

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
1	<p>DATE: November 21, 2013</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Rose Super 48 Sales</p> <p>LOCATION: 215 Rivermede Rd.</p>	<p>a. That the proposed development will increase traffic and gridlock in the area, particularly in the surrounding side streets. Believes access to the Liberty site should come from the north, and that the intersection at Highway 7 is not feasible.</p>	<p>a. Through the study process it has been determined that there will be the need to introduce a phasing program to permit the orderly development of the area over the long term, which will provide for coordination of transportation improvements with subsequent phases, beyond phase 1. Phasing of development, particularly in Area 1, will be necessary to allow for improvements to be implemented to respond to the increased demand on the road network. Phasing policies for Area 1 are set out in the main body of the report under the section “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan”, subheading c) “Development Phasing”. Certain improvements will be required through Phase 1, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of accesses to the public road system, satisfactory the City and Region in respect of their number, design and location. (e.g. a road connection to the north to Ortona Court) - A VivaNext BRT stop to serve the Secondary Plan area; - Transportation Demand Measures to support transit use. <p>The subsequent phases will be subject to a more detailed study. It is recommended that this be carried out by the City, in consultation with York Region, which will establish the maximum amount of supportable gross floor area and mix of uses that will be permitted to support each</p>	<p>a. It is recommended that the changes identified in the main body of the report, under the section “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan” in paragraphs b) “Building Heights and Density” and c) “Development Phasing” be approved.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>b. Where will the parking for all of the residential and office uses go? There appears to be substantial need given the densities proposed in the application.</p> <p>c. City should confirm ownership of the bridge in question.</p> <p>d. Wants to see a pedestrian connection from the Liberty site to the proposed Transitway station.</p>	<p>subsequent phase, including the coordination of the necessary transportation improvements. The resulting phasing plan will be implemented through the development review process, including a Development Concept Report, the draft plan of subdivision and implementing zoning by-law. It is recognized that a range of improvements to the local road network and the transit network will be required over time. The phasing provisions of the Plan provide the basis for timing growth to improvements in the Transportation system.</p> <p>b. Parking on the Liberty Development site (Area 1) will be determined through the development approval process and zoning. These will be guided by parking policies included in the plan (Section 4.5) and City standards, as contained in the zoning by-law. It is the intention that the majority of parking in the High-Rise Mixed Use area will be underground or in parking structures.</p> <p>c. The Bridge is owned by Metrolinx.</p> <p>d. Schedule G, "Pedestrian and Cycling Network" shows a pedestrian crossing over Highway 7, from Area 1 on the north to the south side of Highway 7, which would provide direct pedestrian</p>	<p>b. No change is recommended.</p> <p>c. No change is required.</p> <p>d. No change is recommended.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			access to the Transitway station to the south.	
2	<p>DATE: November 22, 2013</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Concord West Ratepayers Association</p> <p>LOCATION: 18 Southview Drive</p>	<p>a. The separation of the Transitway element from GO and VivaNext facilities will not be a viable strategy.</p> <p>b. That the Technical Advisory Committee meetings did not provide clear guidance from Metrolinx on a number of matters: removal of the rail bridge, which is interpreted here as a heritage bridge; timing of the Transitway; restricting the double-tracking of the Go rail line from the south side of Highway 7.</p>	<p>a. The Concord GO Centre Secondary Plan provides direction to the relevant transit agencies as to the City's preference for transit connections in the Secondary Plan Area. Schedule E of the Secondary Plan provides for a Potential Transit Hub (modified to a Mobility Hub in the latest version) centred on Highway 7. While the approved 407 Transitway EA establishes the location of the potential Transitway, the location of a GO Rail platform still must be established by an EA. The plan clearly supports the central location of the Mobility Hub at Highway 7 and the Rail line intersection. If the Transitway Station is maintained at the current location, there will be the need to ensure that there are good pedestrian connections between each of the three modes of transit.</p> <p>b. Through the Technical Advisory Committee, the City raised these issues and others communicated through public meetings with Metrolinx and other pertinent authorities. It is noted that many of these issues are process driven. The location of the GO Rail station and the Twin Tracking of the line will be the subject of Metrolinx Environmental Assessment(s). It has been determined that the existing bridge is</p>	<p>No additional recommendations have been provided in respect of these responses. Many of the issues raised here have been addressed in the main body of the report in the section entitled "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan".</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>c. That the greenspace located south of Highway 7 is not shown in green on the final 5 schedules of the draft plan.</p> <p>d. That the City is not being compensated with amenities in proportion to the amount of High-Rise Mixed Use east of the GO rail line.</p>	<p>not a “Heritage Bridge”. Metrolinx advised that the timing of the EA for the full Twin-Tracking (to permit 2-way, all day service) and the Station has not been determined as yet. Also, the timing of the Transitway has not been determined as yet. It will need to be budgeted, and go through detail design, permitting and construction. Therefore, it is well into the future.</p> <p>c. The greenspace referred to in area 6 is located in lands that are properly identified as Parkway Belt West lands, which is consistent with VOP 2010. It is noted that notwithstanding the Parkway Belt West designations, the schedules show the Natural Area designations that are consistent with VOP 2010. This is shown on Schedules B, C, F and G.</p> <p>d. The Parkland Dedication policies in the Concord GO Centre Secondary Plan are consistent with the objectives of VOP 2010. The Plan has been amended to provide for a Neighbourhood park and public square, totalling 3 hectares. Other public amenities can be determined through the development review process. Policy 10.1.1.9 provides that the City may require the preparation of additional studies including a community services needs assessment and/or a public art delivery strategy as part of the Development Concept Report, or in</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>e. Want to see the 407 Transitway B5 trajectory shown in the draft plan.</p> <p>f. There needs to be a rationale for a Transit Hub designation, given an unclear timeline for the GO station, if development is to proceed.</p>	<p>the case of an individual application, as determined through the pre-consultation meeting. Application of Section 37 of the Planning Act is also a potential tool for securing public benefits.</p> <p>e. That option was considered and rejected through the Environmental Assessment Process. The recent comments of MTO have also rejected further consideration of any alternatives to the currently approved EA. Staff continues to recommend that the further consideration of routing and station alternatives take place in conjunction with related EA processes and, should they occur, reviews of the EA.</p> <p>f. The designation of this area as a Transit Hub has been in existence since OPA 660 (approved in 2008), as a part of Vaughan’s urban structure hierarchy. The Plan has been amended to change the Potential Transit Hub to a Potential Mobility Hub. This is discussed in the main body of the report “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan”, paragraph f) “Replacing the Term “Potential Transit Hub” with “Potential Mobility Hub”. While there has not been an EA completed for the GO Rail station component of the hub, VivaNext services are already in the construction phase along Highway 7, in addition to the approved EA for the</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>g. The policies provided in the draft plan's implementation section are too mild and should be reflected in the schedules.</p>	<p>407 Transitway station. The Transit Hub is further supported by VOP 2010 which designates this area as a Local Centre, building on policies already in force through OPA 660 allowing for high density development and facilitating investment in transit infrastructure. This is also consistent with the intent of the provincial Growth Plan and the Metrolinx Big Move plan.</p> <p>g. This plan reflects a fundamentally different approach to how change should occur. Schedule E of the Concord GO Centre Secondary Plan is a reflection of the vision of the City for the area, and also incorporates approved plans that are beyond the jurisdiction of the City. While the City cannot compel higher levels of government to change course, as is the case for the current transitway approval, it has the opportunity to provide a compelling land use vision for the area. Imbedded in this Plan are the indications of the City's intent for the future. Substantial portions of this vision and the preferences for the future are reflected in text. The means of achieving these objectives would be through emerging processes that would normally take place over time. . Section 8.2 of the Secondary Plan identifies the City's priorities and vision for transit facilities and infrastructure, while Section 8.3 outlines that phasing of development must be tied to the provision of transit</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>h. Policy 8.2.3.3.e of the draft plan discourages commuter parking, but it is not clear where parking for the Liberty site will be located.</p> <p>i. Wants policy 8.2.3.2.a to assert that the GO rail double tracking will not occur south of highway 7.</p>	<p>and transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>h. Parking on the Liberty Development site (Area 1) will be determined through the development approval process and zoning. These will be guided by parking policies included in the plan (Section 4.5) and City standards, as contained in the zoning by-law. It is the intention that the majority of parking in the High-Rise Mixed Use area will be underground or in parking structures.</p> <p>i. GO Rail has indicated that it will be double tracking in this area. This project is not under the jurisdiction of the City. It is expected that there will be two EA's pertaining to double-tracking. The initial study, which is underway, pertains to a twin tracking to achieve short term operating improvements. A broader Twin-Tracking study will take place as part of the introduction of the two-way, all-day service. It would be inappropriate to take a position on this matter without knowing the impact of not supporting twin tracking in this area. It is understood that these improvements will be critical to establishing the long term upgrades leading to two-way all-day service. Supporting a restriction on twin tracking in this area could be something that that has system-wide impacts which may affect this important long-term goal.</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>j. Wants policies 8.2.1, 8.2.3.1, 8.2.3.2.b, 8.2.3.3.i, and 8.2.3.5.b to refer to the GO rail station as being built on the north side of Highway 7</p> <p>k. Wants policies 8.2.3.6.f and 8.2.3.6.g to include the greenspace located in the Parkway Belt, as well as a connection to this space for the Concord West Community</p>	<p>j. The Plan provides for the refocussing of the potential GO Rail station on Highway 7, with Policy 8.2.5 b) providing for the station to potentially straddle Highway 7. It does not preclude the station going farther north, if warranted to achieve an appropriate level of connectivity to other transit and road network elements and the surrounding land uses. This is discussed further in the main body of the report in "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph i) Location of the potential GO Rail station.</p> <p>k. The greenspace being referred to is currently in the Parkway Belt West Plan, and is not under the jurisdiction of the City. It is noted that this space is designated as Inter-urban Transit under the Parkway Belt West plan. Nor can the City compel the province to release this greenspace from its planned transit project. However, policy 8.2.3.6.f indicates that the City has an interest in acquiring this land for open space and green infrastructure purposes should any such lands be deemed surplus by the province. A "Potential Pedestrian Crossing" of the Rail Line, west of Rockview Gardens has been identified, as well, in the long-term, subject to bridge improvements, a connection from the west along Highway 7, to a future connection into</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>i. The draft plan does not include the original configuration for the 407 Transitway GO Barrie station</p> <p>m. Schedule E shows the Transitway trajectory and GO station that are proposed by MTO despite the draft plan's modification of the Transit Hub</p> <p>n. The community was not in favour of the proposed Highway 7 intersection at the January 30, 2013 Public Meeting, however it is still shown in the draft plan schedules</p>	<p>the valley system, through a "Multi-Use Trail".</p> <p>i. While it is shown on the Transitway Study, it would still be subject to a separate EA process which would actually determine its location, which would be conducted at a later date.</p> <p>m. The Transitway alignment and station are subject to an approved Environmental Assessment and can be reflected as a transit facility in the plan. The schedules have been modified to only show the approved transitway alignment on Schedule E – Transit Network. It is noted that the MTO will be making an application to amend the Parkway Belt West Plan, to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, to reflect any changes to the Plan resulting from the approval of the plan. This is discussed further in the main body of the report in "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph g) The Highway 407 Transitway Station and Alignment.</p> <p>n. This matter was discussed with the Region of York, the Province, and the study teams' transportation consultant, it was confirmed that this location is the only place along Highway 7 that provides safe sightlines and access to the north and south sides of Highway 7. It is also noted that the provisions for second</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>o. The potential east-west connection shown over the Liberty site crosses over an ecologically sensitive pinetree woodlot</p> <p>p. Prefer residential uses southwest of Highway 7 and the GO Rail line; disagrees with the "Low-Rise Mixed Use" designation</p>	<p>access to Area 1 on the north side of Highway 7 will be addressed through the phased development policies recommended in this plan.</p> <p>o. The Future Road Connections shown in the Secondary Plan are conceptual in nature and will require an EA to determine the best and most ecologically sensitive alignment. Staff concur that the crossing of the valley with a bridge structure should not be a priority consideration. For this reason, the schedules have been amended to delete the easterly leg of the "Proposed New Road Link".</p> <p>p. Area 4 is seen as a transition area in the plan between the higher density uses to the northeast and has a maximum height of 4 storeys and density of 1.8 FSI, which represents a transition into the Low Rise Area, which typically have building heights of 9 m. The intention for this area is stated in Policy 3.2.5 which provides: "Notwithstanding its status as one of the four quadrants of the "Potential Mobility Hub" designated around the junction of Highway 7, the Barrie GO Rail Line and the Highway 407 Transitway, the primary function of this area is to act as a transitional use between the surrounding, and potentially more intensive uses to the north and north east."</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>q. Disagrees with the “High-Rise Mixed Use” designation east of the GO rail line on both sides of Highway 7</p> <p>r. The proposed heights in the Liberty application (32, 33, and 38) are too high and encroaches into public and natural spaces</p> <p>s. The draft plan does not refer to the MTO lands as being a part of the Upper West</p>	<p>q. The heights and density shown in the secondary plan have been spread evenly over each site, and do not prescribe how these must be arranged. The provision of density and heights is managed through the development approval process, in accordance with the policies of this plan. There is precedent for High-Rise Mixed-Use from the currently in-force OPA 660, which designates the area as a Local Centre and provides for densities of a minimum of 3.5 FSI. This has been maintained in the recommended plan. However, it will be allocated in accordance with a phasing plan. These matters are discussed in the main body of the report under the section “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan”, subheadings b) “Height and Density” and c) “Development Phasing”.</p> <p>r. The heights noted are taken from the development application for Area 1, The Secondary Plan maintains a 22 storey maximum heights with the potential additional height up to 27 storeys, with bonusing for community benefits under Section 37 of the Planning Act. See main body of report in “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan” under Paragraph b) Building Height.</p> <p>s. The valley system through this area is a part of the Natural Heritage Network</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>Don River sub-watershed, while it is referred to as “Existing Natural Cover” and “Terrestrial Natural Heritage System” in the Don River Watershed Plan</p> <p>t. The open space shown on the Liberty site in Schedule F abuts the rail line and is unsafe.</p>	<p>as shown on Schedule 2 – Natural Heritage Network of VOP 2010. The Natural Heritage Network is made up of a number of core features including valley and stream corridors. The limits of such areas are determined in consultation with the TRCA.</p> <p>t. Such lands will only be considered as a buffer and would not be programmed as Public Park space or be eligible to be considered for dedication as parkland. It is noted that all buildings must respect building setbacks from the rail tracks being 30m where a berm is provided.</p>	
3	<p>DATE: November 23, 2013</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Dan McDermott Sierra Club Ontario</p> <p>LOCATION: 550 Bayview Ave.</p>	<p>a. Would like to see transportation hub infrastructure built north of Highway 7</p> <p>b. Requests that the Don headwaters be given the Urban River Valley designation</p>	<p>a. The final design and layout of the proposed transit hub will be the result of future feasibility studies, Environmental Assessments, detailed design studies, and reviews of previous EA's, carried out by respective transit agencies – Metrolinx, MTO, and VivaNext. The City of Vaughan will be able to provide further input on transit hub design at these stages.</p> <p>b. Staff have reviewed the Greenbelt Plan Amendment No. 1, which provides policies and direction for the designation of Urban River Valleys. Currently there is not sufficient rationale to seek to have the lands within the secondary plan area designated as Urban River Valley.</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>The Urban River Valley designation would not provide any additional policy protection to the Natural Areas within the secondary plan. Existing VOP 2010 and TRCA policies meet or exceed the External Connections policies that would apply. It is noted that the Don River in Vaughan is already designated as a River Valley Connection in the Greenbelt Plan on Schedule 1: Greenbelt Plan Area. Further, VOP 2010 policy 3.3.1.6 provides enhanced protection to river valleys that are connected to the Greenbelt but not properly in its boundaries, striving to increase the width of vegetative protection zones in these areas.</p> <p>Land ownership in river valleys also poses an issue, which is fragmented with both public and private ownership. Greenbelt Urban River Valley designations can only be applied to public lands. Therefore, it would be impossible to designate a contiguous river valley system within Vaughan. This may also create a misconception that only designated segments are important.</p> <p>Finally, any addition to the Greenbelt would have to show that it does not impede the Growth Plan or undermine other provincial Initiatives such as the Big Move plan. Given that a portion of Area 6 south of Highway 7 are lands under the</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>Parkway Belt West Plan as Inter-urban Transit, the addition of these lands to the Greenbelt may be questionable.</p>	
4	<p>DATE: November 25, 2013</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Philip Levine IBI Group</p>	<p>a. Requests that OPA 660 be recognized as the in effect OPA.</p> <p>b. Does not want a Transit Hub to be shown straddling and/or north of Highway 7. Applicant does not want any of their lands or internal infrastructure associated with the Transit Hub</p>	<p>a. Staff has added a reference to the current status of OPA 660 in the covering staff report. It will also be noted in the secondary plan in Part A.</p> <p>b. The reference to Transit Hub is being deleted. It will be changed to a Mobility Hub, which is a defined term in the Metrolinx Mobility Hub Guidelines. The circle has been reduced in size to focus on the intersection of the rail line and Highway 7 as being the centre of the mobility hub and the expression of a preference for the location of the transit facilities as close to Highway 7 and the rail line as possible. This would be the approximate centre of the mobility hub which includes a mixed-use development component within walking distance of the transit infrastructure. The current policy recommendation reflects a strategic position that the transit services should be the focus for the Local Centre. It is intended that this policy provide guidance to the transit authorities when considering and implementing alternative station locations and the interconnection between modes. This is critical to the location of the potential GO Rail</p>	<p>a. The reference can be found in the planning context section of the staff report. No further action is required.</p> <p>b. To enhance the position it is recommended that the term “Potential Transit Hub” be replaced by “Potential Mobility Hub”. Mobility Hub is a defined term in the “Big Move” plan. It reflects the need to link supportive levels of development at locations surrounding areas where two or more rapid transit services intersect. This is consistent with OPA 660, the draft secondary plan, and previous Council comments to Metrolinx on future mobility hub/GO station locations.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>c. Requests confirmation that a Development Concept Report is not required for these lands</p> <p>d. Requests that the 3.5 FSI maximum FSI shown on the applicants lands be</p>	<p>platform, as shown in the approved MTO 407 Transitway EA, as it would be subject to a separate EA undertaken by Metrolinx. This policy would provide that direction. It is agreed that such station facilities should have as little impact on the adjacent development as possible. As such, there is no objection to reducing the size of the Potential Transit Hub circle to focus on Highway 7.</p> <p>c. A Development Concept Report is required for this site. It is an important phasing tool that will be necessary to ensuring the long term evolution of the Area 1 portion of the plan. However, the greater concern was that the Development concept report constituted a further amendment to the official plan. The Development Concept Report does not constitute a further amendment to the Official Plan. Under VOP 2010 it is a supporting document provided at the time of submission of the implementing development application (e.g. subdivision, zoning). Its primary focus is on development phasing and confirming conformity with the Official Plan. The requirements for the Development Concept Report would be determined at the Pre-Application Consultation stage.</p> <p>d. These matters are discusses in the main body of the report in the section</p>	<p>c. To provide greater clarity it is recommended that the following be added at the end of Policy 8.3.1: "The Development Concept Report does not constitute an amendment to this plan. Detailed content of the DCR will be established through the Pre-application Consultation Process based on the criteria set out in Policy 10.1.1.7 of VOP 2010".</p> <p>d. That this issue be addressed in the main body of the report.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>expressed as an overall maximum and not divided into individual parcels</p> <p>e. Requests that the secondary plan allow for mid-rise heights to a maximum of 12 storeys and tower heights averaging 28 storeys to a maximum of 38 storeys</p> <p>f. The parkland requirements are consistent with the 1 ha for 300 units policy that is currently under appeal by the applicant. Would like to see language that defers to the City's adopted policy.</p>	<p>"Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph b) Building Heights and Density.</p> <p>e. These matters are discussed in the main body of the report in the section "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph b) Building Heights and Density.</p> <p>f. There are a number of appeals to Section 7.3 "Parks and Open Space", particularly Section 7.3.3 "Parkland Dedication" of VOP 2010 as it affects cash-in-lieu and parkland dedication in Intensification Areas. These appeals will be resolved through the Volume 1 OMB hearing process. Ultimately the resulting policies would have to be applied to the Concord GO Secondary Plan. The affected section, 5.4 "Parkland Dedication", of the Concord GO Secondary Plan largely replicates the current policy in VOP 2010. Therefore it would be appropriate to refer back to VOP 2010 policies which would ultimately reflect the OMB decision. Specific policies have been added to the secondary plan to specify the required types of park, their</p>	<p>Recommendations addressing these matters are contained in the section "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph b) Building Heights and Density.</p> <p>e. That this issue be addressed in the main body of the report. Recommendations addressing these matters are contained in the section "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph b) Building Heights and Density</p> <p>f. That policies 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 be deleted and that a new Policy 5.4.2 be added: "That Parkland shall be dedicated in accordance with the policies of VOP 2010."</p> <p>Policies addressing further parkland requirements have been discussed in the section "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph k) Parkland requirements for Area 1 resulting in the addition of new policies 5.4.4 and 5.4.5.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>g. Requests that open space buffers on site be referred to as Neighbourhood Park so that they may be eligible for parkland credit.</p> <p>h. Requests that the space labeled Urban Square by the draft plan in Schedule G to be designated as a Public Square to be eligible for parkland credit under Policy 7.3.1.4.</p> <p>i. Requests confirmation that affordable housing policies of VOP 2010 do not apply and that the applicants submission is viewed as a Tertiary Plan under OPA 660 instead.</p> <p>j. Wants confirmation that built form policies of VOP 2010 do not apply and that the applicants submission is viewed as a Tertiary Plan under OPA 660 instead.</p>	<p>conceptual location, and the total parkland required.</p> <p>g. Such lands are not accepted as parkland dedication.</p> <p>h. The Secondary Plan will need to reflect the terminology used in VOP 2010 for the parkland hierarchy. The term used in VOP 2010 is "Public Square". Schedule G and F show an "Urban Square". Therefore the Secondary Plan should be so amended.</p> <p>i. Places to Grow and the York Region Official Plan require the provision of affordable housing. Any official plan amendment by way of a Tertiary Plan or a Secondary Plan will be required to address this issue. This would be established in detail through the development approval process. At the time of the Pre-Application Consultation the City has the ability to ask for the submission of a Housing Options Statement that would establish how this requirement is fulfilled.</p> <p>j. Any such guidelines will provide higher level guidance ensuring that development will be coordinated through the entire Secondary Plan</p>	<p>g. No change is recommended.</p> <p>h. That the term "Urban Square" be replaced with "Public Square" wherever it may appear.</p> <p>i. No change is recommended.</p> <p>j. That the following sentence be added to Section 3.7.1: "However, more detailed Urban Design Guidelines, drawing on the broader policy regime will be</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>k. The location of the proposed pedestrian crossing cannot be determined prior to an EA by GO Transit. The crossing should be identified as a community facility in Section 6 of the plan so it can be counted for bonusing. Only the Open Space lands adjacent to Highway 7 and the GO corridor within the applicant's lands should be protected for a possible pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>area. It is expected that the implementing draft plan of subdivision application will be supported by a more detailed brief which will provide more detailed guidance which takes into consideration the character and opportunities of the site. This will be implemented through the Pre-Application Consultation process and will inform the preparation of the implementing streetscape and site plans. From a longer term perspective, this may form part of the Development Concept Report which will guide the evolution of the site through multiple phases.</p> <p>k. Section 4.2.12.a identifies a number of opportunities for the protection of an overhead pedestrian crossing of Highway 7. It is expected that it would be located in close proximity to the rail line and would probably have vertical connections to Highway 7 and, where feasible, to the adjacent development lands. The policy identifies the potential role of the Environmental Assessment process and the opportunity for partnerships between the public and private sectors. In addition, such facilities are considered to be a community benefit under the City's section 37 policies in VOP 2010. Therefore, contributions from developers may be the basis for a bonusing agreement.</p>	<p>required through development approval to reflect the character and context of the individual development areas. Such guidelines may form part of the Development Concept Report as may be established through the Pre-Application Consultation process."</p> <p>k. No change is recommended.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>i. Wants the proposed pedestrian crossing over the Bartley Smith trail identified as a community facility so that it can count toward bonusing as per VOP policy 10.1.2.9.</p> <p>m. Policy 4.5.5 states that a portion of the parking provided for office uses on the Applicant's lands (Area 1) is to be available for public parking for visitors with the number of parking spaces required and location to be determined through the development review process; the Applicant's position is that it does not wish to have to provide facilities if these are for a the Transit Hub function as it may be relocated or possibly even not be developed.</p> <p>n. Requests that reference to "an existing feature" be removed from policy 5.1.2 and replaced with "Area Subject to Further Environmental Studies". Applicant does not want an amendment of the plan to be required if it is determined that this area is not of significance.</p>	<p>i. Developer contributions to the construction of a pedestrian or bike crossing of the West Don River to the Bartley Smith trail would be considered as a community benefit and would be eligible for bonusing as per VOP 2010 policy 10.1.2.9.m.</p> <p>m. The general intent of policy 4.5.5 is to encourage shared parking in instances where mixed-use development is taking place and different uses have different peaking periods. In addition, it is not intended to provide parking to meet the needs of transit facilities. That would be addressed through other processes. Policy 4.2.3 of VOP 2010 provides sufficient overall guidance as to the City's objectives for the provision of parking.</p> <p>n. The City's interest is to allow for appropriate study of the identified area. Should it be determined that the area is of no environmental significance, an amendment to the secondary plan will not be required and development may proceed in accordance with the underlying land use. This area is discussed further in the section "Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan" under paragraph j) Ecosystem Services Compensation.</p>	<p>i. No change is recommended.</p> <p>m. That policy 4.5.5 of the Secondary Plan be deleted.</p> <p>n. That the following sentence be added to policy 5.1.2: "An existing feature within the City's natural heritage system is identified on Schedule F: Open Space Network as "Area Subject to Further Assessment/Policy 5.6 and Policy 5.1.2." This area will be evaluated through the development review process to determine its significance for the purposes of preservation or the application of policy 5.6 Ecosystem Services Compensation".</p> <p>Policies relating to Ecosystem</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>o. Requests that policy 5.2.5 be more specific so that it is clear that farmed fields are not considered to be a wildlife habitat.</p> <p>p. Policy 5.2.6 calls for watercourses to be protected. The CA definition of watercourse is any depression in the landscape in which water flows at some time. The applicant requests that the removal of a drainage swale be permitted.</p> <p>q. Requests clarification on policy 7.3.2 of the plan that requires Master Servicing Plans for Plan of Subdivision or Site Plan Applications. The applicants' understanding is that MSP's are an element of block plans or secondary plans only.</p>	<p>o. This is intended to be a general policy as it applies to the entire secondary plan area. The primary focus will be on ensuring the appropriate rehabilitation and restoration of the valley lands to enhance wildlife habitat and movement.</p> <p>p. This issue would be addressed through the development review process.</p> <p>q. Policy 7.3.2, in addition to requiring a Master Servicing Plan, specifies that such a plan shall identify the technical requirements to provide the following services to support urban development to the satisfaction of the City: wastewater collection, water supply, and stormwater management. Such a submission would be scaled to the requirements of the application and the nature of the site and its servicing needs. Further guidance would be provided through the Pre-Application Consultation process as</p>	<p>Services Compensation have been added as policy 5.6 as set out in the main body of the report under paragraph j) Ecosystem Services Compensation.</p> <p>o. No change is recommended.</p> <p>p. No change is recommended.</p> <p>q. It is recommended that the following sentence be added to policy 7.3.2: "Further guidance on the submission requirements will be provided through the Pre-Application Consultation process as set out in policy 10.1.3 of VOP 2010."</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>provided for in policy 10.1.3 of VOP 2010. Therefore, a further qualification identifying the PAC process would be of assistance.</p>	
5	<p>DATE: November 25, 2013</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Alfredo Mastrodicasa</p> <p>LOCATION: 43 Hillside Ave.</p>	<p>a. Concern that the proposed development will increase traffic congestion and create a bottleneck at the Metrolinx bridge. Objects to the proposed development and believes it is excessive.</p>	<p>a. Through the study process it has been determined that there will be the need to introduce a phasing program to permit the orderly development of the area over the long term, which will provide for coordination of transportation improvements with subsequent phases, beyond phase 1. Phasing of development, particularly in Area 1, will be necessary to allow for improvements to be implemented to respond to the increased demand on the road network. Phasing policies for Area 1 are set out in the main body of the report under the section “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan”, subheading c) “Development Phasing”. Certain improvements will be required through Phase 1, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of accesses to the public road system, satisfactory the City and Region in respect of their number, design and location. (e.g. a road connection to the north to Ortona Court) - A VivaNext BRT stop to serve the Secondary Plan area; - Transportation Demand Measures to support transit use. <p>The subsequent phases will be subject to a more detailed study. It is</p>	

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>recommended that this be carried out by the City, in consultation with York Region, which will establish the maximum amount of supportable gross floor area and mix of uses that will be permitted to support each subsequent phase, including the coordination of the necessary transportation improvements. The resulting phasing plan will be implemented through the development review process, including a Development Concept Report, the draft plan of subdivision and implementing zoning by-law. The phasing policies will determine the amount of development that can be accommodated on High-Rise Mixed Use sites, which will be guided the provision of adequate transportation.</p>	
6	<p>DATE: November 26, 2013</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Keith MacKinnon</p> <p>LOCATION: 1931 Highway 7</p>	<p>Requests that the land use designation in Area 4 be changed from Low-Rise Mixed Use to Mid-Rise Mixed Use. VOP 2010 identifies the area as Mid-Rise Mixed Use on Schedule 13; Mid-Rise Mixed Use policies in VOP 2010 address integrated Mid-Rise with surrounding low rise residential areas; Mid-Rise Mixed Use would make all corners of the GO rail line/ Highway 7 intersection consistent; believes the Low-Rise Mixed Use designation would prohibit office uses; the close proximity of the subject site to Highway 7 should allow for higher order uses up to 8-10 storeys.</p>	<p>The land use designation on this parcel was proposed after extensive public consultation, which provided staff with a reasonable justification for tapering development near the residential community. In addition, the Low-Rise Mixed Use designation that is proposed does allow for office uses up to a maximum height of 4 storeys.</p> <p>Area 4 is seen as a transition area in the plan between the higher density uses to the northeast and has a maximum height of 4 storeys and density of 1.8 FSI, which represents a transition into the Low Rise Area, which typically have building</p>	<p>No change is recommended.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
			<p>heights of 9 m. The intention for this area is stated in Policy 3.2.5 which provides: "Notwithstanding its status as one of the four quadrants of the "Potential Mobility Hub" designated around the junction of Highway 7, the Barrie GO Rail Line and the Highway 407 Transitway, the primary function of this area is to act as a transitional use between the surrounding, and potentially more intensive uses to the north and north east.</p>	
7	<p>DATE: February 14, 2014</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</p>	<p>a. Requests that a policy amendment be added for Sections 7.0 and 8.3 that require an Urban Master Environmental Servicing Plan and consideration of Low Impact Development and at-source stormwater treatment measures on a comprehensive basis for the entirety of the Concord GO Centre study area.</p> <p>b. Requests policy amendments that provide stronger wording to indicate that development and redevelopment in Areas 1, 2, and 3 be contingent upon the resolution of safe ingress/egress and flood plain considerations.</p>	<p>a. Policies 7.2.4 and 7.2.6 both address Low Impact Development. Given the size of the secondary plan area and the varying timing of development it will be impossible to create a developers group that would be capable of undertaking an Urban MESP. However, it may be appropriate that some aspects of the broader stormwater system be taken into consideration. This can be undertaken through the development review process.</p> <p>b. The recommended policy amendments strengthen requirements that all areas that are affected by flooding in the secondary plan area will require safe ingress and egress before development and redevelopment are permitted.</p>	<p>a. A new policy "8.3.5": Stormwater management reports submitted in support of the implementing development applications will take into consideration the broader system-wide conditions in order to ensure that future stormwater needs are identified and addressed at the site-specific level. The extent of such examination will be determined through the pre-application consultation process with input from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.</p> <p>b. The following changes will be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 3.1.10 will be amended to the following: "Development and redevelopment within Areas 1-4, as identified on Schedule A, in accordance with policies 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, shall not be permitted until such time:" - Policy 3.3.2 will be modified to be included in policies 3.2 and 3.4 to allow for consistency in its

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>c. Requests that Schedule B be amended to indicate the Regional Storm Flood Plain in Area 4, and to also show the extent of the flood plain along Highway #7.</p> <p><u>Table</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Principle 3 of the Secondary Plan: would like to see recognition of the Regional Storm Flood Plain along the Highway #7 corridor. 2. Principle 5 of the Secondary Plan: recognition should also be given to the flood hazard lands and provide for opportunity to enhance these areas. 3. Principle 8 of the Secondary Plan: Principle 8 should include wording that includes Low Impact Development. 	<p>c. Schedule's B, C, F, and G contain areas defined separately as Natural Areas and Floodplain. The Natural Areas boundaries currently shown roughly identify areas of flooding in conjunction with those areas designated as Floodplain. However, Floodplain is not a designation that is consistent with VOP 2010. In addition, VOP 2010 defines Natural Areas as including floodplains.</p> <p><u>Table</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The safety and accessibility of Highway 7 is affected by the potential for flooding, and it is taken into consideration throughout this plan. 2. As the maintenance and enhancement of existing natural features also affects flood hazard areas, it is appropriate to include flood hazard areas in this principle. 3. Low Impact Development will be an important aspect of stormwater management infrastructure in the secondary plan area. 	<p>application across all development areas.</p> <p>c. For consistency with VOP 2010, the Floodplain designation will be removed and those areas will be designated appropriately as Natural Areas. Further delineation of these areas will be consistent with TRCA mapping.</p> <p><u>Table</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wording to Principle 3 has been added that recommends, "taking into consideration the presence of the known flood hazard". 2. Wording has been added so that Principle 5 now states, "Maintain and enhance existing natural heritage features, <u>including the flood hazard areas</u>, in the context of the greater natural heritage network". 3. Principle 8 has been amended to now state, "The timing of development needs to be coordinated with the availability of critical infrastructure such as transportation capacity and improvements in the stormwater

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>4. Section 3.1 – General Land Use Policies should include policy that no new development will be permitted in flood prone areas and/or natural heritage features. Similar to subsection 3.1.10.b, the development of areas 1 and 2 shall not be permitted until safe ingress/egress has been effectively demonstrated</p> <p>5. Development in Area 5 should be restricted according to Regional Storm Plain delimitation.</p> <p>6. Requests that stronger wording be provided which reflect that Area 3 is flood prone and that safe ingress/egress must be demonstrated before development is approved.</p> <p>7. Requests that stronger wording be provided which reflect that Areas 1 and 2 are currently accessed in the Regional Storm Flood Plain and that safe ingress/egress must be demonstrated before development is approved.</p> <p>8. Prior to the development of Area 3 and Area 6 where the transit hub is located, the limits of development</p>	<p>4. Refer to comment C of this item.</p> <p>5. Refer to comment B of this item.</p> <p>6. Refer to comment B of this item.</p> <p>7. Refer to comment B of this item.</p> <p>8. The City is in agreement with this position.</p>	<p>management system <u>including the implementation of Low Impact Development (LID) measures.</u>”</p> <p>4. Refer to recommendation C of this item.</p> <p>5. Refer to recommendation B of this item.</p> <p>6. Refer to recommendation B of this item.</p> <p>7. Refer to recommendation B of this item.</p> <p>8. The proposed additional wording has been added as Policy 3.6.5:</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>must be established as there are significant natural heritage features located on or near the site.</p> <p>9. Wording change to policy 5.1.1.</p> <p>10. Requests wording change to policy 5.3.5 to clarify types of roadways that TRCA will accept.</p> <p>11. Requests that wording be changed in policy 7.2.1 to clarify the regulatory boundary of the TRCA.</p>	<p>9. Wording change to Policy 5.1.1 is grammatical.</p> <p>10. Policy 5.3.5 is intended to refer to road crossings of the watercourse.</p> <p>11. This wording change has been requested to maintain consistency with TRCA jurisdiction.</p>	<p>“Prior to the development of the transit infrastructure associated with the Mobility Hub and/or development of Area 3, the limits of the natural features will be identified and established. Further technical reports on these features will also be required in order to aid in determining the limits of development. The scope of these studies and requirements will be established by the City of Vaughan and the TRCA.”</p> <p>9. Correction has been made to Policy 5.1.1.</p> <p>10. Policy 5.3.4 has been amended to clarify that it is referring to “road crossings” and not roads that run adjacent to a watercourse within the floodplain.</p> <p>11. The recommended change has been made. Policy 7.2.1 now states: “The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) regulates the West Don River. <u>Such regulatory area includes the adjacent valley slopes and setbacks from the greater of the top of bank, the regulatory floodline and areas of significant vegetation.</u> Any development within <u>or adjacent</u> to the TRCA regulated area will be subject to the requirements of the TRCA”.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>12. Requests that wording be changed in policy 7.2.2 to include TRCA Stormwater Management Criteria.</p> <p>13. Requests that wording be changed in policy 8.2.3.3.g with respect to restoration of tributaries.</p> <p>14. Request that wording be changed to include consultation with TRCA when stormwater management for the proposed 407 Transitway is being considered.</p> <p>15. 8.6 Conveyance of Lands – Requests that wording be included</p>	<p>12. This wording change has been requested to maintain consistency with TRCA jurisdiction.</p> <p>13. The City agrees that the restoration of the tributaries of the Don River include stormwater management designs to the satisfaction of the City and the TRCA.</p> <p>14. Stormwater management, as with any other design consideration relating to the 407 Transitway, will be in consultation with relevant agencies in accordance with the 407 Transitway EA, as per Section 9.2 of the 407 Transitway EA Executive Summary.</p> <p>15. The request identifies a standard procedure for conveyance of hazards lands and/or natural</p>	<p>12. The requested wording has been added.</p> <p>13. The requested wording has been added.</p> <p>14. Policy 8.2.3.6 has been replaced with the following wording: “During the Detail Design Stage of the 407 Transitway the Ministry of Transportation has committed to: “Review and adjust, where necessary, the conceptual and preliminary design of all facilities that form part of this undertaking, following any new municipal development plan, transit operational changes, and new infrastructure development occurring after the conduct of this TPAP (Transit Project Assessment Process)”. In addition the approved EA may also be subject to a further review at some point in the future. In consideration of either process, it is requested that the Ministry of Transportation”.</p> <p>15. No change is recommended.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>that zones hazards lands and/or natural heritage feature lands into an "appropriate open space zoning category and conveyed into public ownership".</p> <p>16. Requests inclusion of a monitoring program targeted at evaluating downstream effectiveness of SWM practices relating to downstream erosion.</p> <p>17. Comments relating to Schedule B</p> <p>a. Request that Asterisk on map be identified as it is on subsequent schedules.</p> <p>b. Requests that flood plain area be correctly shown. Currently much of the flood plain is shown as Natural Area.</p>	<p>features into public ownership provided in policy 3.2.3.10 in VOP 2010.</p> <p>16. A monitoring program as proposed could only be undertaken on a system wide basis, taking into consideration all upstream areas. It is inappropriate to include such a requirement in a local secondary plan. No change recommended</p> <p>17. Schedule B</p> <p>a. The asterisk on Schedule B has been removed and now only appears on Schedule F- Open Space Network, and is now referred to as "Area subject to further assessment/ Policy 5.6 and policy 5.1.2".</p> <p>b. The Natural Area designation is consistent with VOP 2010 and includes floodplains. All reference to a separate floodplain designation has been removed to maintain consistency with VOP 2010. It is noted that up to date flood limits will be established through the development review process and will serve</p>	<p>16. No change is recommended.</p> <p>17. Schedule B</p> <p>a. No change is recommended.</p> <p>b. No change is recommended</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>c. Requests that the flood plain area be correctly shown in Area 4.</p>	<p>to determine the developable area. c. Staff concur.</p>	<p>c. Area 4 has been amended to show the flood plain as Natural Area.</p>
8	<p>DATE: February 18, 2014 RESPONDENT: York Region Transit</p>	<p>Request that YRT Route 77 be shown on Schedule E.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Schedule E has been amended to add a reference to "YRT Route 77" in the Legend, in conjunction with the "VivaNext Rapidway".</p>
9	<p>DATE: February 19, 2014 RESPONDENT: Metrolinx</p>	<p>1. Section 4.3 Transit Network a. Requests change in wording of paragraph one of section 4.3 paragraph 1 to clarify the relationship between the secondary plan and the proposed and planned transit facilities.</p>	<p>1. Section 4.3 Transit Network a. Staff concur with the suggested changes for the first paragraph.</p>	<p>1. Section 4.3 Transit Network a. Paragraph one of section 4.3 has been amended as follows: A defining feature of the <u>transit network</u>, as identified on Schedule E, <u>is the proposed GO station and the planned York Region Rapid Transit facilities along Highway 7.</u> The local Centre designation and the implementing secondary plan is <u>predicated on the provision of higher order transit services based on its location along the Highway 7 Regional Corridor and the potential for other complementing transit services.</u> The Plan is predicated on the future construction of a GO station, the planned York Region</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>b. Requests change in wording of paragraph one of section 4.3 paragraph 2 to provide clarity on City and York Region goals and appropriate agency jurisdiction.</p> <p>2. Section 8.2 City Guidance on Future Transit Studies and Planned Investments</p> <p>a. Requests the removal of policy 8.2.3.5.c. Policy 8.2.3.5.c refers to the agencies that may be referred to in consultation of the replacement of</p>	<p>b. Staff concur with the suggested changes of the second paragraph.</p> <p>2. Section 8.2 City Guidance on Future Transit Studies and Planned Investments</p> <p>a. Staff concur with the deletion of policy 8.2.3.5.c subject to the insertion of language which reflects the need to consider the impacts of</p>	<p>Rapid Transit facilities along Highway 7, and the EA-approved Highway 407 Transitway station. The integration of these modes of transit with the adjacent developments and the broader community will be a key driver of this Secondary Plan and the foundation for a Potential Mobility Hub. The City of Vaughan will continue to cooperate with York Region and the relevant transit agencies to expedite the planning, design and construction of the proposed transit infrastructure.</p> <p>b. Paragraph three of section 4.3 has been amended as follows: However, both York Region and the City of Vaughan Transportation Master Plans have identified a desire for a station in this area. Both the twinning of the tracks and a station site selection would require either a combined Environmental Assessment or individual Environmental Assessments, which would be conducted by Metrolinx.</p> <p>2. Section 8.2 City Guidance on Future Transit Studies and Planned Investments</p> <p>a. A new policy 8.2.3.5.c has been added which provides for the following:” Any required stormwater management</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>the rail bridge crossing Highway 7 and its design, specifically to the necessity of including stormwater management that is required to mitigate flooding</p>	<p>the bridge structure on stormwater management measures in the area.</p>	<p>measures will be considered as part of any EA process required to replace or modify the Highway 7 railroad bridge “.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>DATE: February 6, 2014</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Ministry of Transportation</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request a rewording of Principle 4 to state: “Support plans for a higher order transit hub integrating the future 407 Transitway with the GO Barrie Rail line, by intensifying areas adjacent to the potential transit hub through high-density and mixed-use development, as well as by providing good connections to and between the transit service.” 2. Policy 3.1.10.a – Request that 407 Transitway be acknowledged as having received EA approval. 3. Policy 3.2.4 – Request the addition of the 407 Transitway to the “Potential Transit Hub”. 4. Section 3.6 – Requests the addition of the 407 Transitway to this policy. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The inclusion of the 407 Transitway in principle 4 and other changes are acceptable. 2. It is acknowledged that the 407 Transitway EA has received Ministerial approval. 3. No change is recommended in the context of this policy. The use of the Highway 7 / GO Barrie Line junction in this policy is being used as a location descriptor of Area 4, and it is therefore inappropriate to include the 407 Transitway in this policy. 4. A reference has been added to section 3.6. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Principal 4 has been amended to reflect the request of MTO. 2. Policy 3.1.10.a has been amended to reflect the 407 Transitway EA’s approval. 3. No change is recommended. 4. The following wording has been added to paragraph 1 of section 3.6: “In addition, the station area is bolstered by the presence of the EA-approved Highway 407 Transitway station which is located to the south

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>5. Policy 4.2.3 – Requests acknowledgement of 407 Transitway EA in determining the intersection alignment.</p> <p>6. Section 4.3 – Requests inclusion of 407 Transitway in policy.</p> <p>7. The Ministry has indicated that the GO Rail station will be dependent on the implementation of the Transitway station, and that this should be recognized in the third paragraph of policy 4.3.</p>	<p>5. Staff concur that policy 4.2.3 should be amended to reflect the EA intersection location. Policy 4.2.18 refers specifically to Area 1.</p> <p>6. Staff concur. Wording has been added to section 4.3 paragraphs 1 and 2.</p> <p>7. Staff are of the opinion that the basis for the interdependency between the Transitway and the GO Rail service, based on the mode transfer projections for 2031 from the 407 Transitway EA should be updated over time.</p>	<p>within this radius.”</p> <p>5. No change has been made to policy 4.2.18. In policy 4.2.3 wording has been added to confirm the status of the Highway 7 access as determined by the 407 Transitway EA as follows: “Access to the Highway 407 Transitway station will be maintained consistent with the Minor Collector road location shown in the EA-approved station configuration.”</p> <p>6. Section 4.3 paragraph 1 has been modified to include the following: “The Plan is predicated on the future construction of a GO station, the planned York Region Rapid Transit facilities along Highway 7, and the <u>EA-approved Highway 407 Transitway station.</u>” Paragraph 2 has been modified to include: “The 407 Transitway EA provided two options for the VivaNext station. One includes platforms on Highway 7 and the other (should demand warrant) is to provide platforms inside the Transitway station.”</p> <p>7. No change is recommended at this time.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>8. Policy 4.3.3 – Requests acknowledgement of integration of the Transitway station and Go Rail station.</p> <p>9. Policy 4.3.7 – Requests the inclusion of the grade-separated pedestrian crossing that was committed to in the 407 Transitway EA.</p> <p>10. Policy 8.2.1- Requests that the 407 Transitway be included in this policy.</p> <p>11. Policy 8.2.3.3.a, 8.2.3.5.b – Requests that the 407 Transitway be included as one of the rapid transit facilities in policy 8.2.3.3.a. Request that policy 8.2.3.5.b include reference to the 407 Transitway.</p>	<p>8. Staff concur, there is a need for convenient access from the GO Rail platform to the 407 Transitway station.</p> <p>9. Staff concur, the grade separated crossing will be an important component of the Transitway. In addition, the crossing is shown on Schedule G of the secondary plan.</p> <p>10. Staff concur, a reference has been added.</p> <p>11. Staff concur. Policy 8.2.3.3.a has included a reference to maintaining convenient access between the Transitway and other modes. Policy 8.2.3.5.b now includes reference to the 407 Transitway.</p>	<p>8. Policy 4.3.3 has been amended with the addition of the following sentence: “However, in considering the location of the future GO Rail station, there will also be the need to provide for convenient access to the EA-approved 407 Transitway station.”</p> <p>9. Policy 4.3.7 has been amended with the addition of the following sentence: “The 407 Transitway Environmental Assessment also included the commitment to provide a grade separated pedestrian crossing of the GO Rail Line south of Highway 7.”</p> <p>10. Policy 8.2.1 has been amended with the following: “The intent is that the lands in the immediate area be developed in manner that supports and complements rapid transit investments in the Highway 7, <u>Highway 407</u>, and GO Rail corridors.”</p> <p>11. Policy 8.2.3.3.a has been amended with addition of the following sentence: “Maintaining convenient access between these modes and the 407 Transitway station will also need to be taken into consideration.” Policy 8.2.3.5.b has been amended with the following: “It be able to accommodate a GO Rail station, potentially straddling Highway 7, with the necessary connection points to the</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>12. Policy 8.2.3.6 – Request that reference to a review of the 407 Transitway during the Detailed Design stage be removed.</p> <p>13. Schedule A, B, and C – Request that Area 3 be removed from the Mid-Rise Mixed-Use designation.</p> <p>14. Schedules B, C, and D – Requests that the Inter-urban Transit area designation be replaced with the 407 Transitway EA site plan shown on plate 39 of the EA.</p>	<p>12. Policy 8.2.3.6 has been modified to include Section 9.3 – Detail Design Stage and Construction Issues of the 407 Transitway EA. This is discussed in the main body of the report under “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan”, subsection g) The Highway 407 Transitway Station and Alignment.</p> <p>13. This issue is discussed in the main body of the report under “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan”, subsection g) The Highway 407 Transitway Station and Alignment.</p> <p>14. This issue is discussed in the main body of the report under “Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan”, subsection g) The Highway 407 Transitway Station and</p>	<p>VivaNext facilities, <u>the Highway 407 Transitway</u>, and other pedestrian access points.”</p> <p>12. Policy 8.2.3.6 has been amended with the addition of the following: “During the Detail Design Stage of the 407 Transitway the Ministry of Transportation has committed to: “Review and adjust, where necessary, the conceptual and preliminary design of all facilities that form part of this undertaking, following any new municipal development plan, transit operational changes, and new infrastructure development occurring after the conduct of this TPAP (Transit Project Assessment Process)”. In addition the approved EA may also be subject to a further review at some point in the future. In consideration of either process, it is requested that the Ministry of Transportation:”</p> <p>13. This issue has been addressed in the body of the report. No change is recommended at this time.</p> <p>14. This issue has been addressed in the body of the report. No change is recommended at this time.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>15. Schedule G – Requests that the grade separated pedestrian crossing over the GO Rail line be shown as per the 407 Transitway EA.</p>	<p>Alignment. In addition, plate 39 of the 407 Transitway EA shows the Bathurst station site plan.</p> <p>15. Staff concur.</p>	<p>15. Schedule G has been modified to reflect the pedestrian crossing as shown in the 407 Transitway EA.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>DATE: February 19, 2014</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Region of York</p>	<p>1. Principle 8 – Ensure appropriate development phasing – execution of this principle should be supported by a comprehensive transportation assessment for the secondary plan area.</p> <p>2. Section 3.0</p> <p>a. Fourth paragraph, makes reference to "objectives described in Part A". Part A was not provided to York Region at the time of review.</p> <p>b. Requests that City consider a range of housing types in the secondary plan in policy 3.1.4.</p> <p>c. The final bullet of policy 3.1.12 conflicts with policy 3.1.9. Policy 3.1.12 may permit development within 70 metres but would not conform with policy 3.1.9.</p>	<p>1. Staff concur with this comment. The requirement for a comprehensive transportation study has been included in policy 8.3.6.</p> <p>2. Section 3.0</p> <p>a. Part A will consist of a background and review of relevant plans and policies that help inform the secondary plan process.</p> <p>b. Staff concur. The City supports family sized units and a range of dwellings through VOP 2010 policy 7.5.1.3.</p> <p>c. Policy 3.1.12 specifically addresses the requirement for noise and vibration studies when residential or other sensitive uses are considered within 70 metres of a railway line. This does not nullify the requirement</p>	<p>1. No action is required.</p> <p>2. Section 3.0</p> <p>a. Section A will form part of the adopted version of the plan which will be submitted to the Region.</p> <p>b. That policy 3.1.4 of the Secondary Plan be amended to read: "A diverse mix of dwelling units and <u>unit sizes</u> in the Concord GO Centre Secondary Plan area are encouraged."</p> <p>c. No change is required.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>of policy 3.1.9 to setback any residential development by 75 metres from railway lines where there is no berm.</p> <p>d. Policy 3.6 should make reference to the approved 407 Transitway EA.</p> <p>e. Suggest that policies 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 be replaced with a policy that is consistent with all sections of policy 9.2.2.2 in VOP 2010.</p> <p>f. Policy 3.4.3 – replace reference to policy 9.2.2.4 with policy 9.2.2.6.</p> <p>g. Policy 3.6.1 should make reference to the approved 407 Transitway EA.</p> <p>3. Section 4.0</p> <p>a. The Secondary Plan should be supported by a comprehensive Transportation Assessment which should include a detailed development phasing plan and development thresholds tied to the implementation of transportation infrastructure.</p>	<p>d. Staff concur.</p> <p>e. Staff concur.</p> <p>f. Staff concur.</p> <p>g. A reference has been included to acknowledge the need for a convenient pedestrian connection to the Transitway station.</p> <p>3. Section 4.0</p> <p>a. A new policy 8.3.6 has been added to address phasing.</p>	<p>d. Reference to the 407 Transitway has been added.</p> <p>e. The policy has been amended to reflect the reference to VOP 2010 policy 9.2.2.2.</p> <p>f. The policy has been amended to reflect the reference to VOP 2010 policy 9.2.2.6.</p> <p>g. A reference to pedestrian connections to the 407 Transitway station has been added to this section.</p> <p>3. Section 4.0</p> <p>a. See section c) of Issues Resulting in Substantial Changes to the Plan in the staff report.</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>The Plan should also incorporate policies emphasizing the need for the north-south connection to Ortona Court and an east-west road linkage within Area 5 within the initial phase of development.</p> <p>b. Policies 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.2.5, 4.2.6 - These sections reference the need for site-specific Traffic Impact Studies at the time of individual development applications. However, these policies should not substitute the need for a detailed transportation assessment for the entire secondary plan. Accordingly, the Secondary Plan should be supported by a comprehensive Transportation Assessment which should include a detailed development phasing plan and development thresholds tied to the implementation of transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>c. Policy 4.2.13 - Last sentence should be revised to read as follows "Any proposed access to Highway 7 is subject to review and approval by York Region."</p>	<p>b. Wording has been added to policy 4.2.5 to include a number of processes by which transportation needs will be determined.</p> <p>c. Staff concur.</p>	<p>b. Policy 4.2.5 has been modified to read: "Final determination of need, location and design of these streets will be determined through <u>a number of processes, including the Comprehensive Transportation Study, a feasibility study, examining the crossing of the GO Rail line</u>, the review of development applications or through an Environmental Assessment process."</p> <p>c. The last sentence of 4.2.13 has been deleted and replaced by the following: "Any proposed access to Highway 7 is subject to review and approval by York Region."</p>

Item	Respondent	Issue	Comments	Recommendation
		<p>d. Policy 4.3 - Insert reference to the approved 407 Transitway EA.</p> <p>4. Section 8.0</p> <p>a. Policy 8.3.2 should reference the need for a detailed phasing plan that will be developed to the satisfaction of the City and Region prior to any development in phase 1.</p> <p>b. The city should not wait for the preparation of a Development Concept Report to outline a phasing plan for secondary plan area. The relevant phasing policies should form part of this secondary plan.</p> <p>5. Schedules</p> <p>a. On Schedules B, C, D, E, F, and G, "Future Road Connections" should be referred to as "Road Connections".</p> <p>b. On Schedules B, C, D, E, F, and G, the road network south of Highway 7 should be consistent with the approved 407 Transitway EA.</p>	<p>d. References have been included at the request of other agencies.</p> <p>4. Section 8.0</p> <p>a. A phasing plan has been set out in policy 8.3.6.</p> <p>b. A phasing plan has been set out in policy 8.3.6.</p> <p>5. Schedules</p> <p>a. Wording has already been changed to "Proposed New Road Link (Conceptual)" to reflect VOP 2010 policies.</p> <p>b. The minor collector road south of Highway 7 reflects the approved 407 Transitway EA.</p>	<p>d. No action required.</p> <p>4. Section 8.0</p> <p>a. No action required.</p> <p>b. No action required.</p> <p>5. Schedules</p> <p>a. No change is required.</p> <p>b. No change is required.</p>