

Comments on the Draft Secondary Plan

Public		
Eleanor Young (Member of the Vision Georgetown Steering Committee) May 18, 2018		
General	Guiding Principles are well integrated into the plan.	Comment noted.
	Would have appreciated Steering Committee meetings to be more consultative workshops rather than status updates.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>When meeting with the Committee we tried to balance providing project updates, consultation with the committee and seeking input from the committee members on our proposed consultation approach at public workshops.</p> <p>We will keep this in mind as we develop the role and function of future steering committees for other long range planning projects in the Town, which will be guided by the Town's recently developed Community Engagement Charter.</p>
Natural Heritage System (NHS)	<p>Concerned that buffers have not been finalized however recognize that Environmental Implementation Reports are to be done in next stage to confirm buffers.</p> <p>Concerned that the waterway along Trafalgar Road has not been resolved.</p>	<p>The Subwatershed Study recommends a variable buffer approach establishing appropriate buffers supported by detailed analysis, based on the sensitivity of the feature being protected and the anticipated impact from the adjacent land use, at a Secondary Plan level of detail. However, since the specific land use is not known until the development stage, the subsequent Environmental Implementation Report will confirm the buffers required based on specific circumstances.</p> <p>The revised Schedule H6-2 identifies the drainage feature along Trafalgar Road as a Stormwater Conveyance Channel, sized based on the results of the studies undertaken to appropriately address the flooding in the south west area.</p>
Transportation	Happy to see the emphasis on active transportation and interested to see how the details will be worked out. References the 2015 memo on pathways prepared by some Steering Committee members.	Schedule H6-3 identifies a comprehensive multi-modal transportation network including dedicated bike lanes, multi-purpose pathways, and local connections through parks, schools, SWM ponds and local streets to ensure connectivity to all the residential neighbourhood areas, the Community Core, and community anchors. Implementation of the Secondary Plan and complementary Sustainable Design Guidelines will implement the objectives as outlined in the 2015 Pathway memo prepared by members of the Steering Committee.

Community Core	Supportive of the Community Core and concerned about the landowners reluctance to include the Core Commercial designation. Feels that the Community Core is critical to building community.	Comment noted. The Core Commercial Area designation remains in the Secondary Plan as an integral component of the Community Core.
Storm Water Management (SWM)	Concerned that scale and location of SWM ponds has not been finalized to ensure the community is ready for climate change.	A Storm water Plan has now been completed which identifies the preliminary locations and sizes of the SWM ponds. The locations have been shown conceptually on Schedule H6-2.
Energy Conservation	The plan leaves the door open for district energy but recognizes limitations with respect to lack of scale. Would like to ensure the plan considers new and emerging technologies. One example provided is the Integrated Community Energy Harvesting System, which is being studied by McMaster, Carleton and other industry partners.	Policies in the Secondary Plan implement the findings of the Energy Master Plan (updated in 2018) which include continuing to investigate the feasibility of a combined heat and power system for the Core area of Vision Georgetown. The Secondary Plan also allows for consideration of new technologies in energy conservation that may be available as the plan progresses.
Sustainable Design Guidelines	Appreciate the level of detail and emphasis on LEED and other desirable features.	Comment noted.
John and Elaine Hodgson May 16, 2018		
Natural Heritage System	<p>Concerned about the removal of a block of NHS along the Eighth Line across from Eaton Street and Foxtail Crescent. The resident was advised by Town staff that the trees in the woodlot are invasive however there are a variety of trees and wildlife growing within the forest block.</p> <p>Concerned that the forested area to be removed is an important natural heritage area where there is an abundant wildlife habitat in existence.</p> <p>Requests that the Town revisit the secondary plan in order to look at protecting the NHS and finding an alternative to removing this forested area.</p>	<p>With respect to the black locust trees, the recommendations of the Subwatershed Study conclude that removal of a portion of Block D, (the portion primarily made up of black locust, which is an invasive species) and reforestation in targeted areas around Block D were determined to be more beneficial to the overall Block D woodland than maintaining the portion of the Block D woodland that is primarily made up of black locust trees. The targeted reforestation areas benefit habitat for forest interior bird species and create a Core Woodland through an ecological linkage between Block C and D woodlands which would otherwise not be achieved.</p>

<p>Elaine Hodgson June 9, 2018</p>		
<p>Natural Heritage System</p>	<p>The "black locust" woodland contains many other species of trees and wildlife within the "2.4 ha" of forest that the builder would like to remove. This is not just a black locust woodland, it is an entire eco-system.</p> <p>Given the entire land development area for the Secondary Plan is over 300 ha (approximately), once you start calculating out the actual amount of land that is to be developed in comparison with the area of existing forest that is slated to be destroyed, it makes absolutely no sense that the Town of Halton Hills would consider removing a forested area when there is so much other available land to build on.</p> <p>Is it possible to consider an alternate plan where the builders could build around the forest?</p>	<p>See response above.</p> <p>As addressed in detail in the Secondary Plan, the amount of land required for public uses, including schools, storm water facilities and natural heritage system has resulted in a very constrained supply of land (less than 50% of the total) on which to locate the growth the Town is required to accommodate in this area. The proposed Natural Heritage System is part of a Secondary Plan that appropriately balances natural heritage system protection with other land use planning objectives.</p>
<p>Katrina and Reece Keeler May 23, 2018</p>		
<p>Natural Heritage System</p>	<p>Identifies concerns about the along Eighth Line across from Eaton Street and Foxtail Crescent which has been referred to as the black locust woodlot and that this block of the NHS is slated for destruction.</p> <p>Aware that neighbours are voicing concerns about this area as well and that the neighbours have been advised that the trees in the woodlot are invasive but there are other other natural occurring non-invasive vegetation, trees and an abundance of wildlife within this block.</p> <p>Removing specific invasive species and leaving the woodlot intact to replenish itself naturally would be acceptable but not removing an entire habitat of animals, birds and even deer.</p> <p>It would be unethical to remove an important natural heritage area where there is an abundant and thriving wild life habitat.</p> <p>If you stand at the end of Eaton St, facing 8th line, you can clearly see this entire area down to 15th Sideroad is thriving; to</p>	<p>See response to comments above.</p>

	<p>put development in this area would go against Habitat Protection. As per the current plans, a very large section of this area will be removed to allow for medium high density residential area. This is simply unacceptable.</p> <p>Can you please advise if the secondary plan can be revisited to address the concerns of Georgetown residents to protect this NHS and find an alternative to removing the forested area?</p>	
<p>MasonryWorx Andrew Payne May 18, 2018</p>		
<p>Urban Design Policies</p>	<p>Recommends that secondary plan policies for Vision Georgetown be supported with robust external Urban Design Guidelines which address materiality as well as other important design concepts, including massing and streetscaping.</p>	<p>Policies included in the Secondary Plan address urban design and in addition Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines address the design elements raised in the correspondence.</p>
<p>Arnold Foster Re: DG Farms Inc. 823 Trafalgar May 18, 2018</p>		
<p>General</p>	<p>Land use designations and road patterns on the Vision Georgetown Secondary Plan have been relatively consistent in all of the iterations of the Land Use Plan put forward by the Town and presented to the public.</p> <p>Their client is generally supportive of the proposed land use designations and policies related to the public lands including the mix of low, medium and high density residential uses.</p> <p>Although the subject lands have a disproportionate amount of Community Lands in comparison with other lands in the Secondary Plan Area, their client has no objection to the proposed Major Institutional and Park designation in the proposed configuration.</p> <p>They reserve the right to make further submissions and to address the submission made by other interested parties when the matter is brought back before Council.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The “community lands” (i.e. public uses including community park, library/community centre and high school) on 823 Trafalgar Road is a result of the location of the property in the centre of the Secondary Plan Area, and the desire on the part of the public, Council and project team to create a Community Core in Vision Georgetown, anchored by a number of public uses. The revised plan continues to show community lands on the subject parcel, but also introduces more medium and high density residential as a result of a more linear north-south Community Core focused at the intersections of both Street A and B and Street A and C.</p>

Gary Meltzer
 10512 Eighth Line
 Feb. 26, 2018

<p>Natural Heritage System</p>	<p>Three land use concepts for Vision Georgetown that were presented in April 2014 did not identify NHS on his property.</p> <p>In the November 2017 draft concept, the plan reflects study information by AECOM and aerial photographs that show water course movement and identifies a large portion of 10512 Eighth Line as NHS. In the opinion of Mr. Meltzer, the Subwatershed Study reflects only a snapshot and an incomplete picture of the watercourse (Tributary C) that traverses the property.</p> <p>Mr. Meltzer advises that the flow and sometimes pooling of water on his property is a result of the adjacent farmer cutting through a natural rise in the landscape to divert water from the farm property onto Mr. Meltzer's property as well as the downstream culvert on the east side of Eighth Line is clogged.</p> <p>Mr. Meltzer is of the opinion that the two factors referenced above have resulted in an incorrect assessment of the stream on his property. He asks that a longer study (24 months) be commissioned to provide a greater degree of accuracy.</p> <p>Mr. Meltzer also references the south west area of the study area where the 2014 concepts show a large floodplain in the area with is redirected to the corridor along Trafalgar Road to maximize developable land. Given that this area is larger and was permitted, Mr. Meltzer is of the opinion that this should justify the movement or removal or floodplain on his property.</p>	<p>Tributary C is considered to be a headwater drainage feature (HDF) because it does not have permanently flowing water but does convey surface water at different times during the year and during rainfall events.</p> <p>The upstream portion of Tributary C (within the woodland) was identified for 'conservation' in the Subwatershed Study. This requires that the downstream segments of the stream must be consistent and treated as 'conservation' therefore the portion on Mr. Meltzer's property must remain an open channel. Also the culvert across the road from 10512 Eighth Line is a fixed point that the channel must connect to which limits any opportunities for relocating the stream.</p> <p>In a meeting with Mr. Meltzer, Town staff and the consultant team committed to taking a closer look at the boundaries of the Natural Heritage System on the subject property as it appears that there may be an opportunity to somewhat reduce the Natural Heritage System on Mr. Meltzer's property and the property behind it. The project team also committed to having a further discussion with Conservation Halton and the Region of Halton regarding Tributary C.</p> <p>This review and consultation will take place over the summer months and any revisions could be incorporated as part of any modifications to the Plan as part of the Regional Secondary Plan approval process. To reflect this situation, a policy has been added to the Secondary Plan specifying the additional analysis to be undertaken by the Town, and the area subject to the policy has been identified on Schedule H6-2.</p>
--------------------------------	---	--

Southwest Georgetown Landowners Group
 Arutip Engineering Limited
 May 18, 2018 and June 12, 2018

	<p>Correspondence reiterated comments provided in the letter submitted at the Statutory Public Meeting dated May 7, 2018 which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate the Community Core onto Street B, and make Street B the Major Collector Road to provide a continuous connection into the existing neighbourhood east of Eighth 	<p>In response to comments submitted by the Landowners Group, some revisions are proposed to the Secondary Plan policies and land use schedule as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> redistributing land uses within the Community Core in a manner that better takes advantage of both of the intersections of the east west
--	--	---

	<p>Line;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reposition the combined elementary/secondary school campus to the west to the intersection of Street A and 10 Side Road to be in a more centralized location; • Introduce policies in the Secondary Plan that provide for flexibility in the design, number and location of SWM facilities and corridors which will be confirmed through the future preparation of the required Environmental Implementation Report; • Provide policies in the Secondary Plan that provide sufficient flexibility to the delineation of the NHS to reflect the results of a future Environmental Implementation Report; and, • Appropriate changes be made to Land Use Plan to reflect the resolution of the issues related to stormwater flows along the east side of Trafalgar Road. <p>A number of comments provided are regarding these comments.</p> <p>In the June 12, 2018 letter, the landowners state that based on the previous correspondence that they provided on the Town’s Draft Secondary Plan, they do not believe that the Town’s draft Secondary Plan is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) or in conformity with the Growth Plan or the Halton Region Official Plan.</p>	<p>collector roads and Street A;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocating the combined elementary/secondary school campus to the west; and, • introducing some policy flexibility related to refining aspects of the plan through more detailed environmental implementation reports including Stormwater management facilities and the Stormwater conveyance channel in the south west quadrant of the plan. <p>Comments from the landowners group do not specify why they feel the draft Secondary Plan is not consistent with the PPS or in conformity with the Growth Plan or the Halton Region Official Plan therefore staff is unable to respond directly to specific issues. However, as outlined in the staff report, it is the position of staff and the consultant team that OPA 32 is consistent with the PPS and conforms to the Growth Plan and the Regional Official Plan.</p>
<p>Preamble</p>	<p>A number of revisions were proposed which include referencing the Subwatershed Study Addendum in the Secondary Plan</p> <p>Revise the maximum height for high density from 6 storeys to 12 storeys</p> <p>Revisions to SWM policies that allow for innovative and</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Disagree - Maintaining a maximum height of 6 storeys in Vision Georgetown was a key item that the public identified as being important throughout the planning process for Vision Georgetown.</p> <p>Agree.</p>

	<p>contemporary technologies, located to maximize efficiency and be combined wherever possible</p>	
<p>Minimize Land Consumption</p>	<p>A general theme in the comments about minimizing land consumption with respect to storm water management (SWM) ponds, recreational and community uses,</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>Remove reference to enhancement and buffer areas as being part of the NHS</p> <p>Remove the policy regarding the necessity to adapt to and mitigate the impact of climate change</p> <p>Remove the requirement that building construction in the Core shall include infrastructure that will support a future district energy system</p> <p>Remove policies that require LEED certification</p> <p>Remove policies that require buildings to have a distinct base, middle and upper portion to maintain a pedestrian friendly environment</p> <p>Remove the Core Commercial Area designation in the Community Core including removal of associated policies</p> <p>Remove reference to minimum site sizes for Local and Major Commercial Areas</p>	<p>Disagree – this is a requirement of Region Official Plan policy.</p> <p>Disagree – the project team is not in agreement with removing this policy, as consideration of climate change is a requirement of the Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan, as well as the Town’s own policy documents.</p> <p>Revised to say if it is determined that a combined heat and power (CHP) facility is feasible, that the buildings in the subject area provide infrastructure necessary to connect to CHP.</p> <p>Policies have been revised to clarify that all development must be in accordance with the most current version of the Town’s Green Development Standards, while encouraging the pursuit of LEED certification.</p> <p>Removed and replaced with policies regarding articulating the different segments of high density development, given the maximum height of 6 storeys in Vision Georgetown.</p> <p>Disagree - maintaining the provision of a small amount of commercial within the Community Core was an item of importance to the public throughout the planning process for Vision Georgetown, and is viewed as an important aspect contributing to the future success of the Core.</p> <p>Disagree – continue to include the approximate size for Local and Major Commercial to ensure an adequate amount of commercial uses are provide in the Secondary Plan area, an important guiding principle of the Secondary</p>

	<p>Remove reference to the long term intent for the Major Commercial Area to be serviced by underground or structured parking and the need to develop a Comprehensive Development Plan for this block to show how it can develop over time</p> <p>Permit community gardens in the NHS</p> <p>Propose that the maximum height for high density be increased to 12 storeys and increase the maximum density from 150 units per net hectare to 200 units per net hectare. Also recommends that the minimum building height be increased from 4 storeys to 5 storeys</p> <p>Propose that medium density be increased from 100 units per net hectare to 120 units per net hectare and that the height should be revised from a maximum of 4 storeys to a height of 2 to 6 storeys</p> <p>Increase the percentage of townhomes permitted within the Low Density Residential Area from 20% to 30% and increase the maximum density for Low Density Residential from 30 units per net hectare to 40 units per net hectare and the townhomes within this designation from a maximum of 45 units per net hectare to 50 units per net ha</p>	<p>Plan.</p> <p>Revised slightly, but the requirement that a Comprehensive Development Plan be prepared that considers the ultimate provision of structured parking on the site remains in the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Disagree with height increase for high density to 12 storeys, but agree with density increase to accommodate densities for retirement homes that typically have smaller units than a traditional apartment building.</p> <p>Disagree with height increase for medium density but agree with increasing the maximum density to 120 units per net ha.</p> <p>Revised to permit a maximum of 25% of homes within Low Density Residential designation to be townhomes and increased the maximum density for townhouses to 50 units per net ha.</p>
<p>Natural Heritage System Section H6.12.7</p>	<p>Remove policy section regarding creation of new wetlands or woodlands as an enhancement, remove reference to establishing linkages and that a clause be included that states that enhancements contribute to reduced buffer widths as per the buffer framework.</p>	<p>Disagree – this is implementing the Subwatershed Study</p>
<p>Subwatershed Study Section H6.13</p>	<p>Recommend that this Section reference the Subwatershed Study Addendum as well as the May 2017 Subwatershed Study.</p> <p>Revise the buffer range be changed from a 15 m minimum to a 10 m minimum and removes reference to the final buffer widths</p>	<p>Agreed. This has been added.</p> <p>A change has been made to reflect the contents of the Subwatershed</p>

	<p>being determined through the EIR.</p> <p>Remove reference to the NHS as concluded by the SWS being final and instead includes a new policy that the NHS can be revised based on the conclusions of an EIR.</p> <p>Include policies that permit the boundaries of SW Floodplain Channel being subject to a further Environmental Implementation Report.</p>	<p>Study.</p> <p>Disagree. The Subwatershed Study contains detailed analysis that supports the finalization of the NHS at this stage, subject to some refinements at the development stage supported by a satisfactory EIR.</p> <p>Agreed. Policies have been included in Section H6.12.9.</p>
Road Network Section H6.14	<p>Recommend a minimum of 14 metres for window streets and 7.5 metres for lanes</p> <p>Limit roundabouts to collector roads.</p>	<p>Agree, however policy requires submission of a plan that demonstrates that a 14 metre right of way width for a window street is appropriate.</p>
Parkland Section H6.16	<p>Remove policies regarding how parkland will be calculated and should reflect an agreed upon amount of parkland as per a Master Parkland Agreement.</p> <p>Provide more flexibility in park frontages on adjacent roads to state where feasible.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Secondary Plan states that dedication of parkland will be as included in the Town of Halton Hills Official Plan, unless a different amount is determined through a Master Parkland Agreement.</p> <p>Disagree. It is important to maintain park frontages on adjacent roads to maximize visibility and accessibility to parks.</p>
Phasing and Block Plans Section H6.17	<p>Remove policies regarding phasing supporting provision of a range of housing types with a focus on medium and high density, the early development of retail and service uses required to support the new community and the requirement that Street A be constructed before no more than 50% of the area is developed.</p> <p>Remove the requirement for preparation of Block Plans</p>	<p>Phasing policies maintain the need for early development of a range of housing types and maintaining that other retail, non retail and service uses included in early phases to be development ready. The 50% requirement has been deleted.</p> <p>Disagree. The Secondary Plan continues to require Block Plans to ensure coordination of plans of subdivision occurs for such matters as locating schools, parks and storm water management facilities. Additional clarity o the content of Block Plans has been provided.</p>
Cultural Heritage Section H6.21	<p>Remove that the principal heritage philosophy is to retain resources in situ to the maximum extent possible.</p>	<p>Heritage policies in Vision Georgetown have been provided in a manner that is consistent with the Heritage Conservation Strategy and policies recently adopted by Council for the Premier Gateway Phase 1B Secondary Plan.</p>

Agencies		
Halton District School Board		
General Comments	Provides site locational and size criteria for new school sites in Vision Georgetown. Also encourages partnerships and ensuring all of the uses complementary to schools are permitted in Vision Georgetown.	Comments noted and addressed in Vision Georgetown Secondary Plan.
Guiding Principles	Would like Guiding Principle #6 to be amended to include institutional uses as necessary to be provided in a timely manner.	Guiding Principle #6 was established by Council and the community to address the need to provide timely retail within the new community. It is not the appropriate place to include the timely provision of schools.
Community Structure Section H6.4	<p>Further discussion is necessary on the proposed elementary school on the north side of Street B, west of Eighth Line and the relationships between the Local Commercial Area, heritage resource and neighbourhood park and associated traffic.</p> <p>Revise Section 6.4 f) to include “support design opportunities to maximize its potential to become walk-to schools and support of non-vehicle transportation to schools.”</p> <p>Two elementary schools are shown close to cultural heritage resources. School boards are limited on how to address heritage features given the Ministry funding formula.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This can be addressed during the Block Plan and/or draft plan of subdivision approval process.</p> <p>Section 6.4 f) is regarding community structure and the key elements provided in the plan and not the appropriate location to include design objectives related to walkability etc.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
Implications of Planned Density on Built Form Section H6.6	Supports on street parking in key locations for school sites and also supports on-street lay-by bussing lanes for school sites.	Agreed. Lay-by lanes included in this policy.
Built Form and the Private Realm Section H6.9	<p>Supports the general principles in Section H6.9 and seeks to make new facilities energy efficient and sustainable to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>The Board is not supportive of requiring LEED Certification for new schools. Given the limited budgets for new schools, the cost of certification is better used for educational programing space and other sustainability initiatives.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Policies have been revised to clarify that all development must be in accordance with the most current version of the Town’s Green Development Standards, while encouraging the pursuit of LEED certification.</p>
Community Core	HDSB supports the creation of a Community Core, the	Comments noted.

<p>Section H6.10</p>	<p>integration of uses and housing types and the opportunity to share facilities.</p> <p>Supportive of the secondary school site located next to the Library/Community Centre.</p> <p>Amend Section H6.10.1 to include secondary school.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>This section is referencing users more than uses and this comment is covered through referencing students.</p>
<p>Collector Road Network and Roundabouts</p> <p>Section H6.14</p>	<p>Schedules should identify road names to correspond with the policies.</p> <p>Should roundabouts be proposed, the HDSB would like to be consulted with as roundabouts can sometimes be problematic from a safety perspective if close to a school site.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
<p>General Parkland Siting Criteria</p> <p>Section H6.16</p>	<p>Requests that the Town consider creating a park adjacent to Stewarttown P.S. which would support the criteria in this section and the Board’s preference for school sites to be located adjacent to parks.</p> <p>Amend Section H6.16.5 to specifically reference playfields as shared facilities.</p> <p>Would like language included in this section that encourages coordination and ongoing discussion on shared amenities, which recognizes that sometimes the school has afterschool activities that limit parking for park uses.</p>	<p>Given the size of the Stewarttown School site and available green space on site, and also that Stewarttown School is not serving students from Vision Georgetown, the project team has not located a park adjacent to Stewarttown School. Also considered was the long-term vision for this site as articulated in the Gateway designation on the property.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>This matter is not appropriate to be included in a Secondary Plan, and should be addressed through a separate discussion with staff from Recreation and Parks, and could be considered as part of any future reciprocal agreement.</p>
<p>Phasing</p> <p>Section H6.17</p>	<p>Amend Objective g) to directly support the early development of schools sites to support the residents in the new community.</p> <p>Add a policy requiring school blocks to be located entirely within a single development application.</p> <p>Many school sites in Georgetown are at or close to capacity and therefore request that school sites are included in the first phase</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Disagree. While this may be possible for Elementary School sites, due to the size of the Secondary School in the Community Core it isn’t possible to locate it within one property owner and therefore one development application.</p> <p>Comment noted. A phasing plan is to be developed as per policies contained in the Secondary Plan.</p>

	<p>of development.</p> <p>It is the intention of the school board to purchase school blocks as they are registered and then apply for Ministry funding to build the new schools.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Design Guidelines</p>	<p>Generally supportive of the general principles of the Design Guidelines, however the Board has their own school siting and design guidelines for new schools. Where funding permits, the Board will be able to address design details in the guidelines.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Halton Catholic District School Board</p>		
<p>General Comments</p>	<p>Provides site locational and size criteria for new school sites in Vision Georgetown. Encourages partnerships and ensuring all of the uses complementary to schools are permitted in Vision Georgetown to maximize linkages to the community and opportunities to share facilities.</p> <p>Requests that school blocks be placed in earlier phases of development to ensure the board has access to sites in a timely manner.</p> <p>Halton Catholic Board requests that the Town review the current parking requirements for schools in the Zoning By-law as the current standard is quite high and a reduction could have the impact of reducing schools site sizes.</p>	<p>Comments noted and addressed in Vision Georgetown Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Comment noted. A phasing plan is to be developed as per policies contained in the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Secondary School Accommodation Needs</p>	<p>Reiterates the need for a secondary school site in Vision Georgetown and continues to explore the opportunity to locate and elementary school and secondary school on one site.</p> <p>Generally prefer the location of the combined elementary secondary school site at the intersection of Street D and Eighth Line in proximity to Gellert to maximize partnership opportunities.</p> <p>A response to the letter provided by Mr. Robert A. Dragicevic on behalf of the South West Landowners Group requesting that the combined elementary secondary school site be relocated westerly is provided below.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Planning staff and the consultant prefer the location at the intersection of Street A and 10 Side Road for the reasons outlined in the main body of the report and the attached memo outlining proposed changes to the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

<p>Community Hub Designation</p>	<p>Include 'community hub' as a permitted use on all elementary and secondary schools sites as well as other publicly funded institutional sites that allows for the range of uses beneficial in a hub as well as as-of-right zoning for these uses.</p>	<p>Instead of referencing 'community hub' as a permitted use, the Plan was revised to permit public service uses in all commercial designations.</p>
<p>Community Structure Section H6.4</p>	<p>Section 6.4 will need to be updated if the combined elementary/secondary school site is relocated westerly. If the site stays at Street D and Eighth Line, the Board would like to ensure safe crossing to the commercial to the south as well as opportunities to share parking.</p> <p>Further discussion at the draft plan stage is necessary regarding the relationship between the elementary school site, the Local Commercial Area, heritage resource and neighbourhood park.</p> <p>Fully supports the number and general location of the school sites on Schedule H6-2.</p> <p>Two elementary schools are shown close to cultural heritage resources. School boards are limited on how to address heritage features given the Ministry funding formula.</p>	<p>Agreed. Section 6.4 has been updated.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Implications of Planned Density on Built Form Section H6.6</p>	<p>Supports sharing of parking between schools, parks and adjacent uses where possible.</p> <p>Underground or structured parking on schools sites may pose challenges to the Board due to high construction and ongoing maintenance costs.</p> <p>Supports on street parking in key locations for school sites and also supports on-street lay-by bussing lanes for school sites.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Agreed. Lay-by lanes have been included.</p>
<p>Sustainable Development Section H6.7</p>	<p>Supports policies regarding sharing of facilities.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Built Form and the Private Realm Section H6.9</p>	<p>Supports the general principles in Section H6.9 and seeks to make new facilities energy efficient and sustainable to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>Further discussion at site plan stage is required with respect to</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

	<p>strategies for protecting avian wildlife.</p> <p>Generally supports working with the community to create educational programs that benefit students and wider community subject to further consultation</p> <p>Due to benchmark funding from the Ministry, the Board is requesting that the following be optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy efficiency technology (beyond the existing Ontario Building Code) • LEED Certification • Light coloured roofs and green roofs • Rain water harvesting systems, • Planning to be 'grey-water ready' 	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Policies have been revised to clarify that all development must be in accordance with the most current version of the Town's Green Development Standards, while encouraging the pursuit of LEED certification.</p>
<p>Community Core, Mixed Use Gateway, Major Commercial Area, Local Commercial Area Sections H6.10, H6.11 and H6.12</p>	<p>Asks that daycares, EarlyON Centres (drop in centres for caregivers and children), Adult Learning Centres and Community Hubs be permitted uses in the commercial areas proposed within the plan.</p>	<p>Public service uses are permitted in all commercial designations and would include the uses listed by HCDSB.</p>
<p>Major Commercial Area Section H6.12</p>	<p>Concerned that Adult Specialty Store is a permitted use adjacent to a school site.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The combined elementary/secondary school site is no longer adjacent to the Major Commercial Area block, which is where an Adult Specialty Store is proposed as a permitted use.</p>
<p>Major Institutional Area Section H6.12</p>	<p>Support policies in Section H6.12.8 a)b) and c)</p> <p>Regarding d) the board advises that they will seek to acquire the entire combined elementary/secondary schools site and apply to the Ministry to construct the elementary school as it will be required in advance of the secondary school.</p> <p>Asks that daycares, EarlyON Centres (drop in centres for caregivers and children), Adult Learning Centres and 'Community Hubs' be permitted uses in the Major Institutional Area designation.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Public service uses have been added as a permitted use in the Major Institutional designation.</p>

<p>Road Network Section H6.14</p>	<p>Schedules should identify road names to correspond with the policies.</p> <p>Should roundabouts be proposed, the Board would like to be consulted with as roundabouts can sometimes be problematic from a safety perspective if close to a school site.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood Park Section H6.16</p>	<p>Requests Section H6.16.5 be amended to specifically reference playfields as shared facilities.</p> <p>Section H6.16.6 a) centrally located parkettes can also serve as drop off/pick up locations for school bus routes when required.</p>	<p>Agreed. Potential for shared playfields acknowledged.</p> <p>Disagree that this matter is necessary to be included as part of a secondary plan policy.</p>
<p>Phasing Section H6.17</p>	<p>Revise objective g) to directly support the early development of schools sites to support the residents in the new community.</p> <p>Many school sites in Georgetown are at or close to capacity and therefore request that school sites are included in the first phase of development.</p> <p>It is the intention of the school board to purchase school blocks as they are registered and then apply for Ministry funding to build the new schools. The board generally supports the policies in this section</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Comment noted. A phasing plan is to be developed as per policies contained in the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Cultural Heritage Section H6.21</p>	<p>The Board is limited on how to address heritage features given the Ministry funding formula.</p> <p>Site BHR-14 is identified on the Land Use Schedule but not in the text.</p> <p>If the combined elementary/secondary schools site remains in the location at Street D and Eighth Line, the heritage resource will be a challenge to integrate within the school site.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This section of the Secondary Plan has been revised and municipal addresses used for cultural heritage resources..</p> <p>Comment noted. The school site has been relocated.</p>
<p>Major Institutional Area</p>	<p>Should the Town consider relocation of the Major Institutional Area, the Board requests that it be located north of Street D and east of Street A and that the neighbourhood park also be relocated along Street D.</p>	<p>The revised draft land use plan proposes that the combined elementary/secondary school site be located on the north east corner of Street A and the 10th Sideroad. This location is considered appropriate since it would involve the locating of a significant public use on the major north-south collector road as well as at one of the gateways into the Vision Georgetown Community.</p>

	<p>The board will require permissions to allow for a building height of 3 storeys (for the secondary school portion of the building)</p> <p>The site will need to facilitate access to the elementary school from collector or local roads.</p> <p>Supports the creation of a Community Core surrounded by a mix of uses and housing types and hopes to see sport and recreational facilities that can be utilized by the school communities at large for sporting events and activities.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
Design Guidelines	<p>Generally supportive of the general principles of the Design Guidelines, however the Board has their own school siting and design guidelines for new schools. Where funding permits, the Board will be able to address design details in the guidelines.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
Credit Valley Conservation		
General	<p>Credit Valley Conservation provided a number of comments (though track changes) on the draft Secondary Plan policies aimed at providing clarity, consistency in terminology and detail required to SWS requirements in the Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. These comments have been addressed through changes to the final Secondary Plan, where appropriate.</p>
Subwatershed Study Section H6.13	<p>Include the minimum area of the NHS within a the Secondary Plan</p> <p>Specify that a minimum of 2 ha of restoration will be provided for the black locust woodland removal.</p> <p>Specify that a minimum of 6 enhancement areas, 9 infill restoration opportunity sites and several replication features are required to be created as outlined in the Subwatershed Study.</p> <p>Include new subsections that outline the management strategy for the local linkage between Block C and D and the natural channel design for Tributary A respectively.</p> <p>Include landscape enhancements as potentially being included within buffers and recognize that passive trails may be planned within buffer areas.</p> <p>Provide more flexibility in to provide minor refinements to the</p>	<p>Agreed - the majority of comments provided by Credit Valley Conservation have been included in the revised Secondary Plan.</p>

	<p>and Environmental Implementation Reports.</p> <p>With respect to wildlife habitat protection, an additional objective should be included to establish linkages between habitat features including ecopassage opportunities at proposed road crossings.</p>	<p>Agreed. Some terminology was added to consideration of opportunities for linkages at road crossings.</p>
<p>Natural Heritage System Section H6.12.7</p>	<p>Clarify that trails may be provided on the outside edges of buffers and enhancement areas (not within features of the NHS) where appropriate and that the NHS is to be dedicated to the Town in a protected and enhanced state.</p>	<p>Disagree. This can be addressed at a later stage and in accordance with the Vision Georgetown Buffer Framework.</p>
<p>Subwatershed Study Section H6.13</p>	<p>Include the minimum area of the NHS within a the Secondary Plan</p> <p>Specify that a minimum of 2 ha of restoration will be provided for the black locust woodland removal.</p> <p>Specify that a minimum of 6 enhancement areas, 9 infill restoration opportunity sites and several replication features are required to be created as outlined in the Subwatershed Study.</p> <p>Include new subsections that outline the management strategy for the local linkage between Block C and D and the natural channel design for Tributary A respectively.</p> <p>Should be revised to indicate that further study is necessary to demonstrate that the enhancement area is appropriately sized to accommodate the NHS features and functions and may be subject to change. Also within this section should reference minimum requirements for watercourse and floodplain management as outlined in the Subwatershed study and comments from CH on the SW Floodplain addendum.</p> <p>Buffer section should be revised to indicate that regulatory limits may be wider than the range included in the buffer framework and in that instance the regulatory setbacks will apply.</p> <p>Add a new section in the Secondary Plan regarding the southwest floodplain acknowledging that this area is subject to future studies that are required to demonstrate that the proposed alteration will meet the SWS requirements and can be</p>	<p>Generally agree with the comments provided in this section and appropriate changes have been proposed to the Secondary Plan policies.</p>

	<p>permitted pursuant to CH regulations.</p> <p>The section on Environmental Implementation Reports should include the requirement for a Terms of Reference approved by the Town of Halton Hills, Region of Halton and Conservation Authorities</p> <p>The section on EIR Requirements and Technical Studies should be revised to make clear reference to items that were not addressed in the SWS and therefore need to be addressed either through EIRs and/or subsequent technical study.</p> <p>Include landscape enhancements as potentially being included within buffers and recognize that passive trails may be planned within buffer areas.</p> <p>Provide more flexibility in Section A)c) to provide minor refinements to the NHS as a result of more detailed local data, final buffer corridor, linkages, enhancements and restoration area designs.</p> <p>Additional clarification in Section D) on the need for additional technical studies.</p>	
<p>Region of Halton</p>		
<p>Population/Housing Estimates and Density Targets</p>	<p>Requires that the Land Budget Analysis be updated and that the Plan be revised to meet the Region’s Best Planning Estimates.</p>	<p>Agreed. The land budget has been updated and more accurately reflects the Region’s Best Planning Estimates, acknowledging that the significant land budget constraints resulting from additional land area required for a second high school, storm water conveyance and facilities, etc. has made achievement of the BPE targets extremely challenging.</p>
<p>Sustainable Development Section H6.7</p>	<p>Consideration needs to be given to source water protection when recommending permeable pavers in parking lots.</p>	<p>Permeable pavers are encouraged where appropriate.</p>
<p>Natural Heritage System and Subwatershed Study Section H6.12.7 and H6.13</p>	<p>A number of Regional comments on the May 2017 Subwatershed Study have not yet been addressed and must be addressed prior to finalization of the Subwatershed Study and prior to approval of the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Sections of the Secondary Plan that reference the</p>	<p>With respect to the comments in this section on the Natural Heritage System and the Subwatershed Study, it is the position of the consultant team that revisions to the Natural Heritage System as outlined in the Subwatershed Study meet the Regional policy requirements outlined in Section 118(2) of the Regional Official Plan.</p>

	<p>Subwatershed Study being final/completed are inaccurate pending the outstanding concerns identified in the Regional comments, and similarly the NHS is also preliminary and subject to further refinement.</p> <p>States that refinements to the Regional NHS pertaining to the Black Locust Woodland and the Enhancement Area as outlined in the Subwatershed Study have not adequately demonstrated that these refinements are in accordance with applicable Regional Official Plan policies.</p> <p>The Region has not accepted the Subwatershed Study and therefore the extent of the NHS as shown in the Subwatershed Study and the Secondary Plan are not in accordance with applicable Regional Official Plan policies.</p> <p>Section H6.13.2 refers to buffer widths that are not supported by the Region and have identified concerns with the buffer width refinements in several instances over the past four years.</p> <p>The buffer width should be 30 m at this time with potential to refine within the buffer width range at the EIR/FSS stage.</p>	
<p>Affordable Housing Section H6.24</p>	<p>Revise to reference 'Affordable and Assisted' housing.</p> <p>Consider providing priority to planning approval for projects that receive government approval for the provision of assisted housing.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Policies with respect to affordable housing have been added to the Secondary Plan.</p>
<p>Phasing Section H6.17</p>	<p>Additional direction should be provided regarding the timelines for phasing and when various other components/areas of the plan should be implemented.</p> <p>Amend Section H.6.17 to include policies relating to regional servicing and allocation.</p> <p>Generally phasing plans should ensure that a full range and mix of housing types be provided in each development phase and also include affordability targets.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Town will continue to work with the Region on phasing as details of the Regional Allocation Program are available.</p> <p>Policies address requiring a range of housing types by phase, but affordability targets by phase would be too difficult to implement. Affordability targets will be for the Secondary Plan Area as a whole.</p>
<p>Outstanding Items</p>	<p>Three studies are outstanding as required by the Regional Official Plan as follows: Water and Wastewater Servicing</p>	<p>Draft final reports have been prepared for Water and Wastewater, Fiscal Impact Analysis and a Community Infrastructure Plan. These studies will</p>

	<p>Provision of Utilities Fiscal Impact Analysis Community Infrastructure Plan</p>	<p>continue to be reviewed by applicable Town staff and Agencies and will be finalized over the summer and fall of 2018. A policy has been added to the Secondary Plan on the provision of utilities, which will be addressed in greater detail at the Block Plan stage.</p>
<p>Place of Worship</p>	<p>Need to indicate where in the plan religious establishment/place of worship would be permitted.</p>	<p>Agreed. Places of worship have now been included as permitted uses in commercial areas.</p>