is no limit to developer contributions to the development of park services and installations. In particular, the one-time replacement of the original parks’ equipment at the end of its service life is concerning, especially when it comes to the change in ownership of lands, and how these contribution would be dealt with in those circumstances. Please confirm how this policy would apply, what its purpose and intent is, whether there is a limit to “developer contributions”, and the extent and type of “parks equipment” that can be requested under the “one-time replacement” clause</p>	<p>Policy 3.4.1.20 will remain as it premised on the recommendations in the Town’s Leisure & Community Services Master Plan.</p> <p>One time replacement requirement has been removed.</p>
		<p>Policy 7.16.1.1(d) <u>provides that the entire Town is considered a site plan control area. However, some uses are not subject to site plan control, in accordance with the Town’s Site Plan Control By-law including single- and semi-detached dwellings, and duplexes, except in cases where specifically required, such as in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area. We kindly request that Policy 7.16.1.1(d) be updated to reflect the Town’s existing Site Plan Control By-law exempting link residential development and street townhouses from site plan control.</u></p> <p>Our Requested Policy Modification Policy 7.16.1.1:</p> <p>The entirety of the Town shall be considered a site plan control area. However, the following uses will not be subject to Site Plan Control, in accordance with the</p>	Section 7.16.1.1 has been updated in accordance with the Town’s Site Plan Control By-law and Bill 23.

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>Town's Site Plan Control By-law: (d) Development consisting of single detached, duplexes or semi-detached dwellings, or the construction of a building or structure for residential purposes on a parcel of land if that parcel of land will contain no more than 10 units, except in cases where specifically required, such as in the ORMCP Area in accordance with the Town's Site Plan Control By-law</p>	
		<p>Section 2.7.6 of the 2nd Draft OP provides policy direction with respect to stormwater management. Policy 2.7.6.10 states that the Town will: Require a preliminary phosphorus budget as part of a functional servicing report or other study for major development, including development greater than 500 square metres in impervious surface area. The budget shall be required to demonstrate that the phosphorous load from the development will be reduced to zero. Where a development cannot meet the zero phosphorous target, the Town may require phosphorous offsetting through a development agreement, conditions of approval or other mechanisms.</p> <p>Please provide clarity on reason for choosing a zero-phosphorus mandate instead of zero increase in phosphorus?</p>	<p>Policy 2.7.6.10 has been revised to indicate a zero increase in phosphorus.</p>
		<p>Schedule O (Transportation Schedule) of the 2nd Draft OP <u>does not set out the alignments for the collector roads that have been identified within the MESP study area. We kindly request that a policy be provided which speaks to accommodating proposed new collector roads (not shown on Schedule O) permitting opportunities for proposed locations and alignments as determined through a detailed planning process such as an MESP and will not require an Official Plan Amendment.</u></p> <p>Our Requested Policy Addition: 2.7.1.9(k) Maintain and develop the Town's network of public roads to support the growth management objectives of this plan by accommodating proposed new road locations and alignments that are not shown on Schedule O, as determined through a detailed planning process such as a Master Environmental Servicing Plan or Block Plan, will not require an Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Out of the areas within Whitchurch-Stouffville, several are owned by our clients. These areas are identified on Sheet 5 (Land located in the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville) at 11861 and 12045 McCowan Road and land located in City of Markham at 5474 19th Ave. at the northeast corner of 19th Ave. and McCowan Road. The Greenbelt Plan removals "Sheet 5" is attached for easy reference. We kindly request that the Official Plan Schedules be updated to reflect O. Reg 59/05's "Sheet 5", bringing the areas identified out of the Protected Countryside and into the Town's New Urban Areas.</p>	<p>The requested policy modification will be included. The MESP is not yet approved, so premature to show these roads.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
5731 Bethesda Road Joan MacIntyre, MGP	January 23, 2023	<p>In general, there are many laudable goals and objectives outlined in the draft Official Plan, reflecting contemporary directions in good planning. However, we are concerned that there are areas that <u>are not in conformity with the recent changes made under Bill 23</u>. We recognize that there was a short time period between Bill 23 coming into effect and the release of this Draft OP and assume that the Town will be incorporating those changes into the next version.</p>	<p>Policies in force and effected related to Bill 23 will be implemented.</p>
		<p>Section 2.8 should be revised to incorporate wording <u>permitting publicly owned underground stormwater management tanks and dual-use park/stormwater management facilities, for if/when this requirement of Bill 23 comes into effect as well as the acceptance of such lands for full credit towards parkland dedication requirements.</u></p> <p>The Stormwater Management policies of Section 2.8 do not discuss the opportunity for public-owned underground stormwater management tanks or dual-use tank/park facilities in greenfield areas. Our client, as well as other landowners within the municipality, support the ability to construct underground stormwater management tanks with the opportunity to provide public parkland above as part of greenfield developments. The opportunity for these facilities should not be omitted from the new Official Plan. Dual use facilities are consistent with the policies in 2.7.1 which promote infrastructure that exemplifies the principles of sustainability and balancing environmental, socio-cultural, financial and economic considerations. Dual-use facilities: allow for more efficient use of land within a settlement area; allow for more compact development and walkability; can be environmentally beneficial when planned properly, do not prohibit use for active, useable and programmable areas including sports and recreational fields (i.e., soccer, cricket, multiuse trails); and can be engineered to accommodate a variety of structures</p>	<p>Parkland Policies in Section 3.4 have been revised to reflect the in force and effect changes made to the Planning Act Policies 42(6.0.1) and 42(3) by Bill 23.</p>
		<p><u>Remove the requirement for a portion of dwelling units to be provided in a single storey form.</u> Policy 3.1.3.2 provides a list of items that development applications will be evaluated against, to help promote home-based care to allow older persons to stay in residential units as they age. MGP and Fieldgate understand the importance of <u>providing units that are age-friendly and allow for people of all ages, abilities and backgrounds to age in place</u>, and appreciate the work the Town has done on the subject through the implementation of Section 3.1.3. However, we are <u>concerned about the requirement of Policy 3.1.3.2 d. to require a portion of dwelling units to be provided in age-friendly forms such as slab on grade or single storey forms.</u></p>	<p>Policy 3.1.3.2 has been revised to “encourage” a portion of dwelling units to be provided in age-friendly forms.</p>
		<p>The <u>requirement of no net loss of trees is not possible onsite in some instances and requires clarification.</u> Policy 3.2.6.5 Requires that there be no net loss of trees as a result of development for all development applications within</p>	<p>Section 3.2.6.5 has been revised to encourage no net loss or compensation off site.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>Settlement Areas, including Site Plans, Plans of Subdivision and severances. Our client is not supportive of a private tree by-law or “requiring” private tree planting as it infringes on personal rights and freedoms. Additionally, having been involved in the implementation of the Town’s Heritage Walk vision, as part of the onset of the Town’s development expansion, including planting private trees, these efforts were abandoned due to significant resident objections. We request that the Town considers using a policy more in line with Policy 3.4.32 of the Region’s new OP.</p>	
		<p>Parkland Policies in Section 3.4 should be revised to reflect changes made to the Planning Act Policies 42(6.0.1) and 42(3) by Bill 23.</p>	<p>Parkland Policies in Section 3.4 have been revised to reflect the in force and effect changes made to the Planning Act Policies 42(6.0.1) and 42(3) by Bill 23.</p>
		<p>Potential credits for encumbered parkland such as dual use stormwater tanks and public or private parklands should be addressed in the OP for consistency with the Planning Act. Policy 3.4.1.13 outlines the circumstances under which the Town will not accept the conveyance of land for parkland dedication. Subpoint “f” precludes “any land containing an easement, encumbrance or right-of-use that Restricts the Town’s use of the land” from being conveyed. Under the proposed changes of Bill 23, encumbered parkland will be eligible for parkland credits, which would include parkland constructed on top of underground stormwater tanks, or dual-use facilities. This portion of Bill 23 is not yet in effect, but we request that Draft Official Plan be modified to prepare for these portions of Bill 23 coming into effect. Additionally, Parkland often provides a highly opportunistic palet for sustainable infrastructure such as LIDS which can be accommodate without impact to parks programing while allowing the Town to showcase its commitment to sustainable practices and land use efficiency.</p>	<p>Parkland Policies in Section 3.4 have been revised to reflect the in force and effect changes made to the Planning Act Policies 42(6.0.1) and 42(3) by Bill 23.</p>
		<p>Remove the requirement for developers to be responsible for the one-time replacement of the original parks equipment. (Policy 3.4.1.20)</p>	<p>Policy has been removed.</p>
		<p>The term “large-scale development” should be defined in the Official Plan. Policy 4.2.1.6 requires “planning for large-scale development in designated greenfield areas, including secondary plans, to be informed by a Subwatershed Plan or equivalent undertaken by the Town and/or a Conservation Authority.”</p>	<p>Policy 4.2.1.6 has been updated to clarify that Secondary Plans will be informed by a Subwatershed Plan.</p>
		<p>A more comprehensive explanation should be provided detailing when the requirement for a Block Plan is triggered, such as approximate area, multiple owners needing to share external service, etc.</p> <p>In our review of Section 7.2, there is a not an explanation for what triggers the Block Plan requirement. While a Block Plan could be expected as part of a project the scale of a Secondary Plan or a concession block where developer cost sharing agreements are required, inclusion of smaller scale, isolated development applications on this list is concerning particularly where a secondary plan has already prescribed the form of development and road locations.</p>	<p>Criteria and triggers for Blocks Plans included in Section 7.2.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>We request that the minimum FSI of 2.5 be removed from the Urban Medium Density Residential Area designation.</p> <p>Policy 6.4.3.2 c. requires a minimum FSI of 2.5 within this designation. For comparison, Sections 6.4.9.3 b) and 6.4.10.3 b) have Mid-Rise Apartment Buildings of 5-9 storeys requiring a minimum FSI of 2.5 in.</p> <p>We request that street townhouses be exempt from Site Plan Control in the OP, consistent with the Town's Site Plan Control By-Law. Policy 7.16.1.1 d. states that single detached, duplex, or semi-detached dwelling units are exempt from the Site Plan Control Process, in accordance with the Town's Site Plan Control By-law. <u>Under Section 4(a) of the Town's Site Plan Control By-law, link residential development and street townhouse development are also exempt from the Site Plan Control Process.</u></p>	<p>FSI requirements throughout the Official Plan have been updated to include 'generally' to allow for flexibility.</p> <p>The Site Plan Control policies updated to remove site plan control requirements for projects fewer than 10 residential units (Bill 23) and street townhomes.</p>
<p>12724 and 12822 Tenth Line</p> <p>SvN</p>		<p>Policy 3.4.3.16.8: This policy should be removed as park configuration should be determined by the proponent and based on unique site and environmental conditions.</p> <p><u>Request</u></p> <p>The Town strike a section of sub-policy 'a' (in bold) from the Official Plan.</p>	<p>Section 3.4.3.16.8 will be updated in accordance with Bill 23 and sub-policy 'a' deleted.</p>
		<p>Policies 2.22.3 & 3.1.1.13: These affordable housing targets are unrealistic for private sector developers without significant subsidies from the municipality. Further, they exceed the provisions for affordable housing within Inclusionary Zoning areas which is capped at 5%.</p> <p><u>Request</u></p> <p>The Town strike policy 2.2.2.3 from the Official Plan.</p> <p>The Town identify in the Official Plan what financial subsidies and incentives can be made available to developers to help reach these minimum targets.</p>	<p>Affordable housing targets are consistent with Section 1.4.7 of the York Region OP.</p>
		<p>Policies: 6.4.1.2.b.i-iii:</p> <p>These provisions (in bold: i-iii) effectively prevent the mixing of housing forms through a neighbourhood. Given that the housing forms noted are more affordable than detached and semi-detached dwellings these policies have the effect of creating lower-income pockets within a development and neighbourhood. The other policies and provisions of this plan are sufficient to protect for a compatible relationship between the permitted housing forms in the Neighbourhood Area and these policies are not needed in that regard.</p> <p><u>Request</u></p> <p>The Town strikes these policies (in bold), numbered i - iii, from the Official Plan</p>	<p>Policies 6.4.1.2.b.i-iii will be removed.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>Policies 6.4.1.2.b.v and 6.3.2.1: <u>Prescribing minimum and maximum densities are better prescribed in the zoning by-law than in the Official Plan. There are no options to permit minor and insignificant deviations from these policies except for an amendment to the Official Plan, which ought not to be triggered if a development conforms to the other applicable policies.</u> <u>These policies also create a situation of effectively prohibiting development forms between 1.51 and 2.49 FSI and there is no compelling rationale to prevent development of that density.</u> It also contradicts other policies that seek to create a transition in scale, density, and built form between land uses.</p> <p><u>Request</u> The Town strikes the policies (in bold) from the Official Plan. At a minimum, they should be refined to remove the contradictions with other policy objectives (i.e. permitting townhouse and apartment buildings between 1.51 and 2.49 FSI).</p>	<p>All FSI requirements have been updated to include 'generally' to allow for flexibility.</p>
C		<p>Policy 6.4.2.1.c-d: These policies are worded too strongly and do not allow flexibility in their interpretation. Further, the notion of a hard maximum density is inappropriate given the proximity to the MTSA.</p> <p>The minimum and maximum ranges for dwellings are needlessly narrow. The maximums should be increased to facilitate higher density and transit- supportive development.</p> <p>As currently worded these provisions are more restrictive than the current Official Plan policies for Stouffville.</p> <p><u>Request</u> These statements should be changed to allow flexibility in the interpretation of the maximum density: "...shall achieve a minimum density of xx units and should generally achieve a maximum of xx units..."</p> <p>Increase the maximum permitted density for detached and semi-detached units to 40 upnh and 60 upnh for townhouse and apartment dwellings.</p>	<p>Policy 6.4.2.1.c-d has been revised to provide increased densities and updated to include 'generally' to allow for flexibility.</p>
		<p>Policy 6.4.2.2.a: This policy (in bold italics) contradicts policy 6.4.2.1.c-d.</p> <p><u>Request</u> The policy contradiction needs to be addressed while allowing for more flexibility and slightly higher densities in these land use designations.</p>	<p>Noted. 6.4.2.2 applies to the Phase 3 lands.</p>
		<p>Policy 6.4.3.1.a: Elsewhere in the Official Plan, a distinction is made between townhouses and stacked townhouses. As a higher-density housing form (akin to an apartment building) stacked townhouses should be permitted.</p> <p><u>Request</u></p>	<p>Policy 6.4.3.1.a has been clarified to indicated that Townhouses should include all forms of towns.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p><u>Town Staff should clarify whether this policy is intended to also permit higher density townhouse forms and if so, add these as an explicitly permitted use.</u></p>	
<p>15681 Hwy 48, Ballantrae - Applewood Forming Inc.</p> <p>Dan Stone, Thorstone Consulting</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>Based on our review of the Draft Official Plan (Draft OP), we submit that there is <u>merit in including a special site-specific policy for the subject property under Section 6.10.6. of the Draft Official Plan.</u> This approach has been implemented in the Draft Official Plan under Section 6.10.6 for a number of properties throughout the rural areas of the Town, both within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside and for lands in the Oak Ridges Moraine. These properties have been extended site-specific policy permissions in the Draft OP to recognize and permit established uses and previously approved uses.</p> <p><u>Proposed Special Provision:</u></p> <p>6.10.6 Rural/Agricultural Areas</p> <p>6.10.6.1 Special Provision (SP-RA12): Part Lot 23, Concession 8 – 15681 Hwy #48</p> <p>Notwithstanding the provision of this section, the lands designated as “Special Policy Area SP-RA12” may be used for the operation of a building construction and general contracting business including office and showroom facilities and the outside storage of associated equipment and material. Any building expansion or addition or any site alteration shall require the submission of a Site Plan application under Section 41 of the Planning Act for the review and approval of the Town. In addition, other uses permitted shall include appropriate highway commercial and retail uses which are considered more compatible with the surrounding residential community of Ballantrae and are similar to or more in conformity with the provisions of this Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, subject to a Zoning Bylaw Amendment.</p>	<p>The Town’s Greenbelt Conformity exercise undertaken as part of this Official Plan recognized existing designations and carried forward the existing permissions through a Special Provision. Only in instances where a property straddled the Greenbelt Plan and ORMCP were these Special Provisions carried forward to apply to the entirety of the subject property. The Town’s ORMCP Conformity Amendment did not use this approach, and generally site specific provisions were not carried forward explicitly. Notwithstanding, such properties are still subject to the existing use policies of the ORMCP and the Town’s Official Plan, and permitted to continue as per the applicable policies.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed special provision will not be included.</p>
<p>3922 Vivian Road – Barraclough Property</p> <p>Dan Stone, Thorstone Consulting</p>	<p>January 23, 2023</p>	<p>The policy under Section 6.10.6.4 recognizes previously approved land uses in the Official Plan, however, <u>the structure and wording of the policy would appear to require a Zoning By-law Amendment prior to the development of the lands.</u> In consideration of the current approved zoning for the subject property, as confirmed by the Town, we submit that the OP Policy requirement for a Zoning By-law Amendment process prior to development is more restrictive the spirit and intent of the Transitional policies of the Greenbelt Plan as well as Section 7.4 of the Region of York Official Plan (2022).</p> <p>As we have indicated in our June 2022 submission and as set out in the Town’s Pre-consultation Report (file PRE21.080), the development of the subject lands for commercial recreational uses will require the submission, review and approval of a Site Plan application to address all technical requirements and environmental policies of the Town, the Region of York, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and the</p>	<p>Section 6.10.6.4 has been updated to remove ZBLA requirements.</p>

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		Greenbelt Plan. <u>We recommend and request that the policy be modified to provide better clarity for the future development of the lands.</u>	
		<p>Proposed Special Provision Re-wording:</p> <p>6.10.6.4 Special Provision (SP-RA4): 3922 Vivian Road Notwithstanding the policies of the Agricultural Area designation policies in Section 6.2.1 of this Plan, the following additional uses are permitted on the property located at 3922 Vivian Road: commercial recreation uses such as golf courses, campgrounds, fishing operations and fairgrounds as well as the uses set out in the CR zone and defined in the Zoning By-law 2010-010-ZO including related buildings and structures,</p> <p>Commercial recreation uses that are not specified or included in the current Zoning By-law but which are similar to or more in conformity with the provisions of this Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are also permitted, subject to a zoning by-law amendment. Residential uses are prohibited other than accessory residential dwellings to accommodate the owner, manager or other employees of the facility.</p> <p>Any development or site alteration of the lands for the permitted uses shall require the submission of a Site Plan application under Section 41 of the Planning Act for the review and approval of the Town.</p> <p>In closing, we recommend and request that the site-specific policy for the subject lands at 3922 Vivian Sideroad under Section 6.10.6.4 be modified as recommended above. The proposed policy modifications will confirm and provide clarity that the subject lands may be developed as proposed by the MastroGroup without the need for a further amendment to the Zoning By-law.</p>	Revisions have been proposed in Section 6.10.6.4.
11737 McCowan Road, Stouffville Willowgrove Farm Dan Stone, Thorstone Consulting	January 23, 2023	<p>We note that a number of site-specific policies have been proposed in the Draft New Official Plan under Section 6.10.6 Rural / Agricultural Areas. The following policy has been included in the December Draft of the New Official Plan. Willowgrove is proposing and requesting that the policy be modified as outlined in BOLD below to more closely protect for the continuation of existing permitted uses and activities on the Willowgrove property.</p> <p>6.10.6.9 Special Provision (SP-RA9): 11737 McCowan Road Notwithstanding the policies of this Plan to the contrary, the existing commercial recreation uses as set out in Section 6.4.6.1.1 of Zoning By-law 2010-001-ZO and as defined therein and the extension and expansion of such uses are permitted. Commercial recreation uses similar to or more in conformity with the provisions of this Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are also permitted, subject to a zoning by-law amendment. Residential uses are</p>	Continuation of agricultural uses will continue per Section 7.18 of the Draft Official Plan. Revisions have been proposed. Uses on adjacent properties will not be part of the Special Provision.

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		prohibited other than accessory residential dwellings to accommodate the owner, manager or other employees of the facility. In addition, the continuation and expansion of permitted agricultural and rural uses set out in the AG zone on adjacent lands in the same ownership is permitted.	
		For the MZO lands within the New Urban Areas, it is unclear whether any or all of the study requirements outlined in Section 2.4.6 and referenced above can be required. Based on our involvement with the developer group activities in the area, <u>we expect that the MESP will need to be finalized prior to Draft Plan approval for these lands and as such, a Secondary Plan, Block Plan or Community Energy Plan will be prepared for these lands. Please confirm.</u>	The MZO lands are unique, and therefore the Town does not believe the same requirements as the other expansion areas can be incorporated.
		We would request that the policy be modified as outlined in BOLD below. 2.4.6.13 Within New Urban Areas, until such time as the Secondary Plans are approved, normal farm practices and a full range of agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses shall be permitted and encouraged. In addition, for any lands within the New Urban Area designation which are adjacent to the Willowgrove lands subject to SP-RA9, development approvals and any Draft Plans of Subdivision under Section 51 of the Planning Act shall include design considerations to address land use compatibility with the abutting agricultural and commercial recreation uses including measures such as increased buffers, fencing and landscaping as well as warning clauses on title for the new residential uses to avoid conflict.	This is not appropriate to reference a site specific property here. The property owner needs to address their issues through the development process.
		In addition, the policy below is proposed and recommended to be added following the policies in Section 2.4.6.7 as it relates to the phasing and staging of growth and development within the New Urban Area designations. New(insert) following 2.4.6.7 The phasing and staging of development within the New Urban Area and the MZO lands and any associated MESP shall not rely on the Willowgrove lands for the purposes of the provision of infrastructure such as roads or stormwater facilities, and any community infrastructure such as community facilities, parks or school sites.	Servicing and infrastructure needs must be addressed through the MESP and any future Secondary Plan where required. This is to ensure orderly development and provision of required infrastructure. Future development may require cost-sharing and would be subject to landowner coordination policies.
		In addition, it is requested that an additional phasing and staging policy be included to allow for the ongoing Willowgrove Farm operations in the event of partial development of the property in terms of both access and servicing. We submit that it is appropriate to include polices that allow for partial development of the Willowgrove lands if such is deemed appropriate from the perspective of	The Town does not believe this is needed or appropriate as Willowgrove can partially development the land with the appropriate approvals. Any required Secondary Plans should address phasing and infrastructure requirements in detail.

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>planning for complete communities and supports other planning objectives for the Town.</p> <p>New(insert) following 2.4.6.7</p> <p>Notwithstanding the Special Policy Area designation SP-RA9 for the Willowgrove Farm property at 11737 McCowan Road, the orderly progression of phasing may include the development of portions of the Willowgrove property adjacent to the MZO lands provided that vehicular access is secured to ensure appropriate and suitable continued access to Willowgrove operations.</p>	
		<p>As it relates to water and sanitary servicing, we are requesting that the following Sub-Section be included in Section 2.4.6.7:</p> <p>g) that the MESP for the New Urban Areas with MZO areas shall include the necessary infrastructure sizing and capacity to allow for the full build-out of all lands within the MESP study area including both the developable portions of the Willowgrove lands as well as the existing institutional and rural commercial uses on these lands. Further, the phasing and staging of the design and construction of water and sanitary infrastructure may provide for the early servicing of the Willowgrove lands, subject to cost-sharing through the Developer Agreement and any other required Agreement with the Town.</p>	<p>This will be addressed through general policies related to servicing and phasing in the New Urban Areas in Section 2.4.6.</p>
		<p>Section 7.2.1.3 makes reference to the “Framework Plan”. This reference is difficult to understand and interpret in the absence of any policies which speak to or define the Framework Plan. It is suggested that the Framework Plan terminology be removed from the policy.</p>	<p>This policy can be amended to ‘Highway 48 Framework Plan’ for added clarity.</p>
<p>7 Brillinger Industrial Place, Gormley</p> <p>Robert Schickedanz, FarSight Homes</p>	<p>January 24, 2023</p>	<p>Comments on environmental features on subject lands.</p>	<p>Schedule H – Gormley Land Use Designations has been updated to show no environmental features on the subject land.</p>
<p>12072 Woodbine Avenue</p>	<p>January 11, 2023</p>	<p>It is our request that the subject lands are redesignated to the ‘Neighbourhood Area’ land use designation which will allow for the existing use of the property to conform to the Draft Official Plan and maintain its function as a residential parcel. It is acknowledged that although legal non-conforming uses are permitted and</p>	<p>Town not supportive of changing the designation to residential. Existing use provisions would continue to apply.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
Kayly Robbins, Weston Consulting		<p>recognized in the Draft Official Plan, the subject lands are subject to additional limitations with regard to how the existing uses can be redeveloped or altered.</p> <p>We request a review of the enclosed land conversion request (Section 2.2.5.9. of Growth Plan) prior to Council Adoption of the Draft Official Plan.</p>	
11715, 11726 & 11865 Kennedy Road Billy Tung, KLM Planning	December 21, 2022	<p>From our initial review, we are concerned with draft policies that may cause undue delay in the planning and development of these lands. One such example is Policy 2.4.6.3, which holds off on the preparation and approval of new Secondary Plans for Designated Greenfield Areas until the Town achieves its intensification target as a minimum average for five years.</p>	<p>Policies are consistent with York Region OP. For example, Town Draft OP policy 2.4.6.3 is consistent with York Region OP policy 4.2.29 (b).</p> <p>2.5.2.2 a) A minimum Built-Up Area annual residential intensification rate of 25%, which equates to 4,200 residential units from 2016 through to 2051;</p>
Property at Sam's Way and Rougeview Avenue Mallory Nievas, Weston Consulting	January 5, 2023	<p>A meeting with Town staff, Hena Kabir and Kathryn Jones, and the prospective owners, GLC PharmaTech Inc., was held on December 21, 2022 to raise the issue of the draft Official Plan designation and <u>the potential removal of the existing land use permissions for medical office use</u>. Town staff advised that the matter would be brought to the Policy team responsible for the Official Plan Review and that the necessary adjustments would be made to the draft Official Plan to allow for the continuation of medical office use permissions for the subject lands. Weston Consulting provided an email follow up to Town staff on January 3, 2023 summarizing discussions <u>and was assured that the required amendments would be implemented and that formal comments could be provided to the Policy team responsible for the Official Plan Review</u>. As such, please accept this letter as our formal comments, on behalf of our client.</p>	<p>The revised OP proposes to designate the lands south of Sam's Way as Business Park as opposed to Industrial. The Business Park designation permits medical office and ancillary uses.</p>
		<p>We request that in light of previous discussions between our client and the Town regarding the proposed medical office use and the forthcoming Site Plan Approval application, that the schedules and/or policies of the 2nd Draft New Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan be amended to allow for the continuation of the existing land use permissions for office/medical office use and ancillary retail for a minimum of 10% of gross floor area. We appreciate your attention to this matter.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
5262, 5270, 5286, 5318 Main Street, and 12371 Highway 48	January 9, 2023	<p>Parkland -Request some more clarity regarding how determination is made with respect to taking parkland vs. requesting CIL. Suggest some criteria be provided in OP.</p>	<p>Parkland policies have been updated in accordance with in effect requirements of Bill 23. Further to the comments noted, this level of detail should be addressed through the Parkland Dedication By-law.</p>

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
Adam Layton, Evans Planning		- Need additional criteria for different forms of parks based on Bill 23 (POPs, strata parks, etc.)	
		Some discrepancy between land use name on Schedule D-3 and land use policies. Suggest clarifying whether policies of 6.4.3 and 6.4.4 apply, or add a separate section for the land use name on D-3. Urban High Density Residential Area policies (6.4.4) does not include min. or max. densities.	D-3 now removes Medium-High Density Residential Area designation and only includes Urban High Density Residential Area.
		Request clarification as to whether densities are based on gross or net site area.	New definitions for FSI and Lot Area have been proposed consistent with the zoning by-law. FSI is calculated based on the gross lot area.
		Some concerns with having a minimum density of 5.0 FSI for gateway mixed use lands. May exceed height limits and run into issues with water table precluding underground parking – Likely doesn't impact current applications, but may impact SPA processes.	Noted. Revised to include 'generally' 5.0 FSI
		Floodplain focus area 1 may have been impacted by MTO works (now completed). Will schedule separate meeting with Town Engineering and Planning Staff to review same.	Noted. The TRCA floodplain mapping has been updated, to be included in revised draft OP.
		Stronger policies needed to ensure landowner agreements and cost sharing are required for entirety of gateway study area before development can occur.	Section 6.4.9.10 states that in order to ensure any costs associated with the Comprehensive Studies are equitably distributed among all landowners, development within the Gateway Mixed Use Area may only be permitted to proceed by the Town when the landowners in the Gateway Mixed Use Area have entered into a cost sharing agreement or agreements among themselves to address the distribution of costs associated with the Comprehensive Studies in a fair and equitable manner
		Suggest Town needs to have a more active role in administering cost sharing	Noted.
		Still some <u>confusion as to how the adopted UD Guidelines for the gateway area would mesh with the UD policies in the new OP given that future site plan control applications would be subject to new OP.</u>	Section 3.5 of the OP establishes urban design policies and implements the objectives of relevant guidelines. As per 6.4.9.3, regard is to be had to the applicable urban design guidelines, which includes the Main Street UDGs and the Gateway Urban Design guidelines.
		Requested that policies in OP and guidelines themselves remain high level and flexible, without specified figures/requirements.	Noted.
		Road connection to Highway 48 Not shown in OP. Request that this be included with sufficient flexibility with respect to location	Current Schedule F2 does not identify a connection to Highway 48, The location of any proposed road connection should be determined through the development approvals and subject to MTO requirements.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		Suggest need for incentives for development of IZ units – such as waiving application fees, parking requirements, development charges, etc.	The implementation of an Inclusionary Zoning By-law would be subject to future study.
Walmart (SmartCentres) Tim Smith, Urban Strategies Inc.	January 23, 2023	The introduction to Section 6.4.8 states that <u>“Growth will be accommodated in mixed-use buildings with retail functions at-grade, while the area’s existing retail and service commercial function will be maintained and significantly expanded over time.”</u> This statement could be read as suggesting that all growth will take the form of mixed-use buildings, which we do not believe is the intent given the <u>direction to support the Regional Retail Area’s function as a retailing node serving a broad regional market.</u> To help clarify the intent, we would suggest replacing the sentence quoted above with the following: “Growth will be accommodated in mixed-use buildings with retail functions at grade. In addition, the area’s existing retail, service and commercial function will be maintained and may significantly expand over time through stand-alone commercial uses, along with retail functions provided in mixed-use buildings.”	Section 6.4.8 will be revised to “Growth will be accommodated in mixed-use buildings with retail functions at grade. In addition, the area’s existing retail, service and commercial function will be maintained and may significantly expand over time through stand-alone commercial uses, along with retail functions provided in mixed-use buildings.”
		As noted above, we support the revisions that provide flexibility regarding the types and sizes of commercial uses. For further clarity, we suggest replacing “large retail stores” and “small-scale commercial and retail uses” in the list of permitted uses with simply “retail stores, including grocery, liquor and beer stores”. This should prevent any uncertainty when medium-size or common specialized stores are proposed	Section 6.4.8.1 will be updated to remove size indicators and to state ‘retail and commercial uses’ as permitted uses.
		Development Policies 6.4.8.3(a)-(e) focus on mixed-use development, implying that the growth of retail and residential uses will proceed in parallel through coordinated developments. In our opinion, significant commercial development is likely to precede significant residential development, given the area’s role as a retail destination serving a fast-growing municipality. However, <u>the Draft Official Plan continues to tie retail growth to mixed-used development through a retail replacement policy and a seemingly arbitrary requirement for 38 square metres of non-residential GFA per dwelling unit (Policies 6.4.8.3(e)(i) and (ii)). Having no basis in an analysis of a reasonable ratio of retail space to residential density in the area and how it would best be achieved, this requirement should be deleted.</u> Furthermore, the requirement in Policy 6.4.8.3(a) for all mixed-use buildings to have non-residential uses on the ground floor is not reasonable. As stated in our previous comments, retail or other non-residential uses on the ground floor of all residential buildings across the Regional Retail Area would not be viable or appropriate. Together, the strict retail requirement policies in the Draft OP will discourage intensification and urbanization of the area. A more appropriate policy approach in the context of an expanding retail node would be to establish a range or target for the optimal amount of commercial space within the area, together	This policy has been removed.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		with a schedule of required locations for retail, as the basis for minimum retail requirements. This should be done through a block planning process.	
		Policy 6.4.8.3(b) establishes a height limit of 20 storeys but also states that the height of buildings will be established through a Block Plan. We see an <u>opportunity over time for buildings of varying heights across the Regional Retail Area, above and below 20 storeys. An analysis at the block planning stage should determine appropriate height limits and not be constrained by an arbitrary limit in the Official Plan. We therefore suggest removing the 20-storey limit.</u>	The term 'generally' has been added to provide flexibility where appropriate.
		The requirement in Policy 6.4.8.3(d) for a minimum density of 2.5 FSI in the Regional Retail Area further implies that all future development is expected to take a multi-storey, mixed-use form and effectively prohibits stand-alone retail and office development. This policy should be revised to clarify that the minimum 2.5 FSI requirement applies to mixed-use development only.	FSI requirements throughout the Official Plan have been updated to include 'generally' to allow for increased flexibility.
		Later policies in Section 6.4.8, notably 6.4.8.3(h), indicate that stand-alone retail buildings are permitted in the Regional Retail Area. It may be inferred, however, from the policy focus on mixed-use development that all development is expected to take this form and stand-alone retail buildings are not appropriate, or at least discouraged. To avoid any uncertainty, <u>we request that the new Official Plan retain the statement in Policy 7.6.8.5 of the previous draft explicitly permitting retail and service commercial uses in stand-alone buildings.</u>	Section 6.4.8 will be revised to "Growth will be accommodated in mixed-use buildings with retail functions at grade. In addition, the area's existing retail, service and commercial function will be maintained and may significantly expand over time through stand-alone commercial uses, along with retail functions provided in mixed-use buildings."
		Regarding Policy 6.4.8.3(h), specifically subpoints (i)-(iii), <u>the desired features of retail development are based on sound urban design principles.</u> However, how the five features listed are to be achieved may be interpreted in different ways, based on the policy's language. To ensure they are not interpreted as requirements to be satisfied in a certain way, we suggest they be identified as general expectations or matters to be addressed in future urban design guidelines.	The implementation of the urban design requirements can be further addressed and discussed during Site Plan Control.
		We note the requirement in Policy 6.4.8.3(l) for a Block Plan process where residential uses are introduced in the Regional Retail Area. We agree that a Block Plan is the appropriate instrument to provide direction regarding building heights and built form generally; community amenities and other infrastructure; and the full range of urban design matters that affect a neighbourhood. It should also identify the required locations for retail uses while ensuring future residential development is compatible with existing and future big-box development. Given the important role of a Block Plan in guiding the area's evolution toward a mixed-use destination, we suggest moving Policies 6.4.8.3(l), along with 6.4.8.3(m), to the front of Section 6.4.8.3	Block planning requirements will defer to section 7.2 policies which clearly outline the requirements.

**Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Official Plan Review
Public Comment Matrix (3rd Draft Official Plan, June 2023)**

Name	Date	2nd Draft OP Comments	3rd Draft OP Response
		<p>Finally, consistent with our comments above relating to the important role of stand-alone commercial uses within the Regional Retail Area, we would ask that policy 6.4.8.3(m) be modified to state, "While the Regional Retail Area may continue to develop with stand-alone commercial uses to support the objective of maintaining and expanding the area's retail, service and commercial function, the Town will promote future growth to be accommodated in mixed use buildings where the retail functions are accommodated at-grade." This simple change would go a long way to addressing our fundamental concern with the revised policies.</p>	<p>Section 6.4.8 will be revised to "Growth will be accommodated in mixed-use buildings with retail functions at grade. In addition, the area's existing retail, service and commercial function will be maintained and may significantly expand over time through stand-alone commercial uses, along with retail functions provided in mixed-use buildings."</p>
<p>5832 Main St. Stouffville</p> <p>Rick Sutherland, Sutherland's Aluminum Ltd.</p>	<p>March 14, 2023</p>	<p>I am writing today as we have a huge concern about the new OP Western Approach 6.4.132 and how it will affect our property. I read this a few times before it actually sunk in as it indicates that <u>New Gas Bars, Car Washes and Automotive Services will be Prohibited under my current zoning.</u></p> <p>I hope when you read this you will understand and appreciate where our site is located and our reason for this letter.</p> <p>We own a vacant property at 5832 Main Street in Stouffville. We bought the property from Shell Canada a number of years ago with the intent to develop it as the Town grows. One of the reasons we purchased it was the Zoning and Permitted uses allowed for a Car Wash and Automotive Service uses. We felt and still feel this is a good fit being directly beside a Gas Bar with a possible Duel Access. I understand if the permitted use for a Car Wash and Automotive Service use is Prohibited from our site we would have to do an OPA in the future which we honestly feel is unfair especially for our site, location and our conversations I have had with the town for this use.</p> <p>We are asking for a Special Provision to allow our site at 5832 Main Street Stouffville to continue the permitted use for a Car Wash and Automotive Service uses.</p>	<p>Per Section 6.10.1.16, Special Provision SP-16 has been added which permits car wash and automotive service uses to be permitted on the subject land.</p>