

## 23-203-CD Appendix C – Public Comments Matrix

Commenter	Comment	Applicable Plan	Nature of Comment	Response
Trevor Hawkins/ Meghan Lippert, MHBC on behalf of Camrich Holdings Ltd.- 311 Dundas Street South	<p>lands within the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation are intended to provide transition in height, massing, scale and form between higher density developments in the Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density designation and surrounding lower density residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Section 19.6.4 'Height and Density' of the Draft Secondary Plan (it is assumed this section numbering is an error as the preceding subsection is 19.3.3.4) proposes a minimum building height of 3 storeys and maximum building height of 8 storeys for lands within the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation. This represents a 25% reduction in the minimum building height and a 33% reduction in the maximum building height as compared with the Official Plan. Further comments are provided below regarding an appropriate building height for the subject lands.</p>	Main and Dundas	Clarity/ revisions in height and density; policy numbering/ referencing corrections	Table 3 of existing OP provides min and max densities and heights including a min of 4 storeys and max of 12 storeys for Nodes in the built-up area. The secondary plan updates the general policies of the OP, including new min and max heights for a range of designations that make up the Community Node.
	<p>We recognize that through the preparation of the second draft of the Secondary Plan the height, density and use permissions for the subject lands have generally been more closely aligned with the Community Node policies of the Official Plan. Notwithstanding the general alignment with the Official Plan, as noted earlier, the subject lands are permitted significantly less height. Given that the subject lands are located on two Major Arterial roads, are sufficiently sized to accommodate transitions in</p>		Clarity/ revisions in height and density, designation/ mapping changes	Proposed designation has been revised as requested.

Commenter	Comment	Applicable Plan	Nature of Comment	Response
	height, and are adjacent to a proposed Major Gateway, we request that staff designate the portion of the subject lands identified as 'Active Frontage' on Schedule D as Mixed-Use Mid-Rise High Density on Schedule B- Land Use Plan (see Figure 1 herein). This would permit up to 12 storeys along these two major roads, with the balance of the site permitted 8 storeys, allowing for a transition in height and massing within the site, towards the low-rise neighbourhood to the east.			
	With respect to permitted density, it would be appreciated if staff can confirm a maximum 2.0 FSI remains permitted for the subject lands, as the draft Secondary Plan does not appear to clarify minimum or maximum densities for individual proposed land use designations. In the absence of specific policies in the Secondary Plan, we understand that the Official Plan policies prevail.		Clarity/ confirmation in FSI permissions	Proposed plan includes minimum density targets with maximum density to be a functional limitation driven by development standards in zoning.
Les Kadar, Garden Gate Ltd.	most important factor is the timeline of the closing date for public input in January which to me is not acceptable and not just because of Christmas holidays and for many January holidays as well, but as an overall policy. Far too short a period to obtain educated responses from a non-professional public especially for such a monstrous long range project and life altering impacts. the public needs a fair shake at expressing concerns, providing educated input and the feeling that being consulted was just that, consulted and their opinions weighed into the	Non-specific	Timing	Timeframe has been extended

Commenter	Comment	Applicable Plan	Nature of Comment	Response
	mix. This cannot be done in the timeline established at this point.			
Bell Canada	<p>Moving forward, Bell Canada would like to continue to ensure that the landowners are aware and familiar with our conditions as they pertain to forthcoming Site Plans, Draft Plans of Subdivision and/or Draft Plans of Condominium as follows:</p> <p>Condition:            “The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell. The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost.”</p> <p>The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at <a href="mailto:planninganddevelopment@bell.ca">planninganddevelopment@bell.ca</a> during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development. It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada’s existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the even that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure. If the Owner elects not to pay for the</p>	General/ Non-specific	Condition for agreements	Noted

Commenter	Comment	Applicable Plan	Nature of Comment	Response
	above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.			
	Bell Canada understands the City's desire to support high quality urban design through built form to enhance the appearance and livability of its urban areas. We strive to minimize the impact of our infrastructure, however with the evolving nature of telecommunication/communication technology it is not always possible for a number of reasons, and appreciate the opportunity to work with the City to find solutions that align as much as possible with the municipality's urban design interests in principle, where feasible.		Consider urban design solutions for telecommunications/ communications technology in instances where meeting urban design guidelines or policies may not be possible	Noted – will require further consideration from staff.
	We do note, significant future investment in an LRT for Hespeler Road, and would request that Bell be circulated on this future project as details become available in order to assess the impacts on our existing plant/equipment, in particular costs for relocation or opportunities for future network provisioning.		Request to be notified/ informed	Noted
Waterloo Catholic District School Board	Requests for further discussion and meetings with school board representatives to understand population/ unit projections to assist in school accommodation planning	General/ Non-specific		Staff have and will continue to meet with School Board staff as additional growth management data becomes available.
Verbal, at public meeting	Concern with shrinking size of condo units and the impacts on an aging population; and, requests to include policies that would require developers to provide a range of unit layouts that are large enough	General/ Non-specific		Noted

Commenter	Comment	Applicable Plan	Nature of Comment	Response
	to accommodate accessible design standards (for example, ensuring washrooms, hallways/ living spaces are large enough to accommodate wheelchairs)			
	Concerns with eroding housing affordability and impacts on future residents; and, requests to include policies that would require developers to ensure affordable ownership and rental options are provided in every development			Noted
	Concerns with traffic congestion and levels of heavy truck transportation along the corridor and potential for worsening conditions as the areas intensify/ redevelop			Noted
	Requests for clarity on locations for schools and whether any school sites have been identified, with a desire to ensure there are policies to permit schools within the secondary plan areas			Ongoing discussion with School boards
	Questions about implications of Bill 23 on the secondary plan process and other future planning processes			Ongoing review
	Questions about how density will be regulated given the absence of floor space index or units per hectare metrics in the policies			Height and urban design policies can work together to address community building objectives in the absence of density permissions such as UPH and FSI

Commenter	Comment	Applicable Plan	Nature of Comment	Response
	<p>Questions about mechanisms and tools available to incentivize change/ what if landowners are content to keep existing uses and do not want to redevelop</p> <p>Concern with limited setbacks along the street edge and impacts of proximity to road infrastructure on residents in new buildings- have there been any health impact studies/ noise impact studies/ vibration studies completed that demonstrate the minimal setbacks are safe/ adequate/ appropriate for residents?</p>			<p>Existing uses that don't conform to the plan would become legal non-conforming and redevelopment would have to conform to the policies of the secondary plan and Official Plan.</p>