



## What We Heard: Summary of Discussions with Treaty 20 First Nations on the Draft Official Plan

City of Peterborough Official Plan Update

June 2021

---

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	Recommended changing the sub-heading from “Indigenous Peoples of Canada and Engagement” to “Indigenous Peoples of Canada and the Duty to Consult” and deleting references to the “Williams Treaties”.	The sub-heading for Section 7.1 has been revised to Indigenous Peoples of Canada and the Duty to Consult and all mention of the Williams Treaties have been removed.
2	Signatories need to be mentioned in the first sentence (i.e., Curve Lake First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation and Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation) of Section 7.1.	Added to Section 7.1(a) “The modern First Nations signatories to Treaty 20 are Curve Lake, Hiawatha and Mississaugas of Scugog Island.”
3	Section 7.1(d) needs to speak to the importance of Constitutional rights and that the language needs to be much more profound than mutual respect as it relates to access to food and medicines. The policy needs to clarify what rights are protected under Treaty 20 and inherent rights. Treaty 20 gave rights to all the wetlands, rice beds, maple bush, islands and shorelines.	No change recommended - Do not believe it is appropriate for the Official Plan to provide interpretation of Treaty 20. These rights are protected under Section 35 of the Constitution Act.
4	Regarding Section 7.1(b), language around free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) needs to be stronger. FPIC means consulting with First Nations prior to development and gaining consent to move forward. Suggest adding text to explain what FPIC is in the Official Plan. FPIC is connected to Section 35 of the Constitution Act and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	Added to Section 7.1(b) that “Free, prior and informed consent involves consulting with Indigenous Communities prior to development and gaining consent before moving forward, where appropriate”.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	Regarding Section 7.1(c), "interests" needs to be changed to "rights" and suggest adding a section on constitutionally protected rights. Remove the reference to Alderville First Nation and adding "other local First Nations".	<p>Revised Section 7.1(c) to "The City will engage and partner as appropriate with Indigenous Communities when considering planning matters that may affect their rights."</p> <p>No change recommended with respect to request for a new section on constitutionally protected rights - do not believe it is appropriate for the Official Plan to provide an interpretation of the Constitution Act, further noting that the Constitution does not define Indigenous rights under Section 35.</p> <p>Reference to Alderville First Nation has been replaced with "other local First Nations" as suggested.</p>
6	Regarding Section 7.1(e), the Official Plan needs to acknowledge inherent rights and Constitutionally protected rights and should have a section explaining the Duty to Consult.	Section 7.1(d) acknowledges that there are Aboriginal and treaty rights as set out under Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. Policies regarding consultation with First Nations are located throughout the Plan and a separate section is not necessary.
7	Regarding Section 7.1(f), the policy needs to further describe the process for partnerships and how that policy may look like on the ground. The policy should be strengthened and require protection of wetlands, rice beds, maple bush, islands and shorelines or broadening the reference to a "case-by-case" or other provisions to offer flexibility.	No change recommended – some examples of potential partnerships are mentioned in the Plan (e.g., Archaeological Management Plan, watershed planning initiatives). Listing items of interest because it may pose limitations in the future and is not advisable.
8	Remove the word "affected" from "affected Indigenous Communities" in Section 5.1(d), reference to the Chippewa Nation in Section 5.1(e) and Section 1.1(b), and "all" from "all Indigenous Communities". The policy should pertain only to Williams Treaties First Nations.	Removed "affected" and all reference to Chippewa Nation from the Plan as suggested.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
9	Regarding Section 5.1(h), it is requested that “should” be replaced with “will” in the policy to read “Indigenous place names will be acknowledged on the physical landscape of the City”.	Changed “should” to “will” – It is noted that the City’s Naming Policy adopted in 2003 recognizes significant local events, people and geographic features through the naming of streets, parks and municipal buildings/facilities. The Naming Policy states that a database of possible street/park/building names will be compiled and includes a category for Local First Nations. The Policy also states that additions to the name back may be proposed by members of the community and that names should be chosen with consideration to gaps in previous naming practices (i.e., First Nations). Emergency response/911 concerns are foremost in all criteria included in the policy.
10	Regarding 5.1.6(c), the reference to “a Complete Application” leaves a gap for minor variances. Concern was expressed regarding minor projects in area of high archaeological potential (e.g., 300 metres from shorelines) or known archaeological sites.	Revised this policy to remove reference to a Complete Application and added reference to site alteration:  “Upon receiving information that lands proposed for development or site alteration may include archaeological resources or constitute an area of archaeological potential, the City will not take any action to approve the development, and the owner of such land will be required to have an Archaeological Assessment and fieldwork studies carried out by a licensed archaeologist in accordance with Provincial standards.”

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
11	Regarding 5.1.6(e), CLFN recommended strengthening the policy wording to indicate "Early and on-going engagement with Indigenous communities throughout the Archaeological Assessment process is [advised]". CLFN also recommended that the policies direct developers to the First Nations archaeological protocols and that the protocol be mentioned at the beginning of the policy. CLFN indicated that the following statement in the policy should read "Where the preservation of the archaeological resources in situ is not possible, the proponent [must] engage with [appropriate Treaty 20 First Nations] to address their interest in the resource and define interpretive and commemorative opportunities related to the resources".	<p>Changed policy to "Early and on-going engagement with Indigenous communities throughout the Archaeological Assessment process is [advised]".</p> <p>Added to Section 5.1.6(f) that the "The proponent shall have regard for the applicable First Nations archaeology protocols within the Treaty 20 area."</p> <p>Revised Section 5.1.6(g) to state "Where the preservation of the archaeological resources in situ is not possible, the proponent must engage with appropriate Treaty 20 First Nations to address their interest in the resource and define interpretive and commemorative opportunities related to the resource" as suggested.</p>
12	Regarding 5.1.6(h), it is recommended that the policy wording be revised to state that the City [will] prepare an Archaeological Management Plan or note an Archaeological Management Plan or "similar value" to ensure an Archeological Plan or Study occurs in areas of high archaeological potential.	No change recommended - the specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan – this is described in further detail in a new Section for "How to Read this Plan".
13	CLFN stated that Section 4.6.1(a) needs to be followed by policy directing the protection and monitoring of water and wetlands. At present, it states that it is acknowledged that water and wetlands are sacred and are of utmost importance to the Michi Saagiig Nation but does not have any policy language to follow-up with this statement.	Added criteria to Section 7.21.2(g) that an Environmental Impact Study shall meet the following general requirements: (ix) "Outline potential impacts from the proposed development and any mitigation measures or monitoring to address these impacts" and (x) "Assess whether there will be any residual impacts after mitigation".
14	Regarding Section 4.6.1(b), add some language on what climate emergency declaration means.	No change recommended - climate change is applicable to multiple sections (not only the Natural Heritage System) and is discussed throughout the Plan. The climate emergency declaration is discussed in further detail in Council Report IPSIM20-003.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
15	There is inconsistency between protection and compensation objectives in the Official Plan.	This comment was perceived to be directed towards the natural heritage system framework, specifically with regards to wetlands and compensation. The natural heritage system framework allows opportunity for compensation where some features may not need to be protected in situ. For example, the relocation of small patch of wetland to a larger wetland will allow for a higher level of wetland function because the small wetland patch is not functionally connected.
16	The term “long-term sustainability” stated in Section 4.6.1(d) was problematic language.	No changes proposed. Disagree that the term is problematic – this is a commonly referenced term.
17	CLFN indicated that the phrase, “provide opportunities” should be removed from Section 4.6.1(e)(i) so it reads “protection from the impacts of development of all significant natural heritage features”.	Section 4.6.1(e)(i) has been revised: “Provide protection from the impacts of development on natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions”.
18	Access to traditional harvest and education should also be listed under Section 4.6.1(e)(ii): “Provide access, where appropriate, to the Natural Heritage System for the purposes of environmental education and nature-based recreation, and integrate nature-based recreation opportunities within parks and along walking trails and bicycle routes that facilitate active transportation;”	Added traditional harvest to this policy.
19	Why isn't a 120-metre buffer applied as the minimum for provincially protected wetlands?	Table A of the Official Plan identifies a minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres for provincially significant wetlands. However, a site-specific Environmental Impact Study will still need to determine an appropriate width and demonstrate why they do not need more than the minimum prescribed in Table A of the draft Official Plan.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
20	Pleased with Section 4.6.1(h) which states “The City will establish Environmental Impact Study guidelines in consultation with the Conservation Authority, Indigenous Communities and appropriate stakeholders to fulfill the policy requirements of this Plan.”	No change needed – comment is in support the draft policies. Noted that the policy has been moved to Section 7.21.2 (Complete Application Requirements).
21	First Nations must be listed in Section 4.6.1(i), to require consultation with First Nations regarding development and/or site alteration of a minor nature and scoping/waiving EIS requirements. This comment needs to be applied throughout the document, where appropriate.	Policy has been added to Section 7.1(f) that “Involvement and engagement with Indigenous Communities will occur as early as reasonably possible on future planning proposals.”
22	Under Section 4.6.2(r), where there are negative impacts within a Level B Natural Heritage System feature, First Nations must be consulted and listed in the policy. First Nations need to be in discussions before mitigation and compensation.	See response to Comment #21. Section 7.13 (Securement of Lands within the Natural Heritage System) also states that the City will undertake a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy in consultation with the Conservation Authority, Indigenous Communities, and stakeholders to guide acquisition, compensation, restoration and stewardship activities within the City. The Restoration and Enhancement Strategy will provide recommendations regarding the identification of priority areas for restoration, enhancement and securement using principles of conservation biology and landscape ecology, including special consideration of Regional Connections and Proximity Linkages, and will allow for compensation measures to be directed in a manner that will provide a benefit for the overall Natural Heritage System.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
23	Do not agree with the Level classification system for wetlands and believes the policies for Level C wetlands may still impact Section 35 Constitutional rights.	Further to the response to Comment #22, it is a requirement that the Provincial Policy Statement is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the recognition and affirmation of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. Added language that "Free, prior and informed consent" involves consulting with Indigenous Communities prior to development and gaining consent before moving forward, where appropriate.
24	The Official Plan should start with a land acknowledgement	Added land acknowledgement to the beginning of the Plan: "We respectfully acknowledge that the City of Peterborough is situated on the treaty and traditional territory of the Mississauga Anishinaabeg. We offer our gratitude to the First Peoples for their care for, and teachings about, our earth and our relations. May we honour those teachings."





# What We Heard: Summary of Public Feedback

City of Peterborough Official Plan Update

June 2021

## Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction .....	3
2.0 General .....	4
3.0 Complete Community.....	9
4.0 Vibrant and Unique .....	21
5.0 Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability.....	28
6.0 Well-Connected with Options for Mobility.....	41
7.0 Strong and Diverse Economy.....	47

## 1.0 Introduction

This is a compilation of comments received from July to December 2019 on the Draft Official Plan (June 19, 2019 version) and the City's respective response to each comment. Please note that some comments have been listed verbatim and others are summarized. The comments received have also been organized under the following categories:

### **1. General**

- Comments generally related to the whole Official Plan and do not fall under any of the specific Guiding Principles and themes. Examples include those comments pertaining to vision, guiding principles, formatting, and organization.

### **2. Complete Community**

- Comments related to growth management, neighbourhoods, housing, parks, open space and rural transitional area.

### **3. Vibrant and Unique**

- Comments related to cultural heritage, urban design, and the Central Area/downtown.

### **4. Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability**

- Comments related to the natural heritage system, sustainable development, climate change, hazard lands.

### **5. Well Connected with Options for Mobility**

- Comments related to transportation planning, multimodal transportation, telecommunications and utilities.

### **6. Strong and Diverse Economy**

- Comments related to employment districts, commercial structure and economic development.

2.0 General

#	Comment/Question (General)	City’s Response / What We Did
1	Secondary Plans and Appendix I is missing from the document.	Secondary plans have been incorporated into the new Official Plan and edited where necessary. Appendix I will be released with the final draft of the Official Plan.
2	Provide the context of each section at the beginning and make clear distinction between descriptive text and policies. The descriptive text can be in smaller text and located on the side margins. Make the “intent” clear in each section and use the heading consistently throughout the document.	The final draft Official Plan will be formatted accordingly. Revisions have been made to improve the consistency of headings within each section.
3	Provide graphics and visually clear headings	The layout of the Official Plan will be undertaken as part of the future/final stages of work.
4	Include a land acknowledgement at the beginning of the Plan.	Added land acknowledgement to beginning of the Plan.
5	The Vision statement is generic and could apply to just about any city; it is not tailored to our particular city and does not speak to why future residents would choose to continue to live, learn, work, and play here. A vision must inform but should also inspire, by highlighting what will define Peterborough as a place, as a culture, as a community, and by identifying how it adapts to and capitalize upon the many forces that we expect will shape it over the next two decades.	The vision was developed based on the input received through the public consultation activities, particularly the online surveys. Other sections of the Plan provide the intent to the policies of the Plan in further detail.
6	A shorter plan, with graphics illustrating what the “on the ground” implementation of policies will generate, will both inform and hopefully inspire.	The layout of the Official Plan will be undertaken as part of a future stage of work and will be made available along with the final draft. Generally, throughout the editing process, effort has been made to consolidate repeating policies and avoiding adding additional explanatory text to reduce length.

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (General)	City's Response / What We Did
7	The context section does little to position the policies that follow. What are the city's strengths and weaknesses, and what opportunities and threats do we expect the city and its planning to face over the life of the official plan? The context section should tell a story; the one that has already been written, is being written now, and how we want that story to play out over the next 20 years.	Text has been added to the Context section to outline future challenges and provide context for the Official Plan policies that follow. However, it is noted that the general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to avoid increasing the length of the document.
8	Much work preceded the official plan, and public engagement has helped to shape it. A description of "how we got to the official plan" would help the plan be seen as the community's plan.	This information will be reported to Council. The suggested section would not be as relevant in future years. Further noting that the general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to avoid increasing the length of the document.
9	There needs to be more user-friendly guides and resources for planning and development processes.	This is not a component of an Official Plan. This may be considered as a separate initiative.
10	Love the vision and guiding principles! Wondering about organic waste disposal options? i.e. green bins? Are these coming??	The provision of an organic waste composting facility is outside the scope of the Official Plan; however, a new composting facility may be completed by fall of 2023. The Official Plan does speak to waste, recycling and composting containers as considerations for site plan approval under Section 7.7 (Site Plan Approval) and encouraging three stream waste collection capability in all multi-residential buildings under Section 5.4.3 (Policies for Buildings and Sustainable Design).
11	There are positive aspects to Peterborough's Draft Official plan such as improved inclusion of First Nations and acknowledgment of their traditional lands and inclusion of Indigenous names, a commitment to energy conservation and a focus of local food stores. In addition, improved access secondary suites is good because it should increase places available for rent.	No changes provided – comment is in support of draft policies.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (General)	City's Response / What We Did
12	The current draft appears heavily focused upon meeting provincial requirements, and in that sense is quite passive in nature. Given the many factors facing this city at this critical juncture in its history, its official plan should be more than a response to requirements, but a clear direction-setting document that guides (and inspires) the community to the future it desires.	It is a requirement of the Plan to conform with provincial policies and requirements. Improving clarity and appropriate guidance has been considered in revisions.
13	The context section does little to position the policies that follow. What are the defining physical features unique to this city? What does the community value about these features? Beaches, extensive public access to shoreline and water, commanding views, and others help to make this community unique. The context section should tell a story; the one that has already been written, is being written now, and how we want that story to play out over the next 20 years.	The context section was revised to speak to the physical landscape and outline the purpose of the Official Plan.
14	More detail is required on the things that will be monitored. Why not commit to developing a monitoring plan that includes a wide range of indicators related to the various elements of the OP? Sustainability could be one unifying theme.	Section 7.3.2 (Monitoring) commits to monitoring and measuring performance. That section speaks to monitoring to determine if the implementation of the policies fulfills the overall Vision, Guiding Principles and Objectives of this Plan. Sustainability is already captured through the vision and guiding principles.
15	<p>The following are important to me:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads</li> <li>- Employment</li> <li>- Daycare</li> </ul> <p>I realize that there has been a 20% decrease in subsidy for childcare but that means that the province is still paying 80%, I'm going to need childcare soon and I also feel that 30 good jobs being lost is far too much for a council to ignore. Keep the jobs and these services to the citizens of Peterborough.</p>	<p>The Municipal Child Care Programs is part of the annual budget discussions and is not within the purview of the Official Plan Update.</p> <p>The Official Plan does however speak to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing a convenient, accessible, affordable and integrated transportation system;</li> <li>• Ensuring that there is an appropriate supply of lands are designated for population-related employment (e.g., retail, daycare, institutional uses) and employment land employment (i.e., industrial uses) to allow for job creation and a wide range of employment opportunities;</li> <li>• Fostering a high quality of life to attract investment and sustain a workforce; and.</li> <li>• Considering opportunities to offer incentives for business growth.</li> </ul>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (General)	City's Response / What We Did
16	I want to express my concerns about closing the city run daycare programs. The company I worked for closed and therefore I can really feel for the daycare workers and hope you find it in your heart to not put them out of work, believe me it's devastating. I also will need daycare if I can find a good paying job. Maybe the City could work on trying to attract more jobs to the area. I am not one to take advantage of government programs but unless I find work soon, I will need to look into what help I can get. In short, I would like you to focus on job creation and daycare. I appreciate the opportunity to have input.	Please see response to Comment #15 above.
17	Are there separate public at large/citizens, Indigenous groups'/youth advisory committees? Or a committee that incorporates knowledge and experience of settler, Indigenous people, and youth?	The establishment of a committee of Council is outside the scope of the Official Plan. The draft Official Plan does, however, include policies for consultation with Indigenous communities and community engagement. One of the objectives to community engagement described in the Plan is to provide equitable opportunity for a wide demographic to be informed and involved on planning matters, Sections 7.1 and 7.2 (Public Consultation and Community Engagement)).
18	It's important to acknowledge that this Plan must <b>position the community</b> to respond <i>effectively, efficiently and equitably</i> to the challenges and opportunities that have arrived or loom on the horizon. The City's planning approach must be characterized by quick response to rapid change, a focus on key strategic issues (rather than comprehensive), and planning will have to be highly inclusive in nature.	Additional language in the Context section was added to frame future challenges/opportunities.
19	The Draft Plan lacks any <b>front-end context</b> that one would expect to see and that would drive the Plan's goals, objectives and policies. The Plan must explain the assumptions, analysis, projections and predictions that provide the foundation for future planning, and life, in this community. Accordingly, the Plan must explain the nature of the many <b>trends, challenges and trends</b> to be planned for in this community over the next 20 years for land use planning, urban design, infrastructure and resource management.	Additional language in the Context section was added to frame future challenges/opportunities. It is noted; however, that providing context is not a statutory requirement of an Official Plan. The focus must be on managing change into the future through planning policy.

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (General)	City's Response / What We Did
20	A key issue concerns the absence of any substantive <b>plan monitoring and evaluation strategy</b> , including supportive indicators. The insights generated by plan evaluation would then guide changes to plan content and direction, and thereby ensure <i>relevance, currency and effectiveness</i> of the plan. Accordingly, the Plan needs a monitoring and evaluation strategy that explains the evaluation process and elements. This includes clarification of tasks and timing; it will also be necessary to develop strategic, key indicators that are tied directly to, and support, the Plan's goals, objectives and policies.	Added text to Section 7.3.2 (Monitoring) that the results of monitoring activities may be used to inform future policy direction and updates to the Plan.
21	Ideally, we want to see (and read) Official Plans that not only inform and meet statutory requirements for content; they should also inspire and motivate the community. The Official Plan should be readable, accessible and focused - one that focuses on the key strategic issues of importance to the City's quality of life, sustainability and well-being.	The draft Official Plan contains a considerable amount of context and explanatory text which supports the readability and provides rationale for the subsequent policies in every section. The final formatting of the document will also support readability.
22	With regard to the <b>public consultation</b> issue, where did the City really land on Arnstein's Ladder, IAP2 spectrum, etc. with this Draft? The City seems to have taken a rather traditional approach to consultation with the Draft Plan (i.e. open houses, information sessions).	In May of 2017, based on the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) model, Council agreed to "Involve" the public in the development of the Plan with some opportunities to "Collaborate". The City has used a number of methods to involve and collaborate through pop-ups, online surveys, a four-day community design charrette, open houses, and face-to-face meetings. It is estimated that there has been well over 5,000 participants throughout the Official Plan Update process.
23	Nogojwanong Friendship Centre should be included in the Official Plan so that the concerns of urban Indigenous community members are heard, and that Indigenous Peoples are empowered in and around Peterborough. This relationship should be ongoing. As part of building and maintaining relationships, seat(s) should be given for Indigenous representation at council meetings.	Section 7.1 (Indigenous Peoples of Canada and the Duty to Consult) includes the Nogojwanong Friendship Centre, recognizes the interests of the urban indigenous population from a local and regional planning perspective and directs the City to engage and partner with Indigenous Communities as appropriate. Indigenous representation at council meetings is not within the scope of the Official Plan update.
24	Recognize the rights of Indigenous communities, not simply or narrowly "interests".	This Plan has been revised in consultation with Treaty 20 First Nations.
25	Positive to see reference/recognition to Free Prior and Informed Consent in regard to Indigenous People, commitment to work towards constructive, cooperative relationships with Indigenous People	These policies have been revised in consultation with Treaty 20 First Nations.



### 3.0 Complete Community

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
1	How will inclusionary zoning policies be measured and monitored?	Inclusionary zoning policies have been removed from the draft Official Plan until such time it can be confirmed that they can be implemented in the City.
2	The Official Plan does not appropriately address the issue of poverty and homelessness.	Policies relating to Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing can be found in Section 5.2.3. Specific details and program direction will be established in the Housing and Homelessness Plan.
3	Improvements to public space will attract more development downtown.	The City will continue efforts towards improving and enhancing the public realm in the Central Area. References to this are in Section 4.3 (Central Area).
4	There are not enough cultural and recreational facilities in the City.	The determination of need for more cultural and recreational facilities will be established through the recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.
5	The cultural and recreational facilities that exist are not equitably distributed.	The equitable distribution of cultural and recreational facilities will be established through the recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.
6	Place time limits on development fee exemption to encourage timely development.	Any limitations to development charge exemptions will have to be established through the Development Charges By-law.
7	All neighbourhoods should include a restaurant or pub.	Neighbourhood supportive uses are permitted in the Residential designation.
8	New subdivisions should include multi-use recreational facilities.	The need for recreational facilities will be established through the recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Following the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the location of recreation facilities in new subdivisions will be determined through the Secondary Planning process.
9	The City needs to facilitate 'neighbourliness' – social gathering spaces in neighbourhoods.	Section 5.3 (Parkland and Open Space) identifies opportunities for socialization as a benefit to providing park space throughout the City.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
10	Mechanisms are required to protect existing neighbourhoods especially with regards to compatibility and traffic.	Added policy language to Section 4.2.2 (Residential Designation) to require residential development and intensification be compatible with the surrounding context.
11	Permit the development of tiny homes on private property (e.g. Cornerstone Landing Youth Services and Algonquin College in Lanark County).	Tiny homes on private property can be established under the policies for additional residential units/secondary suites, Section 4.2.2(Residential Designation)).
12	Work with community for innovative ways to provide affordable and special needs housing.	Policies relating to Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing can be found in Section 5.2.3. Specific details and program direction will be established in the Housing and Homelessness Plan.
13	Develop existing surface parking lots in the downtown.	Section 4.3.1 encourages parking in the Central Area to be in above or below grade parking structures and appropriately designed. Section 4.3.1 requires all development in the Central Area to be transit-supportive and pedestrian-oriented.
14	Parks should all have water service to facilitate community gardens.	The facilities provided at each park is established through the recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan/Park Standards.
15	Farmland should be preserved and the City should intensify opposed to developing new subdivisions.	The currently unbuilt land not required for urban development for the life of this Plan will be identified as Rural Transition Area (Section 4.7).
16	Consider permitting modular housing as an option for low-cost and affordable housing.	Modular housing is already permitted in residential areas, subject to the policies and provisions of the Zoning By-law and the Ontario Building Code.
17	Passive recreation opportunities should be explored and considered, not just development of parks with playgrounds and sports facilities.	The facilities and programming of uses provided at each park are established through the recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan/Parks Standards.
18	Residential development needs to be accompanied by commercial development to reduce vehicle trips.	Neighbourhood supportive uses are permitted in the Residential designation. Further, the mixed-use corridors (Section 4.4) enable the development of buildings containing commercial and residential uses in areas outside of the downtown.
19	Larger developments should include indoor and/or outdoor common space.	On-site amenity space is a requirement for larger developments. More detailed requirements may be established through the Zoning By-law, design guidelines and/or determined through Site Plan Approval.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
20	The Plan should consider inclusion of the new 10-point housing plan.	Point 6 of the 10-point housing plan states that "City of Peterborough will continue to develop its Official Plan to ensure that creative solutions for housing are available to the community, such as allowing for tiny homes through zoning and by-law amendments and will look to create an inventory of land that could be made available for affordable housing development". These are addressed in Section 5.2.4. The other nine points are outside the purview of the Official Plan.
21	Require residential development to be no more than one kilometre from a grocery store.	The draft Official Plan contains General Policies for Food Stores (Section 4.1.5) which encourages the equitable distribution of food stores and their location in neighbourhoods and strategic growth areas.
22	Requiring 10% of new residential developments be affordable will discourage development in the City and/or result in local builders investing in neighbouring municipalities.	Section 5.2.4 has been reworded to clarify that the percentage is a City-wide target on an annual basis.
23	The affordable housing target should be increased – 10% is not enough	Increased the minimum target to 20%.
24	Include higher density forms of housing as a proxy for housing affordability.	Section 5.2 (Housing) identifies providing a range and mix of housing types as an objective for being able to respond to the different needs in the housing market. Higher density housing is intrinsically more affordable.
25	Affordable housing needs to prioritize homelessness first.	Homelessness first strategies are developed through the City's Housing and Homelessness Plan.
26	There is a need for a specific affordable housing strategy with ways to compel the development industry to build.	The City has an Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan to assist/incentivise in the development of affordable housing in the City. Although the City can create incentives for developing affordable housing, landowners cannot be forced to use the incentives or develop their property.
27	An intensification rate of 50% is too low and needs to be increased.	The 50% intensification target currently stated in the draft Official Plan is a minimum target. Exceeding the target is permitted.
28	Louis Street Park should be developed as a passive green space and the splash pad/ice rink should be located at the Simcoe and Bethune Park.	The Louis Street Urban Park has already gone through the design process and is currently under construction.
29	The City needs to be enabled to be proactive on housing issues through policies in the Official Plan.	Considerations to encourage affordable and accessible housing is included in Section 5.2.4. Housing strategies are also in the City's Housing and Homelessness Plan.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
30	Zoning By-law needs to be changed to remove restrictions on residential development.	The Planning Act requires the City to update its Zoning By-law within three years of the new Official Plan coming into effect.
31	Greater incentives for affordable housing need to be established.	Considerations have been added to Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing). Recommendations for greater incentives for affordable housing may be also established through Housing and Homelessness Plan.
32	Establish communication protocol when working towards affordable and assisted housing.	Policies regarding public consultation are established through Section 7.2 of the Plan.
33	Affordable housing success stories need to be promoted.	This is not within the scope of an Official Plan. The Housing Division prepares annual reports on progress relating to the goals of the Housing and Homelessness Plan, which may highlight success stories that occur each year.
34	Policies that protect the existing affordable housing stock from redevelopment need to be introduced.	Policies that protect existing affordable housing stock are present in Section 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 (Conversions of Rental Housing)
35	Barrier-free housing is badly needed.	Through Site Plan Control, the City will require site development and design to include barrier-free and universal accessibility as established through the Ontario Building Code and AODA.
36	Height limits in neighbourhoods will restrict infill development opportunities.	The intent of the Official Plan is to direct the greatest density to the downtown and mixed-use corridors (i.e., strategic growth areas). Some larger infill projects may occur in the Residential designation.
37	City should continue acquisition of property adjacent to the Otonabee River and Little Lake for public parks.	Section 5.3 speaks to the shoreline of the Otonabee River, Little Lake and Trent-Severn Waterway will be set aside as part of the City's parks and open space network. Further, Section 5.4.1 states that the City shall explore opportunities for the acquisition of land abutting the waterways to improve public access.
38	Change bylaws with minimum house sizes to allow for tiny homes in the city, or more than one tiny home on shared property.	Section 5.2.3 provides consideration to the provisions of the Zoning By-Law are sufficiently flexible to permit or explore a range of innovative housing types and sizes, including secondary suites, accessory dwelling units, garden suites, cohousing, tiny homes, communal housing, and life-lease housing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
39	There is a disconnect in encouraging infill development and identifying greenspace as an important aspect of quality of life.	The City will develop a network of active and passive open space and recreation facilities to prevent a deficiency in park area and provide adequate opportunities for residents of the City (Section 5.3). Further, the Official Plan establishes five categories of parks including Urban Park Spaces, which was developed to respond to the shift towards intensification in the downtown and corridors.
40	Central Area boundary should be extended north and west to Parkhill Road and Park Street.	The northern boundary of the Central Area is unchanged from the current boundary because aside from identified mixed use corridors of George and Water Streets, the area north of the Central Area boundary is viewed to have limited redevelopment potential. The Central Area already includes Park Street.
41	Height limit in the Central Area should not exceed six storeys.	In the Central Area, height in excess of six stories is only permitted as of right in the Downtown Core Area and Industrial Conversion designations. The additional height is necessary to help the City achieve its intensification target and density target.
42	Ensure new development consists of a mix of unit types as well as community spaces.	The Housing Supply policies in Section 5.2.2 identify that the City shall provide an appropriate range of housing types and densities to suit the needs of current and future residents. Additionally, the Official Plan establishes five categories of parks including Urban Park Spaces, which was developed to respond to the shift towards intensification in the downtown and corridors. Further, as part of Site Plan Approval, the provision of outdoor amenity and/or play facilities shall be displayed, where appropriate.
43	The City needs to better facilitate second units/garden suites.	Secondary suites are permitted in Residential designations. This policy has been moved to Section 5.2.3. Secondary suite (additional residential unit) policies are also further articulated through policy 4.2.2 and have been revised to permit up to two secondary suites for each single-detached, semi-detached or townhouse unit. One unit may be contained within the primary residential dwellings and another unit may be within an accessory structure.
44	Do second units or garden suites count towards the intensification target?	Yes, second units (referred to as additional residential units in the Official Plan) count towards the annual residential intensification target.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
45	A range of affordable housing unit types should be available from tiny homes to housing for large/multi-generation families.	Section 5.2.2 (Housing Supply) speaks to the City permitting and facilitating all forms of housing to meet the needs of current and future residents, including affordable, assisted and special needs housing. Specific programs and housing needs may be established through the Housing and Homelessness Plan.
46	Discriminatory language (e.g. ageist wording) needs to be removed.	Revisions have been made to remove references to specific demographic groups where deemed appropriate.
47	The Official Plan is too vague. It does not include any legal framework or zoning provisions.	The Official Plan is meant to be a high-level and overarching document identifying goals and objectives of the City. The legal framework for planning in Ontario is established at the Provincial level and zoning provisions are established through the Zoning By-law.
48	There is a need to update the Zoning By-law immediately.	Section 26(9) of the Planning Act requires the City to update its Zoning By-law within three years of the new Official Plan coming into effect.
49	Is there political will to achieve the vision and principles of the Official Plan?	The Official Plan will need to be adopted by City Council.
50	The Official Plan has to be adjusted to reflect Bill 108.	Revisions have been made to the draft Official Plan with respect to Bill 108.
51	Need an accessible housing target of 15%	Added policy to Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) that "The City will encourage options for accessibility within all new residential developments."
52	The City needs to speed up the approvals process for new subdivisions which will help with affordability.	Section 5.2.4 states that the City will encourage and assist, where possible, in the creation of affordable and/or accessible housing by exploring opportunities for fast-tracking development applications that are providing affordable and/or accessible housing. It is noted however that timelines for reviewing development applications are established in the Planning Act
53	All references to affordable housing that may apply to private developers must be removed/	The City is required by the Province to include affordable housing policies in the Official Plan.
54	Will the City be preparing a Schedule for Residential Density?	The City will not be preparing a schedule that replicates the Residential Density schedule of the current Official Plan.
55	How will the existing Secondary Plans be incorporated into the new Official Plan?	Relevant secondary plans have been incorporated into the new Official Plan and edited where necessary.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
56	How is the concept of Nodes from the urban design charette being incorporated into the Official Plan?	The nodes analyzed during the design charette have generally been incorporated into the mixed-use corridors and identified as key intersections (Section 4.4.2 (Major Mixed-Use Corridor Designation)). More detailed policies and design standards for these intersections may be established through the Secondary Planning process.
57	What is the highest priority of the Official Plan?	All priorities are equal and the Official Plan is to be read in its entirety (Section 1.2 (Purpose and Effect)).
58	What is being proposed to improve the availability of services and amenities?	Services and amenities are proposed to be improved under the overarching guiding principle of creating complete communities. Mixed-use corridors and the permission of neighbourhood supportive uses in residential areas will bring commercial services closer to residents. Section 5 speaks to community development policies (housing, parks, etc.).
59	How was the determination made between what was considered "Major" versus "Minor" Mixed-Use Corridor? Perhaps the intersection of Clonsilla and Lansdowne needs to be reconsidered.	The determination between major and minor mixed-use corridors was based on the anticipated redevelopment potential. The boundaries of the Major Mixed-use Corridor has been revised to include the intersection of Clonsilla Avenue and Lansdowne Street West.
60	The City should consider having housing designated specifically for students and housing designated specifically for low-income residents.	Student residences may be considered as part of an institutional use; however, it is not appropriate for the Official Plan to identify types or classes of people.
61	Increase affordable housing target from 10% to 25%	The target indicated in the Plan has been increased to 20% per annum.
62	I support flexibility in height limits, well-designed tall buildings are a compact, sustainable way to house a lot of people. NIMBY-driven decisions are never good decisions for the long term.	Section 5.4 (Urban Design) states the City's commitment to achieving a high quality of urban design and architectural excellence and encourages development proponents to design buildings which include building materials and colours, landscaping and architectural styles compatible with the context of the area, while achieving variety along the streetscape. Development proponents will be further encouraged to incorporate architectural detailing and high-quality durable materials that maintain and enhance the character of the existing area and extend the life cycle of the built environment.
63	Good design of tall buildings can address height concerns. Rather than being inflexible with height limits, allow nearby residents to comment on design. Use virtual reality to visualize neighbourhood with new tall building.	Design is considered in Section 5.4 (Urban Design).



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
63	Agree that tall buildings can be built more creatively allowing more height (i.e., staggered levels) but agree that Central Area should be limited height (4-5 floors).	There are locations within the Central Area that may accommodate taller buildings. The maximum heights are subject to the policies in Section 4.3.1.
64	Ensure that tall buildings/apartments have surrounding greenspace to support healthy development of children/families and support mental health in all ages.	On-site amenity space is a consideration for development under Sections 4.2.2 for Neighbourhoods, 4.3.1 for the Central Area and 4.4.2 for the Major Mixed-Use Corridors. The City has added a policy under Section 5.4.1 (Urban Design) to commit to the preparation of urban design guidelines for medium and high-density development.
65	Ensure the Parkhill Rd/Water St commercial node stays as small as possible. The expansion of this node could be problematic for surrounding neighbourhoods.	The Parkhill Road and Water Street intersection is designated as Major Mixed-Use Corridor and the surrounding area is designated as Minor Mixed-Use Corridor. The Minor Mixed-Use Corridor is expected to accommodate limited intensified development, while maintaining a broad mix of compatible land uses per Section 4.4.3.
66	More density in the downtown core. Increase the density target from 150 residents and jobs per hectare to 200.	The target of 150 residents and jobs per hectare represents a minimum target in which the City must plan to achieve by the year 2031.
67	Section 5.2 Housing: Wording is not strong enough in terms of housing types we "require" vs. what developers want to build. Look up Mayor Plante of Montreal, this week cancelled a development because the builder would not comply with a variety of housing types. The City must strengthen its stance and be in control.	Section 5.2.2 states that the City shall require a mix of housing types and densities. The Planning Act also places limitations on where inclusionary zoning may be applied.
68	The Plan should also address the need of services to assist those using affordable housing	Section 3.2 (Population and Employment Forecasts) indicates that all planning approvals will be evaluated on the confirmation of the availability of adequate public service facilities.



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
69	New housing developments should be required to provide supporting infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks) and support park and open space and land securement plan	<p>With respect to sidewalks, Section 6.2.4 (Complete Streets) requires sidewalks on both sides all public roads, including cul-de-sacs with 30 or more residential units or with a through pedestrian connections.</p> <p>With respect to parks and open space, Section 2.2.1 (Complete Community) speaks to the provision of a balanced mix of land uses, including access to parks and open spaces. Section 5.3 (Parkland and Open Spaces) further indicates that a complementary program to provide active and passive open space and recreation facilities will be developed to prevent any deficiency in park area and to provide adequate recreation opportunities for the citizens of the City of Peterborough and for visitors to the City. Special emphasis will be placed on ensuring the continuity and accessibility of a connected system of parkland throughout the City of Peterborough. Section 5.3 has been revised to speak to accessibility of the parkland system.</p>
70	Will the city be supporting acquisition of new parks and open spaces? When was the last park/open space that the city invested/purchased?	The Louis Street park and Bethune Street linear park are examples of recent investment in parks.
71	Housing affordability needs to be considered in making each policy choice throughout the Plan	Housing affordability is a consideration of this Plan and strategies for addressing housing affordability are identified in Section 5.2.4.
72	Positive to see that City of Peterborough's Housing Plan informs the Official Plan policies and the specific 10% target/requirement for all new developments.	The affordable housing target has been increased to 20% after further review and consideration. For greater clarity, the 20% requirement applies as a city-wide target and does not apply to site-specific developments.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
73	Is the 10% comparable to other jurisdictions of similar size and demographics?	The City of Brantford's (population 97,000 in 2016) targets for affordable ownership housing and affordable rental housing will be established in the Brantford-Brant Housing Stability Plan. The current targets in the Brantford-Brant Housing Stability Plan are to provide an increase of 506 units of municipally owned and operated affordable rental housing by 2030, and an increase of 337 units of affordable rental housing owned and operated by non-profit and/or co-operative housing providers by 2030. The affordable housing target in the draft Official Plan has been increased to 20% after further review and consideration. The City's target is a minimum target.
74	Our new arrangement of housing developments should occur around nuclei/centres that supply daily needs.	The Plan acknowledges key intersections as having the potential to reinforce a community hub or gateway in Section 4.4.2 (Major Mixed-Use Corridor Designation).
75	There are issues with inconsistent application of a complete community between the definition and introduction of the Official Plan. One is at a city-scale and others are at a neighbourhood-scale.	The "complete community" may apply to both a community/city-scale and neighbourhood-scale.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
74	<p>The new Minor Mixed-Use Corridor designation will trigger significant changes which deserve scrutiny. There are only two ways to intensify the number of jobs and residents in the Minor Mixed-Use Corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demolish a given, existing building and rebuild up or out on the same land size.</li> <li>• Put more residents or jobs into an existing building by adding additions or converting the existing building</li> </ul> <p>Both options will change the appearance of the area and increase the number of cars parked on or near the plot of land. Intensification runs the risk of exacerbating the parking problem in the area bounded by Parkhill, London, George and Water where car parking which pills over on to lanes, on-street parking, even front yards and back yards. In regard to cars parked in such a way as to intrude on to lanes, the only recourse City residents have is to obtain a court for an injunction.</p> <p><b>Suggestions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the upcoming Zoning Bylaw to implement the new Official Plan, base parking requirements on hard evidence such as Census, data from comparable cities such as Brantford, Guelph, parking counts.</li> <li>2. Regulate parking based on the number of individuals (e.g. number of jobs or bedrooms), not number of units.</li> <li>3. Into the new Official Plan, build an automatic 5-year review of the efficacy of Zoning Bylaws to implement the goals of the new Official Plan.</li> </ol>	<p>Section 4.4.3 (Minor Mixed-Use Corridor Designation) states that adequate parking, loading and waste collection/storage facilities for all permitted land uses shall be provided on the site. Front yard parking will not be permitted for non-residential uses and mid-rise residential uses and parking and servicing areas shall be located at the rear or side of the building and not visible from the street. The parking and servicing areas must further be set back and appropriately buffered from existing or planned residential areas. In addition to the updates to the zoning by-law, the secondary planning process will provide direction on the type of development and how to address parking and other issues. The Planning Act requires that the City update the Official Plan 10 years after it comes into effect as a new official plan and every five years thereafter. Subsequently, the Planning Act requires that the zoning by-law is updated no less than three years after the approval of its new official plan.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Complete Community)	City's Response / What We Did
77	I would like to urge you to do all you can to encourage some intensification of rental and condo residences in the downtown area. The scale that makes the most sense in terms of fitting in are buildings on the scale of the new buildings at Aylmer and Hunter by Ashburnham Realty, but other size buildings are also welcome. I know several aging residents of downtown who are thinking of moving downtown, but it is very hard to find something. All of these people would be selling houses in Peterborough to do so, freeing up space for families and making life easier for themselves by locating where they would not need to drive as often. The demand is there, but not the supply at a reasonable price. Generally, I think that Peterborough needs to 'citify' itself and reduce green field sprawl as best it can. Good for the climate and quality of life (with nature near enough for everyone to access).	Residential intensification is key to achieving the density target for the Urban Growth Centre and the intensification target in the built-up area as specified in the Official Plan. The Official Plan provides criteria for mid-rise and high-rise buildings under the general policies applicable throughout the Central Area in Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to the Central Area).
78	Are additional stories beyond the prescribed Official Plan maximum building heights will still be allowed under the Community Benefit Development Charge (Bill 108)?	Section 37 bonusing provisions of the Planning Act has been repealed - the City is no longer permitted to authorize increases in height and density of development beyond what is permitted in a zoning by-law in return for community benefits. The community benefits charge is a charge to fund the provision of soft services (e.g., libraries, parks) and has no ties to bonusing (planning permissions for greater height and density). The former 'bonusing' policies in the Official Plan have been revised to allow the City to consider additional building height in appropriate locations, to a specific maximum would still be subject to all policies regulating compatibility.
79	Why is the delineated built boundary defined 13 years ago guiding policy to 2041? Does it come from the 2006 Growth Plan, why not use the 2016 edition?	Only the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has the authority to update/revise the delineated built boundary. Per Growth Plan Policy 5.2.2(1)(a) to implement this Plan, the Minister will, in collaboration with other Ministers of the Crown where appropriate, identify, establish or update the delineated built boundary.
80	How will the lands designated Rural Transitional Area be determined once the Land Needs Assessment is completed?	Staff has developed criteria to determine what lands will be designated as excess. This is discussed in Staff Report IPSPL21-016.

## 4.0 Vibrant and Unique

#	Comment/Question (Unique and Vibrant)	City's Response / What We Did
1	Encourage underground parking and active transportation to reduce use of downtown lands as surface parking lots.	Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to the Central Area) encourages parking in the Central Area to be located in either above or below grade parking structures and appropriately designed while also requiring all development in the Central Area to be transit-supportive and pedestrian-oriented.
2	Expand the BIA boundary west to Park Street.	This is outside the scope of an Official Plan. Expansion of existing BIA boundaries is done according to procedure outlined in the Business Improvement Area By-law.
3	Central Area should not extend east of the Otonabee River or south of Little Lake.	The existing Central Area currently extends to those areas.
4	Ensure new developments include community spaces (parks and other shared gathering spaces).	Parks and associated gathering spaces are encouraged in new developments towards the goal of maintaining the City's growth towards a complete community. The City's Park Standards establishes guidelines for the location and design of parks.
5	A Heritage Conservation District study for the downtown should be a requirement.	Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to the Central Area) states that "[t]he City will complete a Heritage Conservation District study for the Central Area."
6	Safe and defensible space creation should be a requirement of urban design.	Section 5.4.1 (Introduction to Urban Design) states that one of the general objectives of urban design is to provide safety, comfort and amenity for those experiencing an area or space.
7	"Providing safety" in public spaces should identify the users that will determine safety.	Section 5.4.1 (Introduction to Urban Design) states that one of the general objectives of urban design is to provide safety, comfort and amenity for those experiencing an area or space. Lists of specific groups are generally avoided throughout the Official Plan to maintain inclusivity.
8	The Official Plan needs to be clearer about AODA and pedestrian friendliness/safety.	Reference to AODA standards has been added to section 2.2.4 (Well Connected with Options for Mobility).
9	Re-introduce school facilities to the downtown.	Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to the Central Area) states that the City will encourage opportunities for new institutional uses within the Central Area.

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Unique and Vibrant)	City's Response / What We Did
10	A main street beautification program should be developed to enhance the look of downtown.	Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to the Central Area) speak to improving the appearance of the public realm in the Central Area.
11	City needs to promote and incentivize development of vacant upper-storey space in the downtown.	The City has a Residential Intensification and Conversion Grant Program through the suite of Community Improvement Plan programs designed to promote and incentivize upper-storey development in the Central Area.
12	Policies should be created to better enforce property standards to ensure upkeep takes place.	Section 7.18 states that the City shall enact a By-Law pursuant to the Building Code Act or other enabling legislation setting forth minimum standards for maintenance and occupancy of all buildings, dwellings and open space areas within the City. Property standards are enforced by the Building Division in accordance with the Property Standards By-law.
13	Storefronts should reflect the existing built heritage of the downtown.	Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to the Central Area) states that "[t]he City will complete a Heritage Conservation District study for the Central Area." Further, the section speaks to promoting downtown re-development within the context of historic preservation.
14	Allow for green space between buildings and the street and a visual break between buildings themselves along major corridors.	Development in the mixed-use corridors will enhance efficiency, convenience, safety and appearance through a number of means, including landscaping and streetscape improvements. Further, it is anticipated that development within the mixed-use corridors will be facilitated by the creation of Secondary Plans to address more specific planning and urban design components.
15	The Official Plan needs to ensure policies are viewed through an anti-oppression lens.	It is not clear which policies are being referred to in this comment, but generally any policy referring to specific demographic groups have been removed.
16	The City should be careful not to token Indigenous art.	Section 5.4.4 (Policies for Public Art) has been revised to include a reference to consultation with First Nations communities where Indigenous artwork or a public art program are contemplated.
17	A Heritage Study for Ashburnham Village needs to be completed.	Policies enabling the study of heritage resources are included in Section 5.1 (Cultural Heritage) of the Official Plan. Identifying priorities will be done through the Heritage Preservation Office in consultation with the Arts, Culture and Heritage Committee, Peterborough Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee, property owners and residents.
18	Cultural heritage needs to respect Indigenous rights and history.	Section 5.1 (Cultural Heritage) acknowledges the notification and involvement of all Indigenous Communities having an interest in cultural heritage.

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Unique and Vibrant)	City's Response / What We Did
19	Cultural heritage needs to ensure inclusion of cultures of new residents to the area.	The cultural heritage reflects built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people. It is not necessarily exclusionary of the cultures of new residents.
20	Height restrictions should be established where mid or high-rise buildings are expected to back onto low-rise housing.	Development will ensure compatibility between new development and the existing built form by design elements such as 45-degree angular planes, setbacks, step backs or landscaped buffer areas.
21	Peterborough needs to be better branded and marketed.	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update. This may be considered as part of an overall economic development strategy.
22	Concern that public consultation is a waste of time and nothing will ever come of the discussions.	Public consultation is an important part of reviewing development applications and preparing policy. This is enshrined in Section 7.2 (Public Consultation and Community Engagement) of the Official Plan.
23	The amount of required public consultation should be dependant on the type of development application.	Public consultation requirements on development applications will be conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.
24	The City should look at radio advertising as an alternative to print notices in newspapers.	Television and radio advertising were added to list of communication tools to Section 7.2 (Public Consultation and Community Engagement)
25	Should there be a height cap in the Central Area and Neighbourhood areas of the City?	The Central Area and Neighbourhood areas have a height limit in the current draft.
26	In some areas there is a height cap subject to policies of the plan. What are those policies and how would they be applied?	Factors that can impact the proposed height of a building include: the classification of the road the building accesses, access to public transportation, compatibility with surrounding uses, proximity to amenities, the site is of suitable size to provide for all design elements, etc.
27	Improve wording in Central Area policies to highlight the importance of built heritage resources.	The Central Area component of the Official Plan includes policies that highlight the importance in the City's built heritage resources.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Unique and Vibrant)	City's Response / What We Did
28	Height in the Little Lake District – Sub-Area 1 designation should be restricted to four storeys.	The height limit in Sub-Area 1 was carried over from the previous plan for this area, which was a result of an extensive consultation process. Additional policy direction was provided with regards to compatible development, noting that compatibility is a requirement of all development.
29	Send a committee to Saratoga Springs NY to ask what they are doing right. It has the most vibrant downtown I have ever seen!	Planning initiatives in Saratoga Springs have included (but are not limited to): preservation of historic assets, the establishment of an Aesthetic Zoning Board and façade restoration program.
30	Parking in the downtown should be free.	The Official Plan does not prescribe parking fees.
31	Plan should include improvements to policing to eliminate all illegal drug activity. Remove methadone centres and improve mental health support to youth	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update.
32	Need explicit inclusion of the arts in the city vision and Central Area	Acknowledgement to 'Art' has been added to Section 4.3.1. The vision statement speaks to a unique and vibrant sense of place and the arts contributes to vibrancy and sense of place.
33	The Official Plan should guide the creation of a creative land trust similar to London, England or San Francisco	Note: The Community Arts Stabilization Trust in San Francisco secures spaces and works with art organizations to stabilize rent and increase their financial capacity. Similarly, the Creative Land Trust in London secures long-term affordable spaces for artists. Live-work units are permitted uses in the Central Area and Mixed-Use Corridors. This may be explored further in the Community Benefits study/by-law. However, these types of initiatives are beyond the scope of the Official Plan. The Official Plan would not preclude the creation of a creative land trust.
34	Heritage in neighbourhoods adjacent to downtown include East City. This is the "Old" Peterborough. It has historical significance for the entire city.	Cultural heritage impact assessments may be required as part of any development. Added to Section 5.1.1(Introduction to Cultural Heritage) that the City will evaluate cultural heritage resources.
35	Need to protect the live-work spaces from out-of-control rent hikes.	Rent increases are regulated under the Residential Tenancies Act and are not part of an Official Plan.



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Unique and Vibrant)	City's Response / What We Did
36	Designate downtown as a special 'cultural district' and heritage district with protections for people working and living there.	Central Area aims to achieve various goals through balanced policies between intensification for economic growth and preservation of natural heritage. Central Area buildings currently already go through the designation process, where cultural significance is determined. Furthermore, heritage districts provide protections for the built heritage rather than the occupants, which is not within the scope of the Official Plan, beyond the policies to promote affordable housing and industrial lands within the Central Area for conversion into employment-oriented uses.
37	Building around Little Lake should NOT exceed 4 storeys. To allow up to 8 (as a bonus?) would be a travesty! (Note: this comment is in reference to the Little Lake South Designation Sub-Area 1)	Little Lake South Designation contemplates a maximum of 6 storeys along George and Lake Streets to a maximum of 3 storeys at the corner of Lock and Romaine Streets. This reflects the height provisions in the Land Use and Urban Design Study adopted by Council for the Special Policy Area identified in the current Official Plan Schedule J. Community consultation was central to the study process and included consultation with City Council, the Downtown Business Improvement Area, committees, telephone interviews with major landowners, City staff and the public. Due to the growing development pressures in the area, the objective of the study was to make recommendations which would direct growth while preserving neighbourhood characteristics that were important to residents and users. All bonusing provisions referenced in the draft Official Plan have been removed per Bill 108. Additional policy direction was provided with regards to compatible development, noting that compatibility is a requirement of all development.
38	Public Art: we should have more. Murals are easy and impactful. We could have a design competition for "light trees: that celebrate Electric City heritage going forward with sustainability in tree/shrub shapes in wire sculpture with bulbs of all kinds. Light, sculpture, art, history, future all in one. Some of the "leaves" are solar panels.	Section 5.4.4 (Public Art) states that public art is encouraged throughout the city and the City will encourage private developers to introduce public art installation as part of developments. Public art will be identified as a community benefit and Section 5.4.4 will be revised to state that the City will adopt policies and procedures for the implementation of a successful public art program.
65	Consult arts community about any "vibrancy" and public spaces	Section 5.4 (Urban Design) states that the City's objectives for urban design are to provide accessible, coherent, attractive, safe and distinctive public spaces. Section 5.4 has also been revised to speak to consultation with the arts community.
66	Great to see focus on built form which shapes so much of the municipality. Durability, materials, and architectural detail build a beautiful city. Look forward to the Urban Design Guidelines. The less ambiguous, the better to speed approvals.	Noted.

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Unique and Vibrant)	City's Response / What We Did
67	The new Plan overwrites the existing and still in force Little Lake Plan. This is in East City. We would like to see the new city Plan conform to the description of community first and ecology first components of the Little Lake Plan.	The Little Lake Master Plan provides direction for parks and recreation amenities, trails, culture, heritage and arts, economic/tourism development, and environmental management. The policies of the draft Official Plan support the community first and ecology first direction in the Little Lake Master Plan.
68	Encourage the rehabilitation of the above store apartments by offering free reserved parking spaces for the residents in the parking garages.	The Official Plan does not prescribe parking fees; however, the Plan speaks to relaxed parking standards to encourage development and the City seeking opportunities to create new, public structured parking facilities within the Central Area to facilitate intensification, particularly of existing surface parking lots.
69	Add arts to the Central Area preamble. The arts are vital, integral, and economic driver to the city. For every \$1 spent on the arts, \$17 is reaped in revenue.	Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to Central Area) has been revised to mention the arts.
70	We need an arts hub or cultural district – city supported space for arts creation, vendors, and presentation	This is generally outside the scope of the Official Plan; however, the Official Plan would not prevent this type of initiative.
71	Nowhere are the arts mentioned as a distinct Unique + Vibrant resource, yet its 100s of artists, entrepreneurs and supporters who arguably bring these qualities to Peterborough.	Section 2.2.3 (Vibrant and Unique) acknowledges Peterborough is home to a vibrant arts, culture and heritage community that includes a vibrant theatre scene; hundreds of cultural workers, producers, and organizations.
72	The boundary for the Central Area includes a portion of Little Lake and the Otonabee River. These waters are incredibly unique to a city's core – yet it is neglected, polluted, unmonitored and mostly inaccessible to the public. How can we lead change on this through the Official Plan?	The City will use watershed plans and the watershed planning process to protect and enhance the hydrological function of the City's water resources per Section 6.1.4 (Water Resources). Section 5.3 (Parkland and Open Space) states that the shoreline of the Otonabee River, Little Lake and the Trent Severn Waterway will be set aside as part of the City's parks and open space network. Section 5.4 (Urban Design) states that the City shall explore opportunities for the acquisition of land abutting its waterways for the purposes of improving public access and enjoyment of the water's edge.
73	In the Vision statement, include "arts" in between "natural beauty, [arts], cultural heritage"	The general approach has been to avoid lists in the Official Plan for a more concise document. The vision statement speaks to a unique and vibrant sense of place, to which the arts contributes to vibrancy and sense of place.
74	Add "arts" to cultural heritage preamble	The Cultural Heritage section is not an appropriate location to include mention of the "arts". Cultural heritage and arts are not necessarily always aligned and cultural heritage is specifically addressed under the Ontario Heritage Act, which is the basis for most of this section.
75	Social inclusion: The Plan should address methods of being able to monitor public spaces to ensure they are inclusive and accessible by all demographics	Section 5.4 (Urban Design) indicates that one of the City's objectives for urban design are to provide accessible, coherent, attractive, safe and distinctive public spaces.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Unique and Vibrant)	City's Response / What We Did
76	Need place for arts community to practice, such as a community centre with a large space, breakout spaces, and storage (e.g., Kawartha Youth Orchestra, Peterborough Symphony, UpBeat! Peterborough Singers, Friends in Music)	Cultural facilities and artist space are permitted in the Central Area. Funding resources are outside the scope of the Official Plan.
77	Do not overwrite the Little Lake Master Plan. Keep ecology first designation and/or expand it.	The draft Official Plan implements an ecology first principle for Little Lake through the proposed Natural Heritage System framework. The expansion of the Natural Areas designation in this area will be evaluated through site-specific environmental impact studies and may be expanded through the recommendation of the Restoration and Enhancement Study.
78	<p>Little Lake Development should be limited to 4 storeys in Area 1 at Lake Street and Crescent Street with no bonus storeys to preserve views for residents. Little Lake development building heights should be limited to 2 storeys on the North side of George Street to preserve daylight and views for residents on George Street high-rise at 169 Lake Street. (Note: The City received a petition with over 100 signatures regarding this area to limit the storeys to a maximum of 4 storeys to preserve views of Little Lake).</p> <p>As referenced in our Petition regarding maximum building heights for Sub Area 1 of the Little Lake Special J Policy area we are also challenging the proposed commercial maximum of 6 storeys for the west side of George Street as per Schedule C: Central Plan Area. Now that we know what the plan is. 6 storeys along the west side of George Street would block out most of the daylight not to mention the view for many of our residents living in the Seniors high-rise immediately behind the George Street storefronts in this same area at 169 Lake Street. For this reason, we feel very strongly that the maximum building height here should be limited to 2 storeys with no Bonusing.</p>	<p>Little Lake South Designation contemplates a maximum of 6 storeys along George and Lake Streets to a maximum of 3 storeys at the corner of Lock and Romaine Streets. This reflects the height provisions in the Land Use and Urban Design Study adopted by Council for the Special Policy Area identified in the current Official Plan Schedule J. Community consultation was central to the study process and included consultation with City Council, the Downtown Business Improvement Area, committees, telephone interviews with major landowners, City staff and the public. Due to the growing development pressures in the area, the objective of the study was to make recommendations which would direct growth while preserving neighbourhood characteristics that were important to residents and users. All bonusing provisions referenced in the draft Official Plan were removed per Bill 108. Additional policy direction was provided with regards to compatible development, noting that compatibility is a requirement of all development.</p>

## 5.0 Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
1	The City should dedicate lands for and permit community gardens and urban food production.	Community gardens are listed as permitted uses in the Major Open Space (Section 4.2.4) and Downtown Open Space (Section 4.3.6) designations. The draft Official Plan also includes policies for local food production, which includes community gardens and urban agriculture (Section 5.6).
2	Support space for farmers markets and sale of local food.	The draft Official Plan includes policies for local food production, which includes access to local food sources (Section 5.6).
3	Include fruit and nut trees in the urban canopy.	Policies regarding local food production contemplates the expanded use of City land for growing food including edible landscapes (Section 5.6).
4	Adopt sustainable development standards including green roofs and renewable energy sources.	The Official Plan contains policies for buildings and sustainable design (Section 5.4.3) which includes green building design. Added policy consideration for the implementation of green development standards to Section 5.7.
5	Walkable and energy efficient communities are encouraged.	Section 5.7 (Climate Change) includes growing as a sustainable community by developing walkable neighbourhoods and promoting energy efficient built forms.
6	Sustainability and green design standards for buildings need to be mandatory.	The Official Plan contains policies for buildings and sustainable design (Section 5.4.3) which includes green building design. Specific design standards for new development will be established through Urban Design Guidelines and/or secondary plans.
7	The Official Plan needs clear statements to implement climate change adaptation/mitigation. E.g., maximum effort towards protecting and enhancing nature features, support energy generation and distribution.	This intent has been generally considered throughout this review of the Official Plan.
8	Should include policies regarding daylighting Jackson Creek.	The Official Plan speaks to daylighting Jackson Creek in Section 5.4 (Urban Design).
9	The City needs to develop a composting facility for food waste.	The provision of an organic waste composting facility is outside the scope of the Official Plan; however, a new composting facility may be completed by fall of 2023. The Official Plan does speak to waste, recycling and composting containers as considerations for site plan approval under Section 7.7 and encouraging three stream waste collection capability in all multi-residential buildings under Section 5.4.3.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
10	Better protections of local waterways are required to limit impacts from development (e.g. stormwater, erosion).	Watershed planning will be utilized to inform the extension of municipal services.
11	Daylighting of Jackson Creek needs to include provisions for re-naturalizing the watercourse.	Section 5.4 (Urban Design) speaks to investigating the feasibility of daylighting Jackson Creek in the downtown.
12	Is installing culverts sufficient in protecting wetland features (e.g. Cleantech Commons, Pioneer Road)?	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update. This may be considered through the appropriate site-specific environmental impact study.
13	Language regarding environmental stewardship requires more firm language instead of flexible or aspirational language.	The language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility that exists in implementing this Plan.
14	Land between Water Street and the Otonabee River should be designated green space instead of major mixed-use corridor.	Sections between Water Street and the Otonabee River have been revised to the Major Open Space Designation.
15	Social housing uses 1:500-year flood hazard where 1:100-year is referenced in the Plan.	The boundary of the flooding hazard is established through a study approved by Otonabee Region Conservation Authority.
16	Builders that clear trees on property without building approvals should face steep fines.	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update. Section 5.5 (Policies for the Urban Forest) does, however, provide policies for the urban forest. Section 4.6.2 (Natural Areas designation) also states that “the removal or destruction of a natural heritage feature or any associated ecological function by unauthorized development or site alteration is prohibited. Such removal or destruction will not provide the rationale for the removal of these lands from the Natural Areas Designation. Restoration, to the satisfaction of the City with reference to the site alteration by-law in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction, will be required where the removal or destruction of a natural heritage feature or any associated ecological function by unauthorized development or site alteration has occurred.”
17	Natural wildlife corridors need to be protected within the downtown core to maintain biodiversity.	The Natural Heritage System contains linkages between features to create a connected system.
18	The City should maintain an overall forest cover of 30%.	Section 5.5 (The Urban Forest) states the overall tree canopy cover target. This target has been increased from 30% to 35%.
19	50% tree canopy on streets is not sufficient.	50% is a minimum target for providing shading in publicly accessible areas. Achieving a higher percentage is permitted.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
20	Include links to the "Pathways to Stewardship and Kinship project"	The draft Official Plan contains policies on environmental stewardship which supports the roadmap in the Pathways to Stewardship and Kinship guide.
21	Empty lots are not necessarily a location to place a building.	The consideration of development on vacant or underutilized lots is necessary for the City to meet the population, employment and intensification targets established by the Province.
22	Policies of inclusion should also refer to natural heritage.	This concept is considered generally throughout the Official Plan.
23	Focus on public education on the value of naturalized areas.	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update, however, the draft Official Plan speaks to the intrinsic value of natural areas and providing access, where appropriate, to the Natural Heritage System for the purposes of environmental education.
24	The Official Plan should require all decisions to be made through a lens of addressing climate change.	Section 5.7 (Climate Change) includes policies for climate change that will be used to inform the City's decision making.
25	The City needs to focus on resiliency, with a focus on storm water management.	Resiliency will be established by the climate change policies of Section 5.7(Climate Change) and the storm water management policies of Section 6.1.5.
26	The language should express more urgency regarding the climate change issue.	Section 2.2.2 (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability) was revised to state "Taking a leadership role in encouraging and promoting green buildings, infrastructure resilience, and sustainable development practices that mitigate and adapt against climate change"
27	Identify relationship between Official Plan and Watershed Plan.	References to the Watershed Plan in the Official Plan are included in the sections speaking to Water and Wastewater Systems, Water Resources and Stormwater Management in Section 6. The Official Plan will be amended accordingly to support the implementation of the Watershed Plan and watershed planning objectives.
28	Curtis Creek in East City needs to be daylighted.	This may be considered through the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy, which is a commitment of the draft Official Plan.
29	Should definition of Non-Provincially Significant Wetland read as "less than or equal to 0.5 hectares" instead of "greater than or equal to 0.5 hectares"?	City staff has confirmed that the proposed wording is correct.
30	The City should include provisions for servicing land between the City and the Airport.	The City will only provide services outside the municipal boundary to service municipal facilities.
31	What is considered a "significant negative impact on the Natural Heritage System"?	This comment is in reference to the policy under section 4.2.4 and this determination would be reviewed in light of the natural heritage system framework in section 4.6.2 (Natural Areas Designation).



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
32	Will the City be providing Appendix 1 to the Natural Heritage System?	The City will release Appendix 1 to the Natural Heritage System with the final draft of the Official Plan.
33	How does the Natural Heritage System of the City compare to the Aichi Biodiversity Target of 17%? The Aichi Target states that by 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water should be conserved.	Lands within the Natural Areas Designation are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of natural heritage features, as such a comparable percentage cannot be generated. The Aichi Target is not mandated under legislation; however, the overall objectives of the Aichi Target may be considered in the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy. The Plan directs for the City to undertake a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy under Section 7.13 (Securement of Lands within the Natural Heritage System).
34	The minimum buffers for natural heritage features need to be higher (e.g., 60-120 metres for provincially significant wetlands)	Table A prescribes minimum widths. The recommendations of an approved site-specific Environmental Impact Study will prescribe appropriate buffer widths.
35	Electrification of buildings (i.e., a move away from fossil fuels as the source of heat) will have a greater impact on GHGs than the addition of on-site renewables, and at a much lower cost	Incentives for green building practices and energy efficiency are considered under Section 7.16 (Community Improvement Plans and Areas). Section 5.7 (Climate Change) encourages opportunities for energy efficiency and alternative energy strategies. Added the consideration of Community Energy Plan and/or Green Development Standards to Section 5.7.
36	It is great to see passive solar receive attention in the plan. However, adequate shading of south and west windows/facades is equally - if not more - important as solar gain, in terms of overall energy use in the building. Passive solar design should be mandated, and the evaluation of the passive solar design should be supported.	Section 5.4.2 (Buildings and Sustainable Design) speaks to passive and active solar energy and mitigating urban island heat effect. Policy was added to 5.4.2 to include passive solar design and the inclusion of south/west shading to reduce energy use.
37	Encourage and incentivize the use of harvested rainwater for indoor uses	Section 5.4.2 (Buildings and Sustainable Design) speaks to water conservation. Incentives for this is consideration under Section 7.16 (Community Improvement Plans and Areas).
38	Require on-site waste sorting at construction sites. Encourage development of local recycling facilities for high waste materials like drywall and wood. Raise landfill costs to incentivize on-site sorting.	Section 5.4.2 (Buildings and Sustainable Design) encourages new construction to use regionally and locally sources building materials to the greatest extent possible and divert construction waste from landfills.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
39	Require carbon footprint analysis of all new buildings and encourage the construction of zero carbon and carbon-storing buildings with reduced development fees.	Requiring carbon footprint analysis of all new buildings is not within the scope of the Official Plan update. Incentives for this are considered under Section 7.16 (Community Improvement Plans and Areas).
40	Streamline alternative compliance applications at building department to reduce barriers for innovators. The city could encourage innovation by instituting an office that deals with alternative compliance applications with knowledgeable staff to foster innovation and improvement rather than discourage it.	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update.
41	Consider development of step codes (as in Vancouver) to open pathways to improved performance of buildings ahead of scheduled code updates. Reward builders who design/build to future improved standards now.	Section 5.4.2 (Buildings and Sustainable Design) encourages on-site renewable or alternative energy systems.
42	Official Plan should support the electrification of public transit.	The particulars of transit vehicle operations are not within the scope of the Official Plan update.
43	Encourage the use of healthy building materials, using established resources such as the ILFI Red List or the WELL Standard. Offer reduced development fees for healthy interior material choices.	This is not directly within the scope of the Official Plan update. However, the draft Official Plan does speak to considering building stock or property in need of rehabilitation as a potential criterion for designating Community Improvement Project Areas in Section 7.16 (Community Improvement Plans and Areas).
44	So much better than previous Official Plans. Reflects learning about importance of environment and climate crisis, though not strongly enough in key sections. Preamble does this best.	The Context Section of the Official Plan has been revised to speak to climate change. This has also been generally considered throughout the Official Plan, however, the approach has been to avoid additional explanatory text for a more concise document.
45	Carry language regarding climate crisis adaptation and mitigation (with definitions of these terms) through every Guiding Principle because the climate crisis will impact every aspect of City Planning. Use Council's Resolution of January 29, 2019 and recent declaration of climate emergency to strengthen the case for this recommendation. The Official Plan should have a statement in the Guiding Principles.	Climate change is discussed in guiding principles - Section 2.2.2 (Environmental Stewardship and Accessibility) the City will ensure development contributes to a more sustainable development by encouraging green buildings, infrastructure resilience, and sustainable development practices that mitigate and adapt against climate change.



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
46	“Adaptive capacity” is more dynamic term than “adaptation” as it suggests the ongoing nature of responses to the climate emergency. Adaptation is not something achieved and then it's over. Therefore, it is suggested that the Vision set the “tone” from the start of the Official Plan that the City's sustainability and resilience are an ongoing effort, now and in all future planning. Suggest “As a leader in resilience and sustainability through all aspects of city living, planning in Peterborough shall use infrastructure and land efficiently, promote healthy lifestyles and incorporate green initiatives to increase the City's adaptive capacity.” Endless growth being a fundamental driver of climate crisis.	“Adaptive capacity” with regards to climate change has been added to the vision statement, Section 5.7 (Climate Change), Section 6.1.4 (Water Resources) and Section 6.1.5 (Stormwater Management).
47	Include component for rehabilitation of damaged areas i.e., Jackson Creek, which has been built over.	Section 7.13 (Securement of Lands within the Natural Heritage System) directs the City to undertake a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy which will guide stewardship/restoration activities and priorities areas for enhancement. Section 5.4 (Urban Design) speaks to investigating the feasibility of daylighting Jackson Creek in the downtown.
48	Incorporate SMART CITY goals	Note: Smart City refers to the greater use of technology and data to improve to processes, communication methods, information sharing and quality of life. Have added policies under Section 7.3.3 (Planning Studies) to develop an economic development strategy, to which Smart City goals may be considered.
49	Proximity linkages – upgrade from “Level B” to “Level A”, not downgrade “A”	Designating the Proximity Linkages as Level A would indicate that the form and function of these areas are to be protected in situ. In the instance of land development, the function may be addressed through various solutions established through site specific investigation and an Environmental Impact Study to determine the location and dimensions best suited to the Natural Heritage System function. Treating the Proximity Linkages as Level B features will preserve the function and require that a net gain in function be demonstrated.
50	Natural Area designation: If a “Level B” feature has not had an EIS, then treat as an “Level A”	An Environmental Impact Study is required if a natural heritage feature is identified within 120 metres of Planning Act applications for development, redevelopment or site alteration.
51	Oversight by third party to comment on City's adherence to OP. Ranking City's sectors to either “on track”, “needs renewed focus”, “off track/failure”. Report back to Council after evaluation.	Section 7.3.2 (Monitoring) indicates that the City will undertake performance measurement in a variety of ways including, but not limited to municipal performance measures reporting.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
52	Increase urban forest cover to 40% from 30% which align city with other Southern Ontario cities.	The target has been revised to increase the target from 30% to 35%, or as otherwise directed in the Urban Forest Strategic Plan.
53	Add statement of intent with respect to the Natural Heritage Features as resilient sites to changing climate.	Sections 4.6 (Natural Heritage System) speaks to the associated benefits of a functional natural heritage system and the need to protect an interconnected system to facilitate adaptations that contribute to the resiliency of habitats and organisms in the face of a changing climate.
54	The City must designate a staff person to monitor builders and developers to ensure their obligations to our environment are met.	The Engineering Services Division oversees developer construction sites.
55	Is the sad state of Little Lake anywhere in our OP? If not, why not?	General approach has been to avoid explanatory text. Water quality will also be addressed in the Watershed Plan.
56	Is there any way the Arena build at Trent and its wetlands, research fields, wildlife sanctuary can be stopped under this OP? It may have been approved under the old OP with old thinking, but that doesn't make it ok today.	The area at Pioneer Road was designated by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) as Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW), as of August 27, 2019. City Council has decided to relocate the proposed twin-pad arena.
57	Are Indigenous Rights anywhere in this section? (didn't see any)	Indigenous Rights are described in Section 7.1 (Indigenous Peoples of Canada and the Duty to Consult) and has been revised in consultation with Treaty 20 First Nations.
58	Need to protect natural heritage system from council decisions – avoid ambiguous terms like “generally be directed to areas outside of”	This comment was regarding the Hazard Lands policies. For greater clarification, hazard lands are not the same as the natural heritage system, although there may be areas of overlap between the two. Policies regarding hazard lands have been revised in consultation with the Otonabee Region Conservation Authority (ORCA).
59	Would be preferable to increase connectivity in NHS, where possible – currently includes several isolated features [not really part of a system]. Try harder to connect features or identify them as separate from the NHS [special areas that need protection]	Section 4.6.2 (Natural Heritage Designation) speaks to proximity linkages between Level A and B features. The function between features may be addressed through site investigation and an Environmental Impact Study. The intent is that these areas are to be treated in a manner similar to Level B Natural Heritage System features. Section 7.13 (Securement of Lands within the Natural Heritage System) indicates that the City will undertake a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy that identifies priority areas for restoration, enhancement and securement and will establish a Land Securement Fund.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
60	Elaborate on the types of activities categories under “minor nature” for site alterations or development	Additional text has been added to describe what is considered “minor nature” as per below: The City in consultation with the Conservation Authority, or any other agency having jurisdiction, may waive the requirement to conduct an Environmental Impact Study, or appropriately scope the study requirements where an application for development and/or site alteration is: i. Of a minor nature or small scale and impacts to the Natural Heritage System are anticipated to be negligible; ii. Located in an area where recent previous studies have been approved by the City and provide sufficient detailed information; or, iii. Located in a disturbed area.
61	Develop a parkland establishment/securement action plan or strategy to compliment Section 5.3.1(a)	A Municipal Parks and Open Space Review was completed to identify gaps in access to neighbourhood parkland, provide strategies to address the gaps and evaluate city-owned open space to recommend sites to be considered for parkland.
62	Need to include restoration of municipal lands	Sections 7.13 (Securement of Lands within the Natural Heritage System) indicates that the City will undertake a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy that identifies priority areas for restoration, enhancement and securement and will establish a Land Securement Fund.
63	Map needs to be clear of where different levels are	The level classification of features will be determined via site-specific Environmental Impact Studies.
64	All elements of NHS should have equal protection to avoid “mischief” from Council	The proposed level system is consistent with, and in some respects stronger than, Provincial policy.
65	Is the City of Peterborough developing Green Infrastructure/Low Impact Development guidelines, standards for new development?	The development of Peterborough's Watershed Plan is currently underway. The watershed plan will create development and infrastructure guidelines. This is also reinforced in Section 6.1.3 (Water and Waste Water Systems) of the Plan which states that the City will lead the implementation of watershed planning initiatives that will provide guidelines for sustainable development, design and construction. Added Policy to Section 5.7 (Climate Change) that the City may consider the preparation of Green Development Standards.
66	Are there any other programming (e.g. incentives, communications, awareness campaigns for residents) to encourage efforts to mitigate impacts from Climate Change and reduce flooding?	Section 7.16 (Community Improvement Plans and Areas) states that the criteria for designating Community Improvement Project Areas, which includes inadequate flood protection, need for greater energy or water efficiency on land or in buildings, and need for waste reduction or achieve other environmental sustainability objectives

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
67	Positive to see policies and standards for urban forest.	No change was made – comment is in support the proposed policies.
68	Is there a standard or Best Management Practice in place or being considered for increasing native species to provide additional ecological services (e.g. pollination, native species habitat, etc.)?	Section 5.5 (The Urban Forest) states that in an effort to increase the city's canopy cover, opportunities for tree planting of native species on municipally owned lands will be identified and implemented in coordination with other public agencies and local interest groups.
69	Has the City of Peterborough considered a minimum standard for new builds (e.g. redevelopment in existing neighborhoods or new residential subdivisions) to contain native plantings (instead of lawn/turf)? This would be similar to 10% standard that all new builds contain affordable and accessible housing.	Section 5.5 (The Urban Forest) states that "The urban forest shall include a variety of trees that are hardy, resilient, non-invasive, salt tolerant, drought resistant and low maintenance. All trees shall be of a species native to this region and that would provide a large canopy and shade over sidewalks, parks and open spaces. The City will further encourage the planting of species that are culturally significant to Indigenous Communities." A specific numeric requirement is only considered in terms of tree canopy surface area cover for sidewalks, parks and open spaces and other publicly accessible areas.
70	Is secondary planning going to address if potential lands should/could be added to the City's Natural Heritage System?	Per Section 7.3.5 (Secondary Plans), secondary plans shall generally address the natural heritage system.
71	Is the current/proposed system, which is largely features based, developed on existing data/studies or were current studies developed?	The mapping was developed through background resources and reconnaissance field investigations. This will be outlined further in Appendix I: The Natural Heritage System Background Study.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
72	Will natural heritage evaluations be required at this stage in planning to evaluate where Natural Heritage features, including possible Natural Heritage System additions?	The Natural Heritage System will be further evaluated through site-specific Environmental Impact Studies. The City will also be conducting a city-wide evaluation of wetlands as directed by Section 4.6.2 (Natural Heritage Designation).
73	Instead of a feature-based system, it would be better if the City of Peterborough took a look at the Natural Heritage System methods that are available such as using a modeling tool or the method the Province adopted for the Growth Plan.	Developing a Natural Heritage System approach is the preferred method to protecting natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. This approach recognizes the interdependence of features and functions, and thus seeks to maintain connections among natural heritage features, so that their existing ecological functions are maintained or enhanced. A Natural Heritage System includes primary components that act as building blocks to construct a functional system. These components comprise different types of natural areas, ecological functions and linkages. When combined, they form an interconnected system of natural areas. This interconnected system allows for individual components to strengthen their potential for providing ecological benefits and supports resiliency in the natural environment. This “building block” approach has been utilized as a foundation for the City of Peterborough Natural Heritage System and a “made in Peterborough” lens has been applied to ensure that the Natural Heritage System reflects the natural areas of the City as well as the values of the community. This is comparable to the Province’s method which consists of a building block approach of core areas and linkages.
74	The proposed plan did not describe some of the terminology used in the mapping (e.g. Regional connections, proximity linkages).	Regional connections and proximity linkages are defined under Section 4.6.2 (Natural Heritage Designation).
75	Regional significant wetlands do not appear to exist in Peterborough’s Official Plan.	Non-provincially significant wetlands would fall under Level B or C depending on the wetland size and level criteria.
76	In <i>wetland buffers use and effectiveness</i> it was argued that a minimum of 200 to 300 feet (60 to 90 meters) should be used for wetland buffers to retain wildlife dependent on wetlands. The 30 meters in Peterborough’s Draft Official Plan for significant wetland buffers falls short in protection of wildlife.	The recommendations of an approved site-specific Environmental Impact Study will prescribe appropriate buffer widths.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
77	The Official Plan appears to grant a lot of power to Otonabee Conservation Authority.	The policies require that the City consult with the Conservation Authority with respect to matters such as scoping/waiving study requirements, data collection for natural heritage feature, and satisfaction of Level B criteria.
78	While there may be times that wetlands need to be developed for building infrastructure where no alternative sites are available it is not clear that compensation of wetlands is a last step in section 4.6.2(b)(ii) because the section treats mitigation and compensation equally with the “or” statement.	Section 4.6.2 (Natural Heritage Designation) states that where a negative impact is unavoidable within a Level B Natural Heritage System feature, then the City may accept a compensatory mitigation approach. Where compensatory mitigation is proposed, development and site alteration will only be considered if it can be demonstrated that a net gain of Natural Heritage System function will be achieved through compensation (e.g., replacement, restoration, and/or enhancement) as well as conformity with provincial and federal policies/regulations.
79	I like in the Level B natural heritage feature that there is a commitment to conserve biodiversity and a commitment to a net gain in wetland functions in Sections 4.6.2(a)(ii) and (b)(ii), respectively.	No changes made – comment is in support of the proposed policies.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
80	<p>On the Official Plan Schedule D Transportation Plan it has Maniece Avenue as a High Capacity Collector which widens the road to 26 metres and would result in the removal of many trees. On Maniece Avenue there are 4 trees that meet the size requirements to be considered as heritage trees. There is a sugar maple, 2 silver maples, and a honey locust. The size requirements for a heritage tree based on diameter at breast height (dbh) for these types of trees are: Sugar= 90cm, Silver= 100cm and Honey Locust= 90cm. Please see the document "Securing the Future of Heritage Trees: A Protection Toolkit for Communities" pages 100-103 for the ages of the trees/ size requirements. On Maniece Aveue there are 2 silver maples with a dbh of=152cm and 102cm. A sugar maple at 109cm and a honey locust at 117cm. The largest honey locust presently in the city has a dbh of 74cm (not meeting the size standard for a heritage tree). Given this information, the honey locust on Maniece Avenue is the largest in the City. Perhaps it may be considered a 'notable tree.'" There are also 3 other Sugar maple trees just shy of the size requirements &amp; they are the following: 81cm, 74 cm &amp; 71cm. This street has many large, older trees that would help the forest canopy targets for the city and they would assist with climate change mitigation.</p> <p>Old Norwood Road is deemed a Low Capacity Collector &amp; there aren't any large trees on this street. As well, the Maria St. extension would be a High Capacity Collector which is just south of Maniece Avenue to move traffic east/west &amp; vice versa.</p>	<p>The implementation of a heritage tree identification, designation and protection program is occurring as part of the Urban Forest Strategic Plan (i.e., outside the Official Plan Update process).</p>



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability)	City's Response / What We Did
81	For the designation of heritage tree status there needs to be a historical/cultural significance for a tree. The book I referenced yesterday on page 101 has the size requirement for honey locust= 90cm dbh (diameter at breast height) which corresponds to an age of 120 years. The honey locust on Maniece Avenue has a dbh of 117cm. This book is a guide only. If the honey locust is about 120 years old then that puts it around the construction of the Lift Lock which was finished in 1904 & is a very prominent piece of Peterborough's history. For the Sugar maple page 103 has the dbh of 90 cm which puts the tree about 200 years old. The one on Maniece has a dbh of 109cm. If this tree is about 150-200 years old the Burnhams owned Maniece Avenue (historically Lot 29, Concession 12) in the 1800"s & they were a very influential family in Peterborough's history. Their ownership can be traced in the abstract registers for Otonabee Township. The largest Silver Maple in Peterborough has a dbh of 163cm. In comparison the one Silver Maple on Maniece Avenue has a dbh of 152cm which may also be one of the larger ones in the city.	See response above to comment #80.
82	Please add consideration for district heating and cooling in all new plans of subdivision. Not only are they more efficient regardless of energy source but that energy source can be changed out, including to 100% carbon neutral heating and cooling. These are hard to install post-development but easy to include in design of greenfield proposals.	This consideration is included in Section 5.4.3 (Buildings and Sustainable Design), which states that the City will work with the private sector to consider the inclusion of on-site renewable or alternative energy systems or identify opportunities for the provision of centralized, integrated energy systems, such as district energy for heating and cooling.

## 6.0 Well-Connected with Options for Mobility

#	Comment/Question (Well-Connected with Options for Mobility)	City's Response / What We Did
1	Consider closing George Street to traffic during the summer months and making Water Street open to two-way traffic.	This is outside the scope of the Official Plan. This may be considered as part of the Transportation Master Plan.
2	The Official Plan lacks a real transportation plan for the future of the City. The Schedule only reflects the existing condition and is not forward looking.	A City-wide Transportation Master Plan is to be completed by 2022 and will be reflected in the Official Plan through an Amendment, once approved.
3	Connectivity and capacity of the existing road network is a concern.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
4	Sidewalks need to be built on both sides of the street and properly maintained once constructed.	As part of developing complete streets, the City will require sidewalks on public streets subject to the policies in Section 6.2.4 (Complete Streets).
5	Many bike lanes just end which puts cyclists in danger.	Connectivity of the cycling network to be reviewed in the Transportation Master Plan.
6	Rethink the use of Maria Street high capacity arterial as an egress.	This will be reviewed through the East Side Transportation Study and incorporated into the Transportation Master Plan.
7	More connections to the downtown required to spur revitalization.	This will be reviewed through the East Side Transportation Study and incorporated into the Transportation Master Plan.
8	Downtown focus should be on pedestrian movements, not cars.	Within the Central Area, it is required that all new development is transit-supportive and pedestrian-oriented (Section 4.3.1).
9	One-way street system needs to be removed.	Policy with specific reference to the George Street and Water Street two-way configuration (Section 6.2.6 (Road Network)) was removed. Changes to the existing road network will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
10	Existing access from the east across the canal are insufficient.	This will be reviewed through the East Side Transportation Study and incorporated into the Transportation Master Plan.
11	A progress report on the 2012 Transportation Plan should be prepared.	This may be completed as part of the Transportation Master Plan.

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Well-Connected with Options for Mobility)	City's Response / What We Did
12	The Parkway needs to be reintroduced to Schedule D as a High Capacity Arterial.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan. Changes will be made accordingly to the Draft Official Plan - it is not the intent of the Official Plan policies to preconceive the outcomes of the Transportation Master Plan.
13	Removal of the Parkway from the Official Plan is long-overdue. (Note: the City received over 70 written submissions from the public in objection to any inferred reference to the Parkway. The submissions requested the removal of any reference to the "Future High Capacity Arterial", designation of the Parkway extension as a greenway/open space, and asked that alternatives such as a ring road and investments to public transit, active transportation, transportation demand management and smart traffic management systems are explored.)	The need for a "Future High Capacity Arterial" will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan and changes will be made accordingly to the Official Plan. It is not the intent of the Official Plan policies to preconceive the outcomes of the Transportation Master Plan.
14	New investments in public transportation must include provisions for electric transit vehicles.	The particulars of transit vehicle operations are not within the scope of the Official Plan update.
15	All major arterial roads in the City should be designed to include cycling infrastructure.	As part of the complete streets policies (Section 6.2.4), the design of all roads will have regard for the provision of adequate space for pedestrian, cycling and transit infrastructure.
16	An Active Transportation Schedule should be made separate from the current Schedule D.	A separate Schedule for active transportation has been created and is consistent with the Province-Wide Cycling Network identified by the Ministry of Transportation
17	Accessibility and connectivity in the City need to be improved.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
18	Problematic intersections need to be reviewed (e.g. Water/George/Parkhill) to see if roundabouts can be utilized as improvements.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
19	Needs further direction on how the existing transportation system can accommodate the new development and intensification that is expected.	This will be assessed through the East Side Transportation Study and City-wide Transportation Master Plan process. Site-specific development proposals may be required to complete a Traffic Impact Study under Section 7.21.2 (Complete Application Requirements).
20	Existing transit system needs to be redesigned to make routes more efficient and user friendly.	This will be assessed through the Peterborough Transit Study.
21	Standards need to be established for a minimum level of service for public transportation.	This will be assessed through the Peterborough Transit Study.
22	When will the Transportation Master Plan be completed? Why was it not done concurrently with the Official Plan?	The Transportation Master Plan process will be completed in 2022. There was a need to complete the Official Plan process that has been underway since 2011.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Well-Connected with Options for Mobility)	City's Response / What We Did
23	How will East Side Transportation Plan and Transportation Master Plan be incorporated into the Official Plan?	The recommendations of the transportation plans will be brought into the Official Plan through the Official Plan Amendment process.
24	A bike lane or path needs to be created to get from the southwest part of the City to downtown safely.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
25	More details on traffic plan for Lily Lake need to be available or established.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
26	Transit investment needs to be done to place it on a more level playing field with driving.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan and Peterborough Transit Study.
27	Metrics (e.g. travel time) need to be established for how vehicles and transit operates on the roads.	Standards may be established through the Transportation Master Plan and Peterborough Transit Study.
28	Section 6.2.5(b) could be used to avoid road improvements, leading to increased maintenance cost for transit vehicles.	The second sentence of this policy has been deleted.
29	Existing Heritage Trail should be shown to extend to the planned Medium Capacity Arterial further west.	Schedule D: Road Network Plan has been revised to extend Heritage Trail to the proposed Medium Capacity Arterial to the west.
30	How will the Medium Capacity Arterial north of Cumberland be implemented if the surrounding lands are identified as Rural Transition Area?	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
31	Will the City be identifying a Major Transit Station Area?	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan and Peterborough Transit Study.
33	In section 6.2.6. Road Network, streets are only defined by speed, vehicle lanes, vehicle volume, and right-of-way allowance. The definitions generally speak to flow of vehicle traffic and occasionally mention bikes and parking. There is no reference to: pedestrian, cyclist, or transit volume; how people are using the street; or function of adjacent properties.	Added policy that the City will prepare road or area-specific cross-sections to illustrate required components of the right-of-way, where appropriate. Section 6.2.4 (Complete Streets) speaks to the design of all roads providing regard to adequate space and safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists, and for safe transfers on and off transit vehicles.
45	More inclusion of mobility device users in Transportation sections.	The General Policies under the Transportation Section 6.2.2 states that the City's transportation system will be planned to be safe, energy efficient and fully accessible.
46	Peterborough needs a ring road to keep up with building boom. Can't abandon effective vehicular traffic movement when committing to low carbon future.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Well-Connected with Options for Mobility)	City's Response / What We Did
47	Open intersection of Royal Drive through to Heritage Park neighbourhood. Traffic light there would provide safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists across Cumberland.	This is a secondary planning issue and not within the scope of the Official Plan Update.
48	Include more active transportation routes (including for mobility device users) in the Central Area/downtown	Central Area policies and complete streets section does speak to active transportation routes and streetscape improvements.
49	Page 149-152 Active Transportation explicitly includes mobility device (e.g., wheelchair users, walker devices) users in addition to pedestrians and cyclists.	The General Policies under the Transportation Section 6.2.2 states that the City's transportation system will be planned to be safe, energy efficient and fully accessible.
50	Section 6.2. Transportation: A Linked Community – include explicit commitment for transportation and active transportation to be AODA compliant. Section 6.2.1(a) excludes mobility device users – they are not the same as able bodied pedestrians	Section 6.2.1 (Introduction to Transportation: A Linked Community) has been revised to state: Successful communities are supported by planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, accessible, inclusive and equitable, to foster social interaction and health, to facilitate community connectivity, and to meet the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and motorists.
51	There is no access from Clonsilla and Parkway to Medical Drive	Transportation improvements will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
52	There is no continuous direct road from Parkway to Medical Dr to new subdivision on Lily Lake Rd.	Transportation improvements will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
53	Repaving/upgrading of downtown streets and sidewalks needs to be a priority – they are in an embarrassing state.	Section 6.2.1 (Introduction to Transportation: A Linked Community) states that the objective of the City's transportation system is to develop, support and maintain a convenient and accessible transportation system that accommodates active transportation.
54	Need more pedestrian crosswalks	Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) states that signalized pedestrian crosswalks should be provided at locations where important civic destinations and/or significant walking traffic is anticipated. Section 6.2.4 (Complete Streets) states that the City shall prepare a Complete Street Guide, which will consider mid-block pedestrian crossings and the use of design features such as curb bump-outs, enhanced medians and boulevards and defined standing areas for pedestrians and/or cyclists at intersections.
55	What we heard: add "mobility" to "Pedestrians/Walkability/Mobility"	This comment was in reference to the display panels at the Official Plan open houses and is not relevant to the wording of the Official Plan.
56	All major arterial roads in the city should be designed to include cycling infrastructure (+mobility device)	Sections 6.2.6 (Road Network) provides design considerations for separated bikeways and/or on-street bike lanes.
57	Throughout well connected - mobility device users are excluded and they have the right to be included	Mobility device users are included under the lens of accessible.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Well-Connected with Options for Mobility)	City's Response / What We Did
58	Accessible transportation – need for berms between roads and bike lane to ensure safe, alternative transportation that also supports climate change initiatives	The General Policies in the Transportation Section 6.2.2 states that the City's transportation system will be planned to be safe, energy efficient and fully accessible. Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) states that active transportation routes, such as sidewalks, bike lanes and multi-use trails will have streetscaping elements that promote pedestrian and cyclist comfort and safety. A new policy in Section 6.2.3 was added to require the preparation of cross-sections by the City where appropriate.
59	Build up a network of multi-use trails that allow small, motorized uses (scooters, etc) but with photo radar-enforced speed limits (25 km?). Get people out of cars but keep convenience and access. Low carbon transit means more small electric motor vehicles. Those can mix with cyclists and pedestrians at low speeds.	Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) states that the City will strive to expand and enhance its trail systems to promote connectivity, mobility, accessibility and active transportation within and between neighbourhoods, employment areas, areas of major open space, parks and the waterfront. Traffic/speed enforcement is outside the scope of the Official Plan.
60	If Peterborough gets passenger rail, where would the station be? How to connect passenger rail to local transit hub(s)?	The location is to be determined in consideration of broader planning objectives.
61	One-way streets should have bike lanes or wider sidewalks incorporated into streetscape.	Section 4.3.1 (Introduction to the Central Area) states that the City will undertake action to improve the appearance of the public realm and the activities it accommodates, including through streetscape improvements. Section 4.4.1 (Introduction to the Mixed-Use Corridors) states that the City will undertake a program of ongoing improvements including through streetscape improvements, barrier-free design, and by building active transportation infrastructure and transit facilities.
62	Downtown train station to connect City to Toronto and Ottawa.	Section 6.2.2 states that The City shall coordinate with the Province, the County, the railway companies, inter-city bus companies and other authorities, in order to provide an effective regional transportation system, adequate external roadway capacity, suitable access to and from the City, and to preserve and enhance the urban environment and function of the City.
63	One of Peterborough's biggest challenges. Cars should be 4 <sup>th</sup> on the planning priority list as we move towards the middle of this century. 1) Transit via bus 2) cycling 3) walking 4) cars	The priorities of different roads needs to be context sensitive.
64	It is impossible to be a pedestrian or use a mobility device in the winter, in the Central Area!	Winter maintenance policy is under Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation), which states that winter maintenance of active transportation facilities will be an important consideration, particularly along routes that connect pedestrians to key destinations such as schools.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Well-Connected with Options for Mobility)	City's Response / What We Did
65	More bike lanes please – and I'm 61!	Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) states that the City shall continue to provide for the development of bikeways by implementing the bikeway network as per the recommendations of the Transportation Plan and ensuring that all new development proposals and infrastructure works provide bikeways and support facilities.
66	Please review Section 4.3.7(f) since no rear laneway exists for Lock St.	The Peterborough Special Policy Area Official Plan Schedule J Land Use and Urban Design study envisioned that parking and loading are accessed through a rear public laneway system with entrance/egress points on Romaine, George and Lake Streets.
67	To improve accessibility, active transportation and ability for more children to walk/bike to school, more cat walks/shortcuts should be encouraged between streets/sub neighborhoods (similar to one found between Wildlark Drive and Fair Avenue in west end of the city); these were more popular in the 1960's and 70's in some Cities.	Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) states that particular regard will be given to adequate space and safety provisions for the movement of pedestrians and cyclists, with a clear system of through routes.
68	Why does the "Future High Capacity Arterial" road not appear on Schedule D and the northern section of the Parkway appear as an "off road bikeway"?	Schedule D indicates that any future high-capacity arterial will be determined through the Transportation Master Plan. It also currently shows the use as an off-road bikeway because that is the current use of the route.
69	Yes, from The Parkway to Medical Drive makes sense, for 115 access to the hospital. Management/upgrading of present arterial roads would be helpful.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan.
70	Alternatives to car transportation should be stated planning priorities. Affordable housing close to downtown amenities would allow walking, cycling and public transit to reduce need for gas-fuelled vehicles.	Support for transit and active transportation is an important component of the Official Plan; however general approach has been to limit additional explanatory text. We agree that all types of housing, including affordable housing supports active transportation and transit use. The Official Plan directs residential development and intensification to strategic growth areas, which includes the downtown.
71	Several of the roads depicted as High-Capacity Arterial on Schedule D do not yet exist; check line types between High Capacity Arterial and Future High-Capacity Arterial as these do not appear to be correctly symbolized on the schedule.	A revised Road Network Schedule has been prepared to distinguish between existing and future roads.
72	Ensure that accessibility and the needs of an aging population are addressed, especially since we have one of the nation's highest proportion of seniors.	Additional considerations were made for accessibility and universal design (e.g., Transportation, Community Improvement Plans, Site Plan Approval and development policies)



## 7.0 Strong and Diverse Economy

#	Comment/Question (Strong and Diverse Economy)	City's Response / What We Did
1	Need further direction on where new employment lands will be located.	The Growth Plan states that Municipalities should designate and preserve lands within settlement areas located adjacent to or near major goods movement facilities and corridors, including major highway interchanges, as areas for manufacturing, warehousing and logistics, and appropriate associated uses and ancillary facilities.
2	City should revisit plans to annex portions of Cavan Monaghan and the Airport.	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update. Based on the Council motion passed on May 25, 2021, City staff have been directed to complete the Official Plan and focus land use designations within the City's boundary.
3	Develop policies for attracting new employers to the City.	The City has an overall policy direction to support a strong and diverse economy (Section 2.2.5). Opportunities for incentives for new employers include an exemption of development charges which would be established through the Development Charges By-law (Section 7.15) or identify an area as a Community Improvement Project Area (Section 7.16). Added policy language for the preparation of an Economic Development Strategy.
4	There is an opportunity to attract and enhance the trades sector in the City if adequate space for tradespeople and artisans is made available.	Artisans and workshops are permitted in the Employment Land designation and within the Central Area. Depending on the type of business, it may also be considered as a home-based business or a neighbourhood supportive use.
5	Seek creative industry as a potential re-use of the GE property.	Flexibility on the types of uses is provided within the Employment Land designation.
6	Support agricultural activity in industrial areas.	No change recommended due to land use compatibility issues and potential contamination issues.
7	Employment land should be identified within the existing City limits before seeking opportunities through annexation of farmland in the Townships for development.	Based on the Council motion passed on May 25, 2021, City staff have been directed to complete the Official Plan and focus land use designations within the City's boundary.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Strong and Diverse Economy)	City's Response / What We Did
8	Some large uncertainties that planning could clearly address appear to be considered in a rather generic way. For example, the GE lands constitute both a major challenge and a potentially huge (albeit long-term) opportunity for the city.	A policy was added acknowledge key opportunity sites and investment areas and potential financial and planning tools. A policy was also added in both the Central Area and the Employment Lands Designation sections for the preparation of Urban Design Studies for lands with significant redevelopment potential.
9	Introduce penalties or disincentives for vacant industrial property.	This is not within the scope of the Official Plan update, however, the draft Official Plan encourages the reuse and/or conversion of greyfields, underutilized sites, and brownfields.
10	Greater flexibility in the location of commercial development, especially food stores, within neighbourhoods is promising.	No changes made – comment is in support of draft policies.
11	Registered Blocks within Heritage Park have been identified as Rural Transition Area.	Schedule A: Urban Structure and Schedule B: Land Use Plan have been revised accordingly to reflect the land needs assessment.
12	Various requests for lands currently identified as Rural Transition Area to be changed to Designated Greenfield Area.	Schedule A: Urban Structure and Schedule B: Land Use Plan have been revised accordingly to reflect the land needs assessment.
13	How have auto-focused uses been defined?	Term has been revised to “automobile-focused uses” for greater clarity and definition for automobile-focused uses has been added.
14	How are the Rural Transition Areas treated for the purpose of calculating density and intensification?	The Rural Transitional Area designation is not included in the calculations for density and intensification.
15	Should identifiers of Trent, Fleming and PRHC be removed from Schedule A?	Major Institutional identifiers have been removed from Schedule A.
16	Are drive-thru businesses permitted? If so, are they appropriate?	Drive-through facilities are specifically prohibited in the Central Area. Drive-thru facilities are considered a type of automobile-focused use and have locational and design criteria in the Major Mixed-Use Corridor and General Employment Designations.
17	Will the draft Land Needs Assessment be made available to the public before the end of the commenting period?	The Land Needs Assessment will be made available with the final draft Official Plan.
18	How has the student population been accounted for and incorporated into the Land Needs Assessment?	The student population was accounted for as “Units not Occupied by Usual Residents” and “Non-household Population”.
19	Does a LTC facility count towards population and employment projections?	Long-term care will count towards population projections as “Non-household Population”. Long-term care staff will be count towards employment projections.
20	What steps has the City taken towards its assessment of employment area land needs?	Staff have prepared a Land Needs Assessment according to the methodology approved by the Province.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Strong and Diverse Economy)	City's Response / What We Did
21	Can some of the contaminated sites in central locations, e.g., GE, be re-used as municipally owned studios and community centre spaces? If corporate owners rehabilitate enough for temporary exposure, can spaces/buildings be re-used for community arts? Couldn't be used for residential, likely, with contamination levels.	This is outside the scope of the Official Plan; however, per Section 3.3 (Objectives for Growth Management) the City will encourage the remediation and redevelopment of brownfield sites to uses that revitalize neighbourhoods.
22	The Official Plan incorporates a number of initiatives to enhance the City for businesses and residents alike.	No changes made – comment is in support of proposed policies.
23	The Official Plan should include partnering with local economic development organizations (e.g., PKED, etc) to build strong and diverse economy	Added policy to direct the creation of an economic development strategy in consultation with key stakeholders/agencies.
24	Dedicate resources to securing railway	Section 6.2.7 (Railways) states that the City shall consider opportunities to share surplus lands to the railway company needs and consider the acquisition of such lines or lands for the City's possible use for transportation.
25	Non-commercial/non-profits should also be included as part of a healthy economy.	The Official Plan does not distinguish between profit and non-for-profit businesses.
26	Arts should especially be protected and encouraged as a driver of economic prosperity, not for their profitability	The Official Plan is not the best mechanism for addressing these issues, besides through the provision of affordable housing.
27	Bus development, economic growth, industrial lands cannot be taking priority over the value the land has as ecosystems, climate change mitigation, species protection, Peterborough really must change its attitude towards the destruction of the greenspace it has left. Economic growth and protecting the environment is 2019 and beyond.	The natural heritage system is protected pursuant to Section 4.6.
28	Suggest discussions begin with General Electric on how they will clean up their mess in the centre of our city, and Little Lake while there at it!	This is outside the scope of the Official Plan, however, per Section 3.3 (Planning for Growth in an Urban Structure) the City will encourage the remediation and redevelopment of brownfield sites to uses that revitalize neighbourhoods.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

#	Comment/Question (Strong and Diverse Economy)	City's Response / What We Did
29	Peterborough's commitment to a green city and economy should be declared, differentiating economic development strategy	Section 2.2.5 (Strong and Diverse Economy) speaks to providing incentives for green and knowledges economies. Reference added to Section 2.2.5 to speak to the green economy and created a policy directing the completion of an economic development strategy in Section 7.3.3 (Planning Studies).
30	General Electric site needs to be cleaned up and re-integrated into the community	Per Section 3.3 (Planning for Growth in an Urban Structure), the City will encourage the remediation and redevelopment of brownfield sites to uses that revitalize neighbourhoods.
31	Culture is not just about heritage. The OP should recognize the important part artists, art organizing, artisans, designers, etc. play in the local economy.	Mention of 'arts' was added to Section 2.2.5 (Strong and Diverse Economy).
32	Peterborough would have increased tourism as well as quality of life for residents if it adopts an environmentally friendly plan for the future.	Leadership in environmental sustainability is included in the Plan's vision statement.



# What We Heard: Summary of Stakeholder Feedback on the Draft Official Plan

City of Peterborough Official Plan Update

June 2021

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	4
Activa Holdings/MHBC Planning .....	4
Age-Friendly Peterborough .....	6
AON Inc./ WND Associates .....	16
Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.....	18
Council for Persons with Disabilities.....	27
Davenport & Associates .....	32
Electric City Culture Council (EC3).....	35
Embee Properties.....	37
Greater Peterborough Chamber of Commerce .....	38
Habitat for Humanity.....	41
Housing and Homelessness Plan Steering Committee .....	43
Kawartha Land Trust.....	44
Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board .....	45
NeighbourPLAN .....	54
Otonabee Region Conservation Authority .....	56
Peterborough and the Kawarthas Economic Development .....	79
Peterborough and the Kawarthas Home Builders Association .....	82
Peterborough Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee.....	83
Peterborough Bicycle Advisory Committee .....	84
Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning .....	85
Peterborough Food Action Network .....	97
Peterborough Field Naturalists.....	98
Peterborough Immigration Partnership – New Canadians Centre.....	105
Peterborough Public Health .....	106
Reimagine Peterborough .....	112
Richard Taylor Law .....	119
Silverthorn Holdings .....	125
Sustainable Peterborough.....	126
Sustainable Trent .....	128
Township of Cavan Monaghan.....	131
Transition Town Peterborough .....	132

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta .....	133
Trent University Natural Areas Committee .....	160
Unitarian Fellowship of Peterborough .....	163
YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish .....	166



Introduction

This is a compilation of comments received to date as part of comprehensive submissions from stakeholder groups and agencies on the Draft Official Plan (June 19, 2019 version) and the City’s respective response to each comment. Please note that only larger issues raised by groups are noted in this matrix. Specific changes to policies through addition or removal of wording can be found in each individual submission, all of which are included with this package. It is also noted that section references in the comment/question column may be outdated – effort has been made to address the updated section reference in the column with the City’s responses.

Activa Holdings/MHBC Planning

Activa Holdings/MHBC Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	<p><b>Rural Transitional Area</b></p> <p>In our view, analysis of the amount of land to be declared as “excess lands” through the Official Plan review process must be undertaken in conformity with the Province’s Land Needs Assessment Methodology for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Province issued their latest Methodology in May 2018. Since that time, A Place to Grow, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe has been released; however, the Province has not yet updated their Land Needs Assessment Methodology. Determination of the amount of excess lands cannot be undertaken until the Province has released updated Land Needs Assessment Methodology or confirmed the approach proposed by the City of Peterborough. We respectfully request to be consulted during the City’s analysis of Rural Transitional Areas. We believe that, at a minimum, the portions of Activa’s lands within Registered Plans of Subdivision should not be considered excess lands as this will avoid leaving an incomplete community / subdivision. We will provide further comments with respect to the Rural Transitional Area designation through the detailed review process.</p>	<p>The Land Needs Assessment has been completed in accordance with the August 2020 methodology. The report will be made available with the final draft Official Plan in late-July 2021.</p>

Activa Holdings/MHBC Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
2	<p><b>Natural Areas and Major Open Space Designation</b></p> <p>Based on our review, it appears that the extent of the Natural Areas designation does not accurately reflect the boundaries of features located on the subject lands (subdivision area located northwest of Carnegie Avenue and Cumberland Avenue). Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Natural Areas designation on the western portion of the subject lands appears to be significantly larger than the wooded area located on the subject lands, and,</li> <li>- The extent of the Natural Areas designation on the eastern portion of the subject lands is larger than the Natural Areas identified in the in-force Official Plan.</li> </ul> <p>We understand that determination of lands designated Natural Areas was based on historical City reports and aerial photography. The mapping of Natural Areas has not been confirmed through detailed environmental studies. As such, we request that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The boundaries of the Natural Areas designation on the western portion of the subject lands be revised to reflect the boundary of the feature; and,</li> <li>- The Natural Areas designation boundary on the eastern portion of the subject lands be revised to be consistent with the in-force Official Plan.</li> </ul> <p>We note that the Natural Areas Development policies draft Official Plan policies permit: "<i>minor adjustments to the boundary of the Natural Areas Designation</i>", without an amendment to the Official Plan, (Section 4.6.2.o). However, the Draft Official Plan does not contain direction regarding the meaning of the term "minor adjustment". Further clarification regarding minor adjustments to the boundaries of the Natural Areas Designation is requested to be included in the second Draft of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>Section 8.1(a) (Interpretation) states that "Provided that the intent of this Plan is maintained, minor adjustments to the location of boundaries shown on the Schedules to this Plan shall not require an Amendment to this Plan." Policy language has been added to Section 4.6.2 (Natural Areas Designation) to recognize existing planning approvals supported by an environmental impact study.</p>
3	<p>With respect to lands designated Major Open Space, we note that a portion of the subject lands previously designated Residential is proposed to be designated Major Open Space by the Draft Official Plan. These lands form the logical extension of the adjacent Plan of Subdivision to the east and do not contain any natural heritage features. We respectfully request that the Major Open Space designation be removed from these lands and that these lands be designated Residential.</p>	<p>The Major Open Space designation mapping is largely consistent with the current Official Plan.</p>

Age-Friendly Peterborough

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	<p>By incorporating the following data into the Official Plan, the City of Peterborough will show support of policies and development that promote healthy aging for a significant number of Peterborough residents and visitors, and better prepare us for our future need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 14% use a mobility aid or aren't mobile.</li><li>• 23% reported a household income of less than \$40,000.</li><li>• 21% live alone.</li><li>• 60% stated they were concerned about transportation as they age, 53% were concerned about housing options, and 48% were concerned about the design of outdoor spaces and buildings.</li><li>• 24% of survey participants indicated the kind of housing they will need as they age is not affordable to them (31% didn't know),</li><li>• 57% stated they had concerns about their ability to afford their future housing needs (19% didn't know).</li><li>• When asked about what forms of transportation they use, 92% said they drive, 58% walk, 29% ride a bicycle, and 15% take public transit.</li><li>• Regarding outdoor spaces, parking, cleanliness, washrooms, pathways, seating areas, and lighting were listed as very important to older adults</li><li>• The draft Official Plan section 3.2 Population and Employment Forecasts, provides employment statistics, however older adults are not mentioned even though our study found that 57% of survey participants stated that workplaces are not open to hiring older workers and this is a barrier preventing older adults from attaining paid work in Peterborough.</li><li>• 63% of survey participants felt that there can be improvement in general awareness of the needs and interests of older adults in Peterborough.</li></ul>	<p>The Context Section of the Official Plan was revised to briefly speak to an aging population as well as other general future trends, challenges and opportunities. The provided statistics are too detailed for an Official Plan and the general approach has been to not have demographic-specific policies, as all demographic groups are equally important.</p>

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
2	<p><b>Inclusion of Age-Friendly</b></p> <p>We recommend "age-friendly" be added to the Vision Statement (2.1 b.), public spaces that utilize age-friendly principles (4.3.7 c. ii.), public park system that is age-friendly (5.3.1 ), and age-friendly be defined (8.2).</p>	<p><b>Section 2.1 Vision Statement:</b> No change recommended - The vision speaks to all residents and visitors. This is comparable to the Age-Friendly Peterborough Community Action Plan Vision Statement that “Peterborough is a thriving region that is inclusive, respectful, and accessible to people of all ages and abilities.” The vision statement also speaks to a “complete community” which in its definition includes age-friendly.</p> <p><b>Section 4.3.7 Little Lake South and 5.3 Parkland and Open Space:</b> Universal Design principles should be considered for all land designations. A policy was added to Section 4.1.2 General Policies for All Designations with respect to universal design principles: “In all designations, any new development, redevelopment or public realm improvement shall strive to incorporate universal design principles wherever possible, to ensure accessibility and ease of mobility for all residents and visitors. To facilitate this, the City may prepare universal design guidelines, as appropriate.”</p> <p><b>Section 8.2 Definitions:</b> No change recommended – the only reference in the Official Plan to the term age-friendly is in the definition of a complete community.</p>

## Age-Friendly Peterborough

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	<p><b>Inclusion of Older Adult Growth Projections</b></p> <p>Considering the impending population growth for the Peterborough area, and the expectation that a significant number of those will be over 65 years of age, the draft Official Plan does not reflect that demographic change. We recommend that section 3 include statistics of older adult growth projections to the year 2041. It is especially important to note that by 2041, 26% of the City of Peterborough total population will be over the age of 65 and the number of residents over the age of 90 will dramatically increase from 465 in 2016 to 2,190 in 2041. The City of Peterborough has the greatest number of residents over the age of 65 in Ontario and second in Canada. This data can inform decisions to ensure we have appropriate services, programs, policies, and infrastructure in place to support our residents as they age. The only reference to an aging population was found in 5.2.3 6. viii. where it refers to affordable and accessible independent living options.</p>	<p>The Context Section of the Plan speaks to having an older average demographic than many other GGH communities. Some additional text was added provided to speak to the aging population of the City; noting however, that the approach is to limit explanatory text.</p> <p>While the age structure is an important consideration in forecasting housing need and other planning considerations, these projections are not required to be in the Official Plan directly. Added consideration of demographic analysis to inform decision-making/provision of services to Section 7.3.3 (Planning Studies) and added 'demographic analysis to list of considerations for Secondary Plans (Section 7.3.5).</p>
4	<p><b>Housing</b></p> <p>We understand the City is not responsible for the development or building of housing, however suggest the City implement policy and process changes to increase the number of affordable and accessible living options available that meet the needs of an aging population and persons with disabilities. (5.2 b.) An accessible package such as wider doors and ramps could be made available by builders. In the Town of Caledon, a draft plan submitted for approval must include a floor plan showing universal design. We recommend 20% of all new residential development include universal design features in order to accommodate our current and future need of those who wish to age in place. We feel there is a need to educate builders about the needs of our aging population and for the City to provide incentives to those who offer accessible units with universal design features. We suggest adding a review of the building code to encourage elevators on buildings less than four floors, therefore increasing the number of accessible units.</p>	<p>Policy was added to encourage accessible housing options in all residential development in Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing). Section 5.2.4 also includes a number of planning strategies to support affordable and accessible housing objectives. A review of the provincial building code is beyond the purview (and authority) of the Official Plan.</p>

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
5	<p>Currently Peterborough is not fulfilling the housing demands of lower-income residents, and as more people retire this need will only increase. We suggest adding affordable, accessible rental units in the Central Area (4.3.1 b.) We support the planning strategies listed in 5.2.3 d. such as encouraging the development of smaller units, secondary suites, accessory dwelling units, garden suites, cohousing, tiny homes, communal housing, and life-lease housing. AFP has conducted research for our Health and Housing Navigation Study to increase awareness of services and accommodations that are available. In phase one, we created a directory of all housing options that target people over 50 years of age, developed a demographic profile to identify the needs of future seniors, and investigated innovative housing options other communities have introduced. In phase two, we will compare what we currently have with our future need, identify gaps, and develop a strategic plan that recommends housing options for Peterborough older adults.</p>	<p>Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) includes a number of planning strategies to support affordable and accessible housing objectives. The proposed Plan identifies the Central Area as a Strategic Growth Area and is thereby a focus area for higher density forms of intensification and development. The Plan also encourages a broad range of housing types with respect to cost, tenure, size, design, and accessibility.</p> <p>Revised Section 7.16(e) regarding Community Improvement Plans and Areas to indicate “inadequate mix of housing types and densities, including insufficient affordable housing and accessible housing” as one of the criteria that must be satisfied when designated Community Improvement Project Areas.</p>

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
6	We recommend that the Official Plan include supporting healthy aging that allows a person to age where they live, not just work where they live. This includes options for affordable housing, transitional supports, retirement housing, long-term care, and palliative care.	<p>The Official Plan includes a number of age-friendly policies and policies that support aging in place (e.g., policies related to community engagement, social inclusion, transportation, housing, public service facilities, parks and open spaces, accessibility and complete communities).</p> <p>Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) also includes a number of planning strategies to support affordable and accessible housing objectives. Long-term care and palliative care are managed by the Ministry of Health and Long-term Care. Both are considered types of public service facilities which are permitted in every land use designation of the proposed Official Plan (except the Natural Areas designation). Direction is also given in the draft Official Plan to locate public service facilities in strategic growth areas/community hubs that are easily accessible by transit and active transportation.</p>



Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
7	<p><b>Parkland and Open Spaces</b></p> <p>We support the statement that neighbourhood parks should be appealing to all age groups and accessible to all residents (5.3.4 a. iv.). As mentioned, neighbourhood parks are intended to serve the close-to-home social and recreation needs of the community. An age-friendly park encourages a sense of community, safety, and inclusion, it decreases social isolation, and promotes healthy aging. We suggest adding age-friendly features such as benches, accessible washrooms, and barrier-free sidewalks/paths to all appropriate sections listed in the Central Area (4.3), Parkland and Open Spaces (5.3) and Active Transportation (6.2.3). We also suggest adding retirement residences and long-term care facilities to 5.3.3 a. iv. where it states that community parks be located next to schools and places of worship.</p> <p>Zoning could take the mandatory parkette one step further to encourage the development of community hubs for natural gathering spaces for older adults.</p>	<p>Sections 5.3 (Parkland and Open Space) provides planning and design guidelines for parks regarding public washroom facilities, accessibility for all residents, and furniture. Detailed requirements for parks are in the City of Peterborough Parks Development Standards (e.g., accessible benches, public washroom facilities, seating/socializing area with accessibility features). The Park Standards also states that all Parks shall meet the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA).</p> <p>It is important to note that all development is required to comply with AODA, as a requirement of the Province. A policy was added to Section 4.1.2 (General Policies for All Designations) with respect to universal design principles.</p> <p>The Plan also encourages improvements to the public realm at community hubs.</p>

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
8	<p><b>Active Transportation</b></p> <p>We support the emphasis of active transportation in the Official Plan. As mentioned in the draft Official Plan, all people, especially older adults need to feel comfortable and safe (5.4.2 c.). Currently, a lack of lighting, traffic, and sidewalk maintenance are examples of barriers. We suggest dividing pathways to separate on foot and on wheel travel. We also recommend adding a statement under 6.2.3 to include the development of educational materials to increase awareness of the use of pedestrian signals and active transportation safety. We also recommend investigating traffic calming solutions.</p>	<p>A policy was added to 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) with respect to the preparation of road or area-specific cross-sections to illustrate required components of the right-of-way. Such cross-sections may consider shared use paths/multi-use trails. Section 6.2.3 also indicates that the design of multi-use trails will be of sufficient width to accommodate all users and two-direction travels and provide appropriate safety measures. The development of educational materials may be considered beyond the Official Plan (i.e., the Official Plan does not the preclude the development of public awareness materials).</p> <p>Section 6.2.6 (Road Network) indicates that traffic management strategies and techniques (which include traffic calming measures) shall be considered where they would provide for the safe and efficient use of existing transportation facilities and minimize the potential impacts of traffic.</p>
9	<p>We recommend that winter maintenance be addressed in the Official Plan. Snow and ice on sidewalks, trails, and bus shelters can be debilitating, cause social isolation and put all people, especially older adults at risk for falls. Active transportation should be an option through the year.</p>	<p>Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) indicates that this Plan requires that all development contribute to the creation of a 4-season walkable and connected community and that winter maintenance of active transportation facilities will be an important consideration, particularly along routes that connect pedestrians to key destinations such as schools and transit stops.</p>

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
10	<b>Ageism</b> The use of "nursing home" is outdated; the preferred term is long-term care facility" (4.3.8 g.).	Revised references from nursing home to long-term care facilities in Section 4.3.8 (Jackson Creek Special Policy Area) and Section 4.1.3 (General Policies for Hazard Lands).
11	<b>Public Transit</b> Public transit is especially important to keep seniors who are no longer driving engaged with their community. The AFP Staying Mobile Working group is developing a Transit Training program to educate and inform older adults about accessible features of local transit and to provide an educational experience for those who would like to learn how to take the bus. We recommend education and awareness about transit options should be added to 6.2.5.	The development of educational materials may be considered beyond the Official Plan (i.e., the Official Plan does not the preclude the development of public awareness materials). The development of these materials may be considered as part of the Transportation Master Plan.

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
12	<p><b>Additional definitions required</b></p> <p>When AFPAC reviewed the draft Official Plan, it was noted that some terms were not clear, and it was suggested that the following definitions be provided in 8.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• age-friendly (to be added to 2.1 b., 4.3.7 c. ii., and 5.3.1.)</li><li>• community hubs (4.2.2 x. ii.),</li><li>• placemaking (5.3.6.1 b. vi.),</li><li>• modal priority (6.2.3 g.),</li><li>• wayfinding (6.1.3 l. iv.),</li><li>• universal design (to be added to 5.2 d. viii.)</li></ul> <p>The term "accessible" is used through the document and had various meanings, therefore the intent was not clear. It is suggested that “accessible” be used to describe the range of ability/disability and a definition be added that includes considering all disabilities including hearing, sight and mobility.</p>	<p>Added definition for Universal Design. The term age-friendly is not used anywhere in the Official Plan except for in the definition of a complete community. Replaced “modal priority” to more plain language. Also added ‘directional signage’ and ‘navigation’ to clarify the meaning of ‘wayfinding’.</p> <p>Added definitions for ‘placemaking’ and ‘community hub’. Placemaking is a planning and urban design process which seeks to create communities that offer a distinct character, a strong sense of community and a context for healthy lifestyles and a high quality of life. The term community hub is used in A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Community hubs provide a central access point for a range of needed health and social services, along with cultural, recreational, and open spaces. Every community hub is unique and is defined by local needs, services and resources.</p> <p>Disagree that the intent of “accessible” in the document is not clear. The meaning of “accessible” may be determined in the context in which the term is used.</p>

Age-Friendly Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
13	<p>The purpose of an Official Plan is to shape how the City of Peterborough looks, feels and functions. It incorporates how the municipality will prepare for the projected population growth. Updating the Official Plan is an opportunity to address the anticipated demographic shift to ensure the needs of an aging population is met.</p> <p>Age-friendly Peterborough vision is for Peterborough to be a thriving region that is inclusive, respectful, and accessible to people of all ages and abilities. Although there are synergies between the City and AFP vision and alignment between the AFP Community Action Plan and the draft Official Plan, we recommend that more emphasis be placed on planning for our future aging demographics. The City of Peterborough, the County, Curve Lake and Hiawatha First Nations endorsed the AFP application to the World Health Organization and committed to support healthy aging. We have a responsibility to create environments, promote services and develop policies so that older adults' basic needs are met, they are able to live and stay mobile in their community, and where they can contribute and feel connected.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #3.</p>

AON Inc./ WND Associates

AON Inc./ WND Associates		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	The Natural Heritage System policies make reference to Appendix I: The Natural Heritage System Background Study, which was not attached to the draft Official Plan for review.	A copy of the background study will be made available concurrently with the next draft of the Official Plan.
2	It is our opinion, that it is premature to designate lands as <i>Natural Areas</i> and identify adjacent environmental overlays within the AON property until the final <i>Natural Heritage System Background Study</i> has been completed. Furthermore, it would be appropriate for the policy to clearly set out the means to implement such environmental protections, ensuring that ground truth science be applied in establishing the limits and appropriate buffers.	The Policy requires that the Environmental Impact Study ground truth and establish appropriate buffers in accordance with the minimums identified in Table A. This policy already states that minor adjustments may be facilitated through an EIS without needing an OPA.
3	The Secondary Plans of the approved Official Plan of the City of Peterborough were not carried forward into the draft Official Plan for the City of Peterborough, and the land use designations and road network as shown on the approved Secondary Plan Schedules are not illustrated on the Schedules of the draft Official Plan. The Rural Transitional Area designation is also not consistent with approved secondary plans.	Added new section for secondary plans (Section 9.0) - Existing secondary plans have been incorporated where appropriate.
4	Development applications that are deemed complete prior to the adoption of the new Official Plan should not be subject to the new Official Plan policies.	Land use planning applications are generally judged on the basis of the law and policy in place on the date of the application.

## AON Inc./ WND Associates

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	The strategies of the Central Area Master Plan (including the priority functions and promotion of the economic development of the downtown area), were recognised in the approved Official Plan (Section 10.6), but have not been carried forward into the draft Official Plan. It is recommended that the draft Official Plan continue to identify the objectives and strategies of the City of Peterborough Central Area Master Plan to recognize the importance of the Central Area and to reinforce the cultural and entertainment priority functions of the downtown as well as major office and government functions.	The Plan does recognize the importance of the Central Area and its functions. Many strategies from the Central Area Master Plan are very specific/project-based and may not belong in the Official Plan.
6	<i>Definitions</i> of the draft Official Plan defines <i>Major Office</i> as “ <i>Freestanding office buildings of approximately 4,000 square metres of floor space or greater, or with approximately 200 jobs or more</i> ”. Due to recent workplace trends (efficient use of space; flexibility in terms of where employees work; etc.), it may be appropriate to review the minimum area of floor space area of Major Office and propose a reduced area.	This definition of Major Office is consistent with A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. It is also noted that all office sizes are permitted in the Central Area.



Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	Policy 3.3(e) directs that the City will plan to achieve minimum average density targets for designated greenfield areas and within the urban growth centre. However, it is our understanding that the City will not be preparing a schedule to replicate minimum residential density targets. The in-force version of the Official Plan provided targets of 50 people and jobs per hectare in greenfield and 150 people and jobs per hectare in the Urban Growth Centre. Further, the language in this policy has been updated from encouraging intensification to seeking to implement it. The direction on how growth will occur is not specific with respect to the built-up area. For example, with respect to the delineated built-up area (Policy 3.4.2) the draft OP states that a significant portion of the City’s future growth will be directed to this area but does not provide the targeted percentage of that growth, per the Growth Plan. Further, this policy provides that higher density forms of intensification shall be primarily focused in Strategic Growth Areas and the Urban Growth Centre but does not specify what is meant by ‘higher density’, although the next sentence in the policy provides that mid- and high- rise forms of housing will be accommodated in these areas.	<p>Section 3.3.3(b) (The Delineated Built-Up Area) states that a minimum of 50 per cent of new housing units approved by the City will be in the built-up area each year.</p> <p>With respect to residential density, “higher density” is meant to include mid- and high-rise forms of housing development. This is noted in Section 3.3.3 (The Delineated Built-Up Area): “Higher density forms of intensification shall be primarily focused in the Strategic Growth Areas. These areas will accommodate mid and high-rise forms of housing, as well as an array of population-related employment opportunities.”</p>
2	The designation of areas in the designated greenfield area as Rural Transitional Area is of particular concern because much of this area was identified as Designated Greenfield Area in the in-force Official Plan, including Secondary Plan areas. Rationale has not been provided for why these areas have been removed from development.	The June 2019 draft schedules do not reflect the land needs assessment results. The quantity of excess lands has been identified in accordance with the Land Needs Assessment in the updated schedules.

## Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	With respect to the Central Area, (3.4.5.e), the draft Official Plan directs that the Central Area will accommodate a significant share of the City's projected population and employment growth to 2041 and beyond. However, there is no analysis to support how this could occur and whether it would be realistic to assume that a significant amount of the City's employment growth would be in a form that would be appropriate as infill in the Central Area, rather than in an employment area.	Secondary plan analysis will look at servicing capability. The Growth Plan policies support directing growth to settlement areas and prioritizing intensification, with a focus on strategic growth areas, including urban growth centres. The urban growth centre is located within the Central Area and is also required by Growth Plan policy to be planned to achieve a minimum density of 150 residents and jobs per hectare by 2031.
4	The Central Area designation only permits height in excess of six stories within the Downtown Core Area and Industrial Conversion Area. However, additional heights should be considered throughout in order to help the City achieve its intensification targets.	Added new policy to acknowledge potential to consider additional building height: "Within the Central Area additional building height may be considered by the City on a site by site basis through an Official Plan Amendment where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development is considered compatible development."
5	In the section regarding Land Use designations, the general introduction provides some objectives, including a target of 0.33 to 0.46 square metres of food store floor space per capita in each of the four defined sub-areas of the City and provides that the retention of food stores in the Central Area will be encouraged. It is unclear how this would be enforced.	Section 4.1.4(a)(ii) (Food Store Distribution in the Urban Structure) indicates that applications for new large-scale food stores shall be considered through a Zoning by-law amendment, accompanied by a justification report recognizing the objectives of the Plan. The intent is that this would apply over the short term and that the City will ultimately identify future sites for large-scale food stores through the Secondary Plan process in new growth areas.

Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
6	<p>Section 4.3 requires that all development in the Central Area be transit-supportive and pedestrian-oriented. The definition for transit-supportive includes reference to the Ministry of Transportation’s transit supportive guidelines. It is unclear what sort of density is assumed to be transit supportive in this case without an understanding of the types of transit that are planned.</p> <p>Further, the policies for the Central Area seem to promote protection of the existing context with less direction on how to accommodate the significant amount of growth that is to be planned as part the Growth Plan’s Urban Growth Centre (150 people and jobs per hectare).</p> <p>Additionally, the policies for the Central Area direct that on-site amenities be provided but does not differentiate between residential and non-residential uses, nor does it specify if this would only apply to certain types of residential forms (e.g. apartments).</p>	<p>The intent is that the policies are focused on the quality of design, the streetscape and amenity space as opposed to only density.</p> <p>The general policies applicable throughout the Central Area in Section 4.3.1 states on-site amenity space as a consideration for all development. More detailed policies for residential development and amenity spaces are provided in the Central Area designations. Section 7.7 (Site Plan Approval) considers outdoor amenity and/or play facilities, where appropriate.</p>
7	<p>Furthermore, with respect to item Section 4.3.1(e)(vii), it is unclear what is meant by the policy that directs that building separations be maintained. With respect to the high-rise residential uses in the Central Area, the policies direct that they shall be planned to be within 250 metres of an existing or planned transit route whereas the Growth Plan provides that a major transit station area will have a radius of 500 to 800 metres and the Province’s Transit Supportive Guidelines provide direction with respect to 400 to 800 metres or a 5 to 10 minute walk.</p>	<p>Maintaining general building separation will vary depending on the street pattern and context. Revised policy to replace “building spacing” with “building separation” for greater clarity.</p> <p>The majority of the Central Area is within 250 metres of an existing bus route, with the exception of a portion of the Little Lake cemetery and eastern portion of Crescent St. However, do not believe changes are needed to accommodate distance from transit for the eastern portion of Crescent St. as this area only permits low-rise apartments and stacked townhouses, not high-rise buildings.</p>

## Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
8	With respect to Mixed Use Corridors, the draft Official Plan directs that these corridors will accommodate transit-supportive densities, including mid- and high-rise forms, but do not provide direction with respect to specific density ranges. The Mixed-Use Corridor policies also state that they would be located in both the Built-up Area and Designated Greenfield Areas but does not indicate if there would be a difference between the two designations. It is unclear how intensification along these corridors has been taken into account with respect to the land budget. However, it is our understanding that the determination between major and minor mixed-use corridors was based on the anticipated redevelopment potential and City staff will review the designation in this area.	It was the intent that the draft Official Plan does not speak to specific density ranges. There is no functional difference between Mixed-Use Corridors within the Built-Up Area and Designated Greenfield Area. Revised wording of Section 4.4.2 (Residential Designation) to “As such, the City will require mid-or high-rise development with high quality public realm improvements and building design, and encourage mixed-use development, at the following intersections ...”.
9	The way that the sections on growth have been structured does not provide a clear distinction between Delineated Built-up Areas and Designated Greenfield Areas with respect to density and population targets, built form etc.	Section 3.0 Planning for Future Growth has been revised to improve clarity.
10	Policy 3.4.3.b does provide density targets for Designated Greenfield Areas at 55 residents and jobs per hectare for residential neighbourhoods and 20 jobs per hectare for employment lands. Again, there is direction to encourage higher density in Designated Greenfield Areas but no description of what is meant by ‘higher density’.	Revised density targets in accordance with the Land Needs Assessment and August 2020 Provincial methodology. The policy is revised to clarify the minimum density target to be achieved as an overall average across the Designated Greenfield Area and within new subdivisions. In terms of residential development, “higher density” is meant to capture medium and high-rise buildings.

## Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
11	Policy 3.4.5 states that Neighbourhoods are expected to evolve over time, which contradicts 3.2.4.f and other policies. Policy 3.4.5 provides that intensification in Neighbourhoods will be through minor means such as infill on vacant lots, secondary suite etc., without dealing with whether or not that would be appropriate in the Built-up Area. It is evident that this would not apply to the proposed Neighbourhoods designation in Designated Greenfield Areas.	There is no policy 3.2.4(f) – assumed reference is to respect to Section 3.4.2(f). Disagree that Section 3.4.5 and 3.4.3(f) contradict each other. The later states that “Residential intensification initiatives within the Neighbourhoods will be limited. That does not mean that Neighbourhoods will not evolve...” Both policies state evolution will occur, but more gradually than other areas. The determination of whether specific developments are appropriate will be through the policies of Section 4.2 (Neighbourhoods) on a site-by-site basis.
12	There may be a disconnect between the maximum height of 3 storeys and the maximum FSI of 1, in particular with respect to townhouses and apartment buildings.	Floor space index has been removed from this section.
13	There is no maximum density (FSI) provided for mid-residential uses. The policies for mid rise buildings also direct that these buildings shall be compatible with existing uses and built forms in the vicinity but do not define what constitutes the ‘vicinity’.	Floor Space Index has been removed from this section. No definition of “vicinity” is required; the term is meant to generally capture the adjacent surrounding area.
14	For high-rise residential uses in Neighbourhoods, there is no mention of the type of transit (higher-order versus bus routes) and note that the proximity of 250 metres is closer to transit than the Growth Plan provides for Major Transit Station Areas, at 500 to 800 metres.	At present, there is no higher-order transit services in the City. The policy refers to any transit service, which in present day would apply to existing and planned bus routes.
15	There is no direction with respect to the redevelopment of old school sites if they are determined to be surplus.	The City generally has the right of first refusal on surplus school buildings. Added new policy to Section 4.2.2 (Policies for Secondary and Elementary Schools) that the City will consider surplus school sites and determine whether a public service use or community use is appropriate for the site.

## Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
16	In the subsection regarding public service facilities, item v. directs that new public service facilities such as hospital and schools shall be located within settlement areas. It is unclear why this policy would be included given that Schedule A: Urban Structure indicates that the municipal boundary and the settlement area boundary are the same.	This policy wording is in accordance with the Growth Plan with respect to public service facilities. However, this policy has been revised to remove reference to the settlement area boundary.
17	In Section 4.2.3(d)(vi) Major Institutional Designation, the policies state that on-site amenity is to be provided, where it is reflective of the existing patterns of private and public amenity space in the vicinity. It is not typical to have a requirement for on-site amenity for an institutional building and it may be challenging to reflect surrounding land use patterns surrounding if the land use type differs.	"Where appropriate" was added - intent of the policy is to ensure that the availability of amenity space is considered.
18	Section 4.2.4(h)(iv) addresses major open spaces and provides a set of criteria for amendments that propose the removal of private land from the major open space designation. One of the criteria is to protect the adjacent properties from the impact of the proposed new use. This should be rephrased to address the integration of the proposed use with the surroundings rather than identifying it as an impact.	Have revised this policy to include both considerations: "The potential for appropriate integration with surrounding uses and the potential need to protect adjacent properties from the impact of the proposed new use".
19	Section 4.3.2 provides the permitted uses in the Downtown Core Area designation and does not include low-rise residential uses whereas the Core Area designation includes a number of existing low-rise residential properties. Subsection b, item iii states that new buildings should be designed to respect the rhythm and scale of building facades and heights in the immediate vicinity. If this is the case, then it could be restrictive with respect to high-rise buildings in this area whereas subsection c states that buildings are permitted to a maximum height of 8 storeys.	The intent is that the Downtown Core Area will intensify over time. However, high-rise buildings may not be appropriate throughout the Downtown Core Area – the policies are intended to ensure that new development considers and respects the surrounding context and built form. Section 4.3.1 states that: "The maximum building height for each designation shall only be achieved subject to..."
20	Section 4.3.4 provides direction on the Industrial Conversion Area designation. Uses permitted as part of a conversion do not include institutional. Further, the policies state that conversion has not been addressed in the policies as of yet. As such, it will be necessary to clarify how this factors into the overall land budget, particularly with respect to intensification in the built-up area.	Institutional uses are permitted in every designation except the Natural Area designation. Employment in the Industrial Conversion Area will be factored in the calculations. Details assumptions are described in the Land Needs Assessment report.

Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
21	The Employment Area Designation, typically along Highway 115, is addressed in Section 4.5.2. The list of permitted uses does not seem to include offices, although business service establishment is included but is not defined. Similarly, Section 4.5.3 provides direction on the Employment Land designation which applies to existing pockets of older industrial development and also does not include office.	With respect to both the Prestige Employment and General Employment designations (previously Employment Area and Employment Land designations), offices accessory to the permitted uses are permitted; however, stand-alone offices are not. Added definition for “business service establishment” (i.e., “an establishment servicing primarily the operational needs of the business community including: employment services, customs services, marketing services, collection and credit services, appraisal services, advertising and graphic services, accounting and bookkeeping services, research and training services, office equipment and computer services, data processing services, courier services, property management services, security services, janitorial services, and studio and communication services.”)
22	The Transportation section of the plan does not address where planned transit might occur. This would be fundamental to determining where growth would be focused.	A Transit Route Review is underway.



## Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
23	While the updated Official Plan policies make reference to secondary plans as a tool to be used for growth, they do not make reference to the secondary plans that have already been prepared and approved. We understand that the City intends to include existing secondary plans, where appropriate, during the next revision of the new Official Plan. However, the criteria for the inclusion of these secondary plans is unclear. Importantly, some of those secondary plan areas overlap with the Rural Transitional Areas that have been introduced. The policies in the draft Official Plan state that development in Designated Greenfield Areas will only be considered following the approval of a comprehensive Secondary Plan. Again, it is unclear how the previously approved secondary plans that overlap with the Rural Transitional Areas will be addressed. It would also be beneficial to outline how nodes analyzed in previous design charrettes will be incorporated into the secondary plans and how they will be identified or addressed in the interim while secondary plans have not been incorporated into the Official Plan.	Added new section for secondary plans (Section 9.0) - Existing secondary plans have been incorporated where appropriate.
24	In addition to the policy revisions described herein, we would also like to note that the updated Official Plan was prepared prior to the introduction of Bill 108 and does not address relevant changes, particularly in the Implementation section (Section 7).	Revisions have been made with respect to Bill 108 and Bill 197 (i.e., density bonusing, parkland dedication, community benefits by-law, additional residential units and inclusionary zoning).
25	There is insufficient information regarding the process undertaken in determining a land budget and, related to this land budget, how it has been determined that areas that are currently available for greenfield development would be down-designated to a Rural Transition Area.	Detail information is in the Land Needs Assessment report.

Brookfield Properties/Bousfields Inc.

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
26	Further, the policies of the updated Official Plan introduce the notion that the Neighbourhood designation would be a stable area with little change permitted. Some of the details of density and height permissions are also concerning as they do not seem realistic, nor is it clear how certain permissions will be used to accommodate growth. Finally, a reliance on transit-oriented development and the assumptions made in this regard are not clear and, in some cases, do not appear to be correct.	The ‘Neighbourhoods’ are not intended to static, but will evolve more slowly with new development and more minor intensification which is compatible with the surrounding area. It is unclear what requires revising in regards to transit-oriented development; however the density (i.e., floor space index) provisions have been removed from this section.

Council for Persons with Disabilities

Council for Persons with Disabilities		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	We assert that "access" and "accessibility" should only be used when discussing matters of disability. Care should be taken to select more suitable word choices when discussing matters of access so as not to muddy the use of the word "accessibility" in relation to those with disabilities. Fully articulating "accessibility for those with disabilities" should be done at regular intervals to reinforce this distinction.	Disagree that “accessible” should only be used when discussing matters of disability. The meaning of “accessible” may be determined in the context in which the term is used. For example, “publicly accessible” is a common term used to mean a place in which the public may access.
2	It should be made clear that planning for accessibility is, in turn, planning for the whole citizenry. Universal Design benefits every single citizen because it crafts the environment more thoughtfully than with conventional wisdom.	Added to Section 4.1.2 (General Policies for All Designations) that any new development, redevelopment or public realm improvement shall strive to incorporate universal design principles wherever possible, to ensure accessibility and ease of mobility for all residents and visitors. Also revised Section 2.2.4 (Well Connected with Options for Mobility) to state “ensuring that new development uses universal design and is easily accessible in accordance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act standards”.

Council for Persons with Disabilities		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	We strongly urge Universal Design to be the new standard that elevates Peterborough. We believe the Official Plan is the ideal place for Peterborough to enumerate our intentions about how we plan for everyone to be included. Each component of the Official Plan should have accessibility as an integral consideration.	Accessibility and universal design are considered throughout the Official Plan. For example, in the design requirements for active transportation routes, transit, public meeting venues, site plan approval, public realm improvements, housing and Community Improvement Plans. All new development needs to comply with Ontarians with Disabilities Act standards.
4	The notion of a Complete Community supports accessibility insofar as it creates a dynamic that concentrates the essential infrastructure such as transit making many things easier to access. Having various nodes will better allow for those with disabilities to participate in their neighbourhoods. The barrier presented to the disabled person when facing urban sprawl can be remedied by equipping nodes with an array of services that support one another and have easy access to transit. For disabled people, the inability to easily get around the city using the existing services is a frequent frustration. A higher walkability score is very attractive because this means less time spent arranging and waiting for services. All people appreciate having their neighbourhoods being so richly supportive, but for those with disabilities having this integration can make the difference between being able to benefit and contribute to their city's social fabric or being isolated.	Policies regarding public service facilities encourage services to be co-located in community hubs. The preferred location of community hubs is in strategic growth areas that area easily accessible by active transportation and public transit. Community hubs provide a central access point for a range of needed health and social services, along with cultural, recreational, and open spaces. The draft Plan also encourages neighbourhood supportive uses within the Residential designation to improve walkability and the creation of complete communities.

Council for Persons with Disabilities		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	Within designated parks, wherever possible within the constraints of nature, every effort should be made to create accessible features to allow for disabled residents to enjoy the natural heritage feature in addition to the greater park area. We as a community recognize that nature is more difficult to make accessible. Highlighting these smaller features within in the city limits, more easily allows people to enjoy our environment.	<p>Section 5.3 (Parkland and Open Space) provides high level planning and design guidelines for parks regarding public washroom facilities, accessibility for all residents, and furniture. Detailed requirements for parks are in the City of Peterborough Parks Development Standards (e.g., accessible benches, public washroom facilities, seating/socializing area with accessibility features). The Park Standards also states that all Parks shall meet the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA).</p> <p>Added a policy to Section 4.1.2: General Policies for All Designations that in all designations, any new development, redevelopment or public realm improvement will strive to incorporate universal design principles.</p>
6	We would encourage the city to consider setting the required number of new residential units to be built at a higher rate than 15%. Given the number of disabled renters, combined with our aging demographic, being more aggressive with preparing our housing market for a future that will require many more accessible units seems prudent. Many disabled people are living in substandard units due to cost and unavailability of accessible rentals. This is unlikely to change without the express intention to make the situation better. Incentivizing the creation of affordable and accessible housing would significantly better the lives of many Peterborough residents.	Policy added to encourage options for accessibility in all residential development in Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing).

## Council for Persons with Disabilities

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	As mentioned earlier, transportation is an ongoing issue for disabled residents in Peterborough. For this reason, a comprehensive system of accessible trails, with connections to parks, is essential for disabled residents to enjoy outside recreation as freely as any other resident. In addition to providing recreation, accessible trails also allow for easy access to circumvent busy streets when using mobility devices.	Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) indicates that the Plan requires that a highly walkable community is developed based on an interconnected network of streets with pedestrian supportive streetscapes that provide for ease of access, orientation and safety for pedestrian, cyclists, and motor vehicles to ensure that all members of society have a range of transportation options. It is also a requirement of the Plan that multi-use trails network be designed to meet the requirements of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, including with respect to slopes.
8	The trails are a wonderful mish-mash of able bodied and disabled people all enjoying the same amenity. Features such as benches, garbage containers, way finding, public washrooms, rest stops, shade, and options for water (adjacent to clear paths of travel) are important self-care requirements for some and will increase accessibility in our outdoor spaces for everyone.	See response to comment #5 above.
10	<p>We would encourage there to be a voice in accessibility when it comes to transportation design, urban design or purchases that will directly serve our population. There is no shortage of voices affected by disability that have something to say about Peterborough's accessibility. These citizens can give an early warning for problems related to transportation for such things as compromised curb cuts and the like because of daily use. We suggest an enhanced reporting service for submitting feedback to the city since the Transportation subcommittee has been dissolved.</p> <p>On a related note, the Built Environment sub-committee reviews some site plans submitted to the city for accessibility issues. Including inside floor plans, where appropriate, would empower the committee to contribute more accessibility education to builders. This in turn would make more builds more accessible, and builders might then become more familiar for building with accessibility in mind. Examining whether the guidelines are precluding some site plans that could benefit from their experience might also be a helpful exercise.</p>	Added policy applicable to all designations, that any new development, redevelopment or public realm improvement shall strive to incorporate universal design principles wherever possible, to ensure accessibility and ease of mobility for all residents and visitors. To facilitate this, the City may create Universal Design guidelines. The development of such guidelines would be open to public consultation.

Council for Persons with Disabilities		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
11	There have been discussions in the media of late concerning new recreational vehicles such a e-scooters. E-scooters and various light "vehicles" present a very clear accessibility issue for everyone in the outdoor space. They represent a threat to accessibility when in use and also when awaiting a new rider. It might be prudent to consider the impact of these on our community's accessibility and to establish guidelines in order to protect the city's efforts to keep Peterborough as accessible as possible.	The City may introduce bylaw regarding e-scooters or amend the active transportation bylaw that regulates bikes, e-bikes and other forms of active transportation.



## Davenport & Associates

Davenport & Associates		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	What is the City's interpretation of Clause 5.3.2 (b) "The City requires that at least 10 percent of all new residential units be affordable housing"? Will each plan of subdivision and/or apartment/condominium have to have at least 10% as affordable housing? Mixed housing projects have a poor reputation. Private developers cannot afford to take a chance on building quality housing only to have the affordable housing component of the building destroy the overall reputation of the building.	Revised this policy to clarify that the policy applies as an overall city-wide objective rather than any one single development. For greater certainty, "affordable" does not mean subsidized (refer to definition for 'affordable') – depending on the price, it could mean smaller unit sizes.
2	The Official Plan must be changed to remove all references to affordable that may apply to the private development. Remove Clause 5.2.3.b "The City requires that at least 10 percent of all new residential units be affordable housing."	Further to the response to Comment #1 above, an affordable housing target is required under A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. It is noted that some forms of private housing development meet the definition of 'affordable'. The target in this policy has been increased from 10% to 20%.
3	The Parkway route must be added back into the Official Plan. The current City of Peterborough Traffic Study, approved by City Council, supports the development of the parkway from the existing parkway at Clonsilla Avenue to Cumberland Avenue.	This will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan. Changes will be made accordingly to the Draft Official Plan - it is not the intent of the Official Plan policies to preconceive the outcomes of the Transportation Master Plan.
4	The Official Plan has not been adjusted to incorporate Bill 108 passed in June 2019.	Revisions made to reflect Bill 108 and Bill 197 changes. Several sections and policies have been revised accordingly e.g., parkland dedication, density bonusing, inclusionary zoning.

## Davenport & Associates

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	Bill 108 permits Inclusionary Zoning only within 800 metres of a major transportation node. Major transportation Nodes occur in the City of Toronto; not the City of Peterborough. Generally speaking, inclusionary zoning is a nightmare to administer. Remove Clause 7.20 Inclusionary Zoning. Bill 108 defines "inclusionary zoning" in a manner that does not apply to the City of Peterborough. Report CSSSJSSC19009 Potential Impacts of Bill 108 on Affordable Housing Development is correct in stating that fact. The City of Peterborough Official Plan should reflect that fact.	Bill 108 limits inclusionary zoning to protected major transit station areas and areas in which a development permit system is established/adopted. Neither of these are currently applicable in Peterborough.
6	What are auto-focused uses?	These are land uses are that focused on automobiles (e.g., car dealerships, gas stations, auto-repair shops). Have revised the term to "auto[mobile]-focused uses" and added a definition for greater clarity.
7	Page 146 - "The extension of municipal services to the Peterborough Airport should also include those lands between the City of Peterborough and the Peterborough Airport." The City of Peterborough "blew it" when they turned down the proposed annexation deal with the Township of Cavan Monaghan. Now the City of Peterborough has no land inventory on which to build new commercial/industrial buildings.	Any municipal restructuring requires Council approval from all affected municipalities and the Minister in accordance to the Municipal Act, 2001. Council directed City staff to complete the Official Plan and focus land use designations within the City boundary. New employment area is identified on the updated Official Plan schedules.

## Davenport & Associates

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
8	Page 162 - Explain "7.0 Implementation" and the ramifications to the development industry.	Section 7 describes the range of tools and processes available to the City for implementing the policies of this Plan. More information is needed as the area of concern is not clear in this comment.
9	The draft Official Plan is a "no growth" Official Plan. The official plan has too many words which lead to too much chance for interpretation by NIMBY, those "environmentalists" that always object to any new development project. The draft Official Plan will lead to long and expensive LPAT hearings.	The City presumes that this comment is concerned regarding the comprehensiveness of the Plan; however the Official Plan needs to meet provincial requirements. The draft Official Plan identifies opportunities for growth and the policy framework in which growth should occur.
10	There is no plan in place to permit the expansion of the commercial/industrial sector other than to attempt to redevelop the existing developed lands (i.e. No Growth).	The City has completed a Land Needs Assessment based on the Province's land needs methodology. As an outcome of the Land Needs Assessment, the City will be identifying new community areas (i.e., lands for residential and population-related employment which includes commercial lands) and new employment areas (i.e., lands for industrial uses) in consultation with the community. The draft Schedules in the June 19, 2019 version did not identify the total new land need to accommodate growth to 2051. The updated schedules reflects the City's land needs to 2051.

Electric City Culture Council (EC3)

Electric City Culture Council (EC3)		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	Consider the arts sector alongside recreation and leisure activities. In particular, we ask that the City of Peterborough recognize artistic practice as a distinct aspect of cultural activity and adopt a definition of professional artist in line with that of the Canada Council for the Arts.	<p>The Official Plan does not speak to specific professions. Definition of professional artist not appropriate for the Official Plan.</p> <p>Recognition of the arts and culture sector and recreation has been added to Section 2.2.5 Strong and Diverse Economy.</p>
2	We ask that the City take steps to establish a ‘cultural district’ in the downtown core in consultation with members of the arts sector. We further ask that the City include policies to preserve existing public service districts (e.g. schools, sites of religious assembly), particularly in the downtown core, and include creative/cultural centres/hubs, non-profit and artist co-op (RGTI) housing within the permitted uses.	<p>Generally this is not within the scope of the Official Plan, beyond the policies to promote affordable housing.</p> <p>Art facilities has been included in Section 4.3.1 (Central Area Introduction).</p>

## Electric City Culture Council (EC3)

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	We would welcome investments of time and resources on behalf of the City to enable the initiatives outlined above and to seriously explore the development of a creative land trust as seen in London and San Francisco, and to implement a no-net-loss strategy for arts and culture organizations/spaces being displaced by redevelopment	<p>Note: The Community Arts Stabilization Trust in San Francisco secures spaces and works with art organizations to stabilize rent and increase their financial capacity. Similarly, the Creative Land Trust in London secures long-term affordable spaces for artists.</p> <p>Live-work units are permitted uses in the Central Area and Mixed-Use Corridors. This may be explored further in the Community Benefits study/by-law. However, these types of initiatives are beyond the scope of the Official Plan – noting the Official Plan would not preclude the creation of a creative land trust.</p>
4	It is imperative that the City integrate cultural considerations in planning and decision-making, strengthening the participation of existing advisory committees and EC3 in major development and infrastructure projects. We further ask that the City work with EC3 to develop a community benefits framework that considers the needs of the Arts, Culture, and Heritage sector.	Arts, Culture & Heritage Advisory Committee is on the Agency Circulation list for subdivision re: major development and infrastructure projects. Arts may be built into community benefits program.
5	We ask that the City invest in developing user-friendly guides and resources for planning and development processes, including the heritage designation process, community improvement plan incentives, and heritage tax rebate systems.	This is out of scope of the Official Plan itself; however user-friendly guides and resources will continue to be developed. Some user-guides are already made available to the public, such as for the Central Area Community Improvement Program/Financial Incentives.

Embee Properties

Embee Properties		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	The Draft Official Plan identifies lands previously designated Service Commercial as Employment Lands. Service commercial is not listed as a permitted use under the Employment Lands designation. The policies and land use permissions of the current Official Plan and zoning by-law should remain in full force and effect.	<p>Added site-specific policy within the General Employment designation to acknowledge current land use permissions (i.e., service commercial uses):</p> <p>In addition to the permitted uses of the General Employment Designation, the south portion of the property known municipally as 300 The Parkway may be used for service commercial uses, restaurants, retail commercial uses requiring large sites for display or storage areas, hotels, and other hospitality and tourism services as specified in the Zoning By-Law.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the provisions of the site specific policy acknowledging current land use permissions, the policies with respect to the Natural Heritage System/Natural Areas designation and Hazard Lands will still apply.</p>

## Greater Peterborough Chamber of Commerce

Greater Peterborough Chamber of Commerce		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	The City needs to provide direction regarding the creation of a regional economic development strategy.	Added policy to direct the creation of economic development strategy in Section 7.3.3 (Planning Studies).
2	Would it be beneficial to have a study done on certain areas e.g. Strategic Growth areas to understand current and future infrastructure capacity of municipal services or is this type of information already available?	<p>Agreed - this may be addressed via Infrastructure Master Plan and secondary plans.</p> <p>The Growth Plan also states that Planning for new or expanded infrastructure will occur in an integrated manner and will be supported by relevant studies and should involve: providing sufficient infrastructure capacity in strategic growth areas.</p>
3	Have the high-density mixed-use strategic growth areas been mapped?	Yes – Strategic Growth Areas include the mixed-use corridors, central area, and urban growth centre.
4	Is the intensification target suitable for the life of the Plan? What will the infrastructure costs be?	This may be addressed via Infrastructure Master Plan and secondary plans.
5	When will Designated Greenfield Areas be identified?	The updated designated greenfield area has been identified on the Official Plan schedules.
6	How many hectares are within the Rural Transitional Area? Will these lands figure in the current Land Needs Assessment and is the City able to tap into them earlier if needed to meet land needs?	Approximately 190 hectares are determined excess – details are in the Land Needs Assessment report. It is recommended that the land needs continued to be monitored to ensure no shortfall in lands.



## Greater Peterborough Chamber of Commerce

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	List of Permitted Uses for Downtown does not identify a convention centre specifically in the downtown area but does identify one in the Major Mixed-Use Corridor.	Revised list of permitted uses for the downtown to permit convention and conference centres. Convention and conference centres have been removed from the list of permitted uses in Major Mixed Use Corridors.
8	There is mention of bonusing throughout the document will this have to be updated or is this practice still relevant in the OP context?	Revisions have been made with respect to Bill 108 and bonusing provisions have been removed.
9	How is the City able to recognize flexibility of zoning? Is the flexibility in the various list of permitted uses or is there also flexibility outside of that concept?	Zoning will provide flexibility in both uses and regulations.
10	Will the plan allow for flexibility of height requirements in areas that are mapped as Strategic Growth areas?	The Plan acknowledges that there are several key intersections (discussed in the community design charrette exercise) in which additional building height may be considered by the City on a site by site basis to a maximum total building height of 12 storeys.
11	Encourage that any employment lands in the Industrial Conversion Area remain employment lands, particularly if the Land Needs Assessment reveals a shortage of land.	Any conversion within this designation must be completed in conformity with the conversion requirements of the General Employment Designation, which includes the consideration of the opportunity to replace the jobs that the subject site/area accommodates, or has the potential to accommodate.
12	Does the City have an inventory of brownfield sites?	An inventory is not maintained. Not all brownfield sites are known and some sites may require further study (environmental site assessment) to identify contamination.
13	Consider including food processing to the list of permitted uses in Employment Areas.	Added "processing" as a permitted use within Prestige Employment and General Employment designations (previously named Employment Areas and Employment Lands).
14	Is the affordable housing target considered Inclusionary Zoning? May not be as it is more of an overall directive than a site-specific directive as is outlined in j. of the same section?	This target is not the same as inclusionary zoning.

Greater Peterborough Chamber of Commerce

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
15	In several sections (e.g. Transportation) there is a consultation with the County and townships and yet this type of consultation is not mentioned in conjunction with economic development. Is there not a way to include this type of consultation with regard to economic development?	Added language to Section 2.2.5 adding language regarding the development of an Economic Development Strategy in co-operation with key stakeholders.

Habitat for Humanity

Habitat for Humanity		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	There should be a statement that targets will be set annually based on the Housing and Homelessness Plan. If a percentage target is to be included, we feel strongly that the percentage should be closer to 25% which is where Toronto and Sudbury have set their targets.	Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) states that the City will strive to achieve the targets for the provision of affordable housing identified in the Housing and Homelessness Plan. The affordable housing target has been monitored since 2000.  The target has been increased from 10% to 20%.
2	All new developments (subdivisions or condo/apartment buildings) should be required or at least should be strongly encouraged through incentives, to also adhere to these targets.	Incentives may be established through a community improvement plan. This is noted in Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing).
3	The City can increase the number of affordable housing developments by making sure surplus City owned properties are offered up for affordable housing projects first, before deciding to put them up for sale on the open market.	No change recommended - Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) states that considering affordable or accessible housing as priority uses for surplus City-owned land and working with other levels of government to make surplus land available to providers of affordable or accessible housing development at little or no cost.
4	In the approval of secondary suites and any affordable housing initiative, there needs to be flexibility in applying the relevant criteria along the whole process, including the consent to sever, site plan proposals and reduction of parking requirements for example.	No change recommended. Note site plan is not required for secondary suites. Reduction in parking requirements is considered for Strategic Growth Areas and affordable or accessible housing development.

## Habitat for Humanity

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	We strongly suggest replacing words/phrases such as "may be considered", "encourage", "support" and "discourage" with words/phrases such as "shall" or "require" etc.	In certain instances, where appropriate, stronger wording such as "shall" has been used. However, the specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan – this is described in further detail in a new Section for "How to Read this Plan".
6	Provide for stronger capital planning of public facilities to include exploring opportunities to stack affordable housing developments with other municipal projects which contribute to complete communities.	In Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) have been added that speak to exploring opportunities to locate affordable housing with new public service facilities and exploring opportunities for the City to have a more proactive role in delivering affordable housing.
7	Enhance and strengthen the Community Improvement Plan to provide even greater incentives to stimulate development of affordable housing. The amount of incentives could be proportional to the degree of affordability the project is able to reach.	The Affordable Housing CIP states that Council may review and amend any of the terms of any of the programs prescribed in the CIP and that the City shall conduct a review of the Community Improvement Plan programs a minimum of every five years with respect to their effectiveness.
8	Consider the establishment of a Housing Development Corporation whose role would be to identify and secure appropriate lands, secure partnerships with the private sector, and focus on creating the conditions for rapid development consistent with the OP.	Added consideration of a Housing Development Corporation to Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing).

## Housing and Homelessness Plan Steering Committee

Housing and Homelessness Plan Steering Committee		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	Need to include a target for building units that meet universal design standards.	Added Policy to Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) that the City will encourage options for accessibility within all new residential developments.
2	Official Plan should include language and direction to build complete communities.	This language is already provided for in the Plan.
3	Parking - ensure flexibility to have less parking at affordable housing properties, as many of these tenants have low-incomes and do not have vehicles.	Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) states that the City will encourage and assist, where possible, in the creation of affordable housing by: Considering the reduction of parking requirements for projects that provide affordable or accessible housing.
4	The 10% target for affordable residential development is too low. Suggestions included increasing it to 25%, as other communities have done, or assigning a number. Based on numbers now available from the 5-year Review of the 10-year Housing and Homelessness Plan, reliable numbers of affordable rental and ownership unit targets are available and can be updated.	The target has been increased to 20%.
5	Language to ensure that affordable residential development can be monitored and how it will be enforced.	Affordable housing is already monitored and reported in the Residential Monitoring Report since 2000.

Kawartha Land Trust

Kawartha Land Trust		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	The Official Plan needs ecological background and must address climate change as an important change agent in the Context	Added some language regarding climate change in the Context Section; noting there is ample discussion around climate change is provided throughout the Official Plan.
2	The City should support enhancing intensification targets and maintaining current City boundaries in order to reduce pressures on rural and natural areas.	The proposed intensification target of 50% is an increase from the existing Plan (which states 40%). Natural areas are protected based on the function and significance of the natural heritage feature.
3	OP needs stronger natural heritage systems protection and mapping; relying on an Environmental Impact Statement for NHS protection is not sufficient. The KNC project included extensive mapping, community input and analysis; KNC should be referenced in relation to the Connectivity Linkages and Regional Connections, and mapped on Schedule E	<p>These policies do not rely on an Environmental Impact Study for NHS protection. Natural features or functions that meet one of the three level designations receive the corresponding level of protection regardless of an EIS or mapping. As the mapping shown on Schedule E is not intended to be an exhaustive inventory of all features and functions site specific studies will be necessary in some instances to determine the Natural Areas level designation and an EIS will be required when prescribed activities are proposed within 120 metres of natural heritage features.</p> <p>A detailed review of the methodology and results of the KNC work was not completed as part of the scope of the OP update. Connectivity and linkages have been identified both with the City and expanding out in the adjacent areas and are mapped on Schedule E. Outward looking regional connections inside the City boundary have been identified. Section 4.6.1 and 4.6.2 has been revised to refer to the applicable NHS for the adjacent areas in the County instead of referencing the provincial Natural Heritage Systems for the Growth Plan specifically.</p>

Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	<p>Education over the past 5 years has been continuously evolving as the Ministry of Education’s expanded role now incorporates child care, Early On Centres, HUB planning and community partnerships. In addition, the Ministry continues to increase supports for special education, as well as expand continuing education, alternative learning and virtual learning. These changing circumstances are reflected in the board’s need for flexibility in facility program space.</p> <p>Further to the facility challenges brought about by changing programming needs, the board’s facility requirements are also impacted by residential intensification and infill development within settlement areas, which increases enrolment in local schools. Conversely, we have noticed some of the rural student population’s decrease over time. We have noticed an increase in families moving to small communities such as Millbrook, perhaps as a result of the rising housing costs elsewhere, which reinforces the importance of flexibility to provide space for student learning. With new residential development and growing industries including General Electric and PepsiCo, an increase in pupil yields per household could emerge which results in the need to acquire new school sites.</p> <p>The Board requests policies within each municipality’s Official Plan which support the ever changing needs of educational facilities. Many policies in the proposed plan such as active transportation, partnerships, and community uses are directly related to the role schools play in supporting families and children in the community. We are pleased to see Active Transportation mentioned in several instances in the draft Official Plan as we encourage active school travel for the many environmental, physical, and mental health benefits. We are also pleased to see that Public Service Facilities (which include publicly funded schools as defined in the draft Official Plan), are able to proceed as a permitted use in all designations.</p>	<p>It is not clear what other flexibility is needed at the Official Plan level – noting however, that public service facilities are permitted in every land use designation (except the Natural Areas designation). The City may consider building in additional flexibility in the zoning by-law for school facilities.</p> <p>Pleased to see support for the policies regarding Active Transportation and Public Service Facilities.</p>

Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
2	<p><b>Guiding Principles 2.2.4 Well Connected with Options for Mobility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include, “such as schools and other public service facilities,” after “destinations” under Section 2.2.4.iv. (see below)</li><li>• Include, “including sidewalks,” after “existing development” under Section 2.2.4.v. (see below)</li></ul> <p>Section 2.2.4:</p> <p>“Peterborough will create a more linked community by:</p> <p>iv. Providing new linkages between key destinations [such as schools and other public service facilities] and the multi-modal transportation network;</p> <p>v. Ensuring that new development is barrier-free and easily accessible and that existing development [including sidewalks] is retro-fitted, wherever possible;”</p>	<p>No changes recommended with respect to Section 2.2.4 (Well-Connected with Options for Mobility) – the current policy wording does not preclude schools and public service facilities. It is noted however, that the Section 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) makes mention of schools as a key destination.</p> <p>The suggested revision to Section 2.2.4 is already considered in Section 6.2.3 which states that the City should identify fragmented sidewalks and lack of connectivity within existing residential areas. This policy has been updated to indicate “shall” instead of “should”: “The City shall identify fragmented sidewalks and lack of connectivity within existing residential areas as part of a sidewalk strategic plan.”</p>



## Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	<p><b>PLANNING FOR FUTURE GROWTH</b></p> <p><b>3.3 Objectives for Growth Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "public service facilities," after "access to parks," under Section 3.3.f. (see below)</li> </ul> <p>Section 3.3(f)          "The City will permit the creation of secondary suites within single detached, semidetached and townhouse dwellings and within buildings accessory thereto. When permitting secondary suites, the City will consider factors such as adequate parking, servicing capacity and access to parks, [public service facilities] and amenities."</p>	<p>This policy has been moved to Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing). Removed parks and amenities from this policy since the Planning Act does not provide for the consideration of these factors.</p> <p>However, consideration for the adequacy of public service facilities are included in Section 4.2.2 (Residential Designation). The development policies for the Residential Designation requires consideration of the adequacy of existing and/or proposed amenities within easy access to serve future residents and the existing community, including public service facilities, commercial opportunities and parks and open spaces.</p>
4	<p><b>4.2.2 Residential Designation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include, "Schools may provide a portion of the parking and shared parking off-site with a compatible user and determined by the School Board in consultation with the municipality.", as Section 4.2.2.p.viii. Our reasoning for this is that the public does not differentiate between public schools and public parks, all parking areas are perceived as being available for public use.</li> </ul>	<p>Added the proposed policy to Section 4.2.2 (Residential Designation); however, the policy specifies adjacent parkland and public service facilities instead of "compatible user" as this is a broad term: "Adequate parking and other required facilities shall be provided on site. However, schools may provide a portion of the parking and shared parking off-site with nearby parkland and other public service facilities, as determined by the School Board in consultation with the City."</p>

## Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide some clarity as to how secondary and elementary schools differ from public service facilities as they are listed separately under Section 4.2.2.b points vi and vii. As per the definition of a public service facility, "Lands, buildings and structures for the provision of programs and services provided or subsidized by a government or other body, such as social assistance, recreation, police and fire protection, health and educational programs, and cultural services." For the purpose of consistency, please revise the language of permitted uses within the land use designations to either read, "Public service facilities;" or, "Secondary and elementary schools including ancillary spaces".</li> </ul>	<p>Removed "Policies for Public Service Facilities" subheading from Section 4.2.2 and incorporated policies into General Policies for All Designations. The Policies for Secondary and Elementary Schools provide additional policy direction for this type of public service facility.</p> <p>Section 4.1.2 (General Policies for All Designations) was revised to list public service facilities as a use permitted in all Designations (excluding the Natural Areas designation). Removed "secondary and elementary schools" from list of permitted uses for better consistency.</p>
6	<p><b>5.3.1 Provision of Parkland</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "The City will develop parkland, recreational facilities and services in consultation with the local residents and in cooperation with other providers of open space such as school boards and other public service facilities." as Section 5.3.1.e.</li> </ul>	Added the proposed policy to Section 5.3.1(Parkland and Open Space: Introduction).
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "where applicable, parks shall be located adjacent to school sites and other public service facilities.", as Section 5.3.1.f. Locating parks adjacent to school sites allows for convenient drop off and pick up points for students. It also promotes student's ability to walk to school, environmental health and well-being benefits. Helps to encourage self-identification as citizens.</li> </ul>	No change recommended – the City's Parks Development Standards states that "Where deemed advantageous and appropriate in community planning, the City will endeavour to site parks and schools together in a campus layout for the benefit of continuity of public land uses, efficiency in layout of structured recreational facilities, parkland and green space connectivity, and for the purposes of integrating or sharing facilities wherever practicable."

## Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
8	<b>5.3.8 Parkland and Educational Facilities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please remove, "Where the land base for school sites is provided on the basis of 5.5 hectares / 1000 students for elementary schools and 8 hectares/ 1000 students for high schools", under Section 5.3.8.c. The size of school sites required for a future school is set by the Ministry of Education.</li> </ul>	Removed size parameters, as suggested.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Designated school sites do not comprise part of the net developable area of a development with respect to parkland dedication or cash in lieu of parkland. Redevelopment of designated school sites for non-school related purposes is subject to parkland dedication.", as Section 5.3.8.f.</li> </ul>	Per Section 7.12 (Parkland Dedication) has been amended in accordance with the Planning Act and included a policy that "the City's Parkland Dedication By-law may include, but shall not be limited to, provisions for: ii. The identification of uses, or categories of uses that may be eligible for a waiver, or reductions to parkland dedication requirements.
10	<b>5.4 Urban Design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "and public service facilities," after "programs and services" under Section 5.4.e.vi. (see below for proposed changes)</li> </ul> <p>Section 5.4.e: The City will maintain and enhance its parks, recreational facilities, open space network, cultural amenities and built cultural heritage resources for the benefit of all residents and as amenities for visitors to the City. Specific measures include:</p> <p>vi. Promoting access to a range of recreational facilities, programs and services <b>[and public service facilities]</b> for all current and future citizens.</p>	Revised to include public services facilities.
11	<b>6.2.2 Transportation: A Linked Community General Policies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Development of shared parking spaces between public service facilities and municipal parks is encouraged where the facilities are within walking distance." after, "The City may enter into partnerships and/or develop a system for the provision of adequate off-street parking in defined parts of the City." under Section 6.2.2.g.</li> </ul>	Created a new subsection under Section 6: Transportation for Parking policies and added suggested policy wording to Section 6.2.7.

## Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Where developments cannot provide adequate off-street parking on the site, the provision of parking on an alternative site within reasonable walking distance of the site could be considered provided that the alternative site is no more than 500-metres from the proposed development, the owner of the alternative site is willing to enter into an agreement with the developer and the municipality, and the alternative site can accommodate the parking of both users with respect to time of need." as Section 6.2.2.k.</li> </ul> <p>On-site parking requirements limit the amount of greenspace and play area on school site. This has negative environmental, health and well-being impacts. There are many users for which a synergistic relationship for off-site parking with a school can be effective to limit traffic congestion and vast expanses of impervious asphalt at schools such as churches, community centres, and parks.</p>	No change recommended. The proposed Plan provides for alternative development standards, such as reduced parking standards to encourage appropriate development applications within Strategic Growth Areas.
13	<p><b>6.2.3 Active Transportation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "and public service facilities," after "community amenities" under Section 6.2.3.b to read "Sidewalks, bike lanes and multi-use trails will connect to the street network and to community amenities [and public service facilities] and will ensure that corridors between key destinations are fully accessible and support active transportation".</li> </ul>	Added public service facilities as suggested.
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Through the development approvals process, active transportation amenities including bicycle parking and racks shall be required." as Section 6.2.3.c.i.</li> </ul>	Added new sub-section for Parking under Section 6: Transportation – this section addresses the provision of adequate and accessible off-street parking and loading areas for all permitted uses. The Zoning By-law will include context appropriate on-site vehicular and bicycle parking as well as specific requirements (per Section 6.2.7(a)).
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Public service facilities, such as schools, should be designed and sited to promote active transportation." as Section 6.2.3.d.</li> </ul>	All development in Strategic Growth Areas will be planned to accommodate transit-supportive densities and promote active transportation (as reflected in Section 3.3.7 The Functional Urban Structure Components).

## Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "On all new local roads, sidewalks will be required on one side of the street. Sidewalks on both sides of local roads may be required in the vicinity of schools and other Public Service Facilities to ensure the safety of students." as Section 6.2.3.e.i.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes required - sidewalks are required on both sides of local roads per Section 6.2.4 under Complete Streets. Section 6.2.4 states that "sidewalks shall be required on all public roads as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. On both sides of Arterial and Collector Roads;</li> <li>ii. On both sides of all Local Roads, including cul-de-sacs with 30 or more residential units, and any cul-de-sac having a through pedestrian connection.</li> </ul> <p>Sidewalks will also be required on at least one side of new condominium private roads and public or private lanes. Where the City determines that physical or practical circumstances would prohibit or not warrant a sidewalk connection, such facilities may not be required to be constructed."</p>
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "and schools" after "libraries" under Section 6.2.3.f.</li> </ul>	<p>Schools are a type of public service facility. Removed list of examples (e.g., libraries, recreation centres) from the policy as public service facilities are already mentioned and are a defined term. Listing examples of these type of facilities are not necessary.</p>
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, <b>"Council will work to identify fragmented sidewalks and connectivity within existing residential areas and develop a plan for the construction of sidewalks or multi-use trails [on at least one side of the road]."</b> as Section 6.2.3.f.i.</li> </ul>	<p>Revised policy to state that the City shall identify fragmented sidewalks and lack of connectivity as part of a sidewalk strategic plan. Missing sections of sidewalk in existing developments throughout the city would be included in the scope of a sidewalk strategic plan.</p>

## Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "and public service facilities" after "The City will strive to expand and enhance its trail systems to promote connectivity, mobility, accessibility and active transportation within and between neighbourhoods, employment areas" under Section 6.2.3.j.</li> </ul>	Added public service facilities to the policy as suggested.
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "The City will consider winter maintenance of multi-use trails, particularly along routes that connect pedestrians to key destinations including public service facilities." as Section 6.2.3.k.v</li> </ul>	Section 6.2.3 states that "the winter maintenance of active transportation facilities will be an important consideration, particularly along routes that connect pedestrians to key destinations such as schools."
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include, "Such as bicycle parking and racks for storage," after "support facilities", under Section 6.2.3.n.ii. (see below)</li> </ul> <p><b>Section 6.2.3(n):</b> The City shall continue to provide for the development of bikeways by: ii. Ensuring that all new development proposals and infrastructure works provide bikeways and support facilities [such as bicycle parking and racks for storage], in accordance with Schedule D: Transportation Plan and the Transportation Master Plan;</p>	Added new sub-section for Parking under Section 6: Transportation to address the provision of adequate and accessible off-street parking and loading areas for all permitted uses. The Zoning By-law will include context appropriate on-site vehicular and bicycle parking as well as specific requirements. Added 'such as bicycle parking' to 6.2.3 (Active Transportation).
22	<p><b>7.3.4 Amendments to this Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Any amendment to this Official Plan shall address the adequacy of publicly funded schools and other public service facilities to support any proposed development." as Section 7.3.4.g.</li> </ul>	Section 3.2(d) indicates that all planning approvals will be evaluated on the basis of: v) Confirmation of the availability of adequate public service facilities.
23	<p><b>7.3.5 Secondary Plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "When considering secondary plans or new area specific plans, a community facility needs assessment which addresses the capacity of existing public service facilities such as schools, and the need for additional facilities including publicly funded schools must be completed. Written confirmation of how pupil accommodation is addresses is required from each school board." as Section 7.3.5.f.</li> </ul>	Section 7.3.5 already requires Secondary Plans to address community facility requirements. Replaced the term "community facility" with public service facility.

## Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
24	<b>7.8.1 Plan of Subdivision</b> Include, "confirmation of sufficiency of school accommodation is required." after "public service facilities;" under <b>Section 7.8.1.c.iii.</b> <b>Section 7.8.c.iii:</b> In addition, the City will approve only those plans of subdivision that meet the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. The plan of subdivision can be supplied with adequate services and public service facilities.</li> </ul> <b>[Confirmation of sufficiency of school accommodation is required.];</b>	No changes recommended - school boards are a commenting agency for plans of subdivision and the Planning Act Section 51(24)(j) requires regards to adequacy of school sites.
25	<b>7.8.2 Plan of Condominium</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include, "confirmation of sufficiency of school accommodation is required." after "public service facilities;" under Section 7.8.2.b.iii.</li> </ul>	No changes recommended – school boards are a commenting agency for plans of condominium.
26	<b>7.11 Land Acquisition</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Where lands have been designated as for a school use in a plan of subdivision the lands shall be reserved for that use for a specified period of time unless an alternative site is designated. The time period of reservation shall not be less than 10 years and shall be sets out in the implementing subdivision agreement. The time period will not begin until the first building permit is obtained within the phase of the plan of subdivision in which the community service block is located. In the case of school sites this reservation will be established in consultation with the school boards and such reservation shall expire upon confirmation in writing by each school board that the site is not required by the school boards." as Section 7.11.a.i.</li> </ul>	No change recommended – this would be more appropriately addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.
27	<b>7.13 Parkland Dedication</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert, "Designated school sites do not comprise part of the net developable area of a development with respect to parkland dedication or cash in lieu of parkland. Redevelopment of designated school sites for non-school related purposes is subject to parkland dedication." Our reasoning is that school sites provide a valuable open space amenity within a community, as such the construction or additions to new development by school boards are not subject to the requirement for parkland dedication under the Planning Act.</li> </ul>	See response to Comment #9.



NeighbourPLAN

NeighbourPLAN		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	There is a need to clarify the definition of Complete Communities used in the Official Plan. This phrase has been used inconsistently throughout the Plan.	This term may apply at different scales.
2	We support increasing the density and uses in downtown Neighbourhoods. However, we think it is vital to protect our park space, and to ensure that as our downtown grows, downtown neighbourhood residents have access to green space.	Parks are permitted use in every designation, excluding the Natural Areas designation. New smaller urban parks are also addressed in the draft Plan. Added following wording: “As intensification proceeds, the City will ensure that adequate urban park space is provided to support these growing communities” to Section 5.3.7 (Urban Park Spaces).
3	We are also particularly interested in the permitted land use Public Service Facilities, and would love to see more public recreation, education, and cultural facilities in the downtown.	Public service facilities are permitted in all designations, excluding the Natural Areas designation. Provincial policy directs public service facilities to strategic growth areas with access to transit.
4	Downtown Neighbourhoods Policy C, point i (p. 58) states that pedestrian linkages will be provided with adjacent districts. This is important to us, but we would also like to see cyclist and transit linkages added to this policy.	Section 6.2.3 for active transportation speaks to four season walkable and connected community. Intent of the policy is also to prioritize pedestrians. Replaced with "active transportation linkages" in Section 4.3.5 (Downtown Neighbourhood Designation).
5	Consider increasing the height restriction for Downtown Neighbourhoods to allow for future apartments.	The maximum building height in the Downtown Neighbourhoods designation has been increased from 3 storeys to 6 storeys.
6	Consider adding incentives to support the repurposing of underutilized buildings in Downtown Neighbourhoods (such as a reduction of development charges, or other special incentives).	This is considered in the section related to Community Improvement Plans.
7	Consider increasing the target for affordable housing within Downtown Neighbourhoods to 15-20%.	This target is city-wide, not neighbourhood specific. However, the target has been increased from 10% to 20%.



## NeighbourPLAN

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
8	We would encourage the creation of a Complete Streets Design Guide, which would create some standards for how Complete Streets are developed in Peterborough.	The creation of Complete Streets Guide contemplated in Transportation section on complete streets (Section 6.2.4).
9	Page 159 states "The City will consider the conversion of one-way streets to two-way streets within the Downtown, with priority given to George Street and Water Street." We would like to see special priority also given to Reid and Rubidge Streets.	This policy has been removed from Section 6.2.6. This determination may be made through a Transportation Master Plan.
10	We are interested in seeing transit options extend beyond City limits to destinations in the County, such as the Airport.	Section 6.2.5(i) indicates that the City shall work with Peterborough County, the Province, adjacent municipalities and any other applicable agencies to support transit service integration within and across municipal boundaries and between transit and other modes of travel beyond the City's boundaries.
11	The Official Plan needs a stronger and clearer definition for "affordable housing". We would like to see a policy that supports the development of rent-geared-to-income (RGI) housing, rather than housing that is simply below market-rate.	The definition used in the Official Plan is the one provided by the Province.
12	We feel that Inclusionary Zoning language needs to be strengthened, and a clear mandate should be given to Council to include an Inclusionary Zoning By-Law in the new Zoning By-Laws resulting from this Official Plan.	Under Bill 108, inclusionary zoning may only apply to protected major transit station areas and areas subject to a development permit system. Inclusionary zoning policies have been deleted, until such time as it can be confirmed that they can be implemented in the City. Inclusionary zoning is currently not a planning tool available to the City of Peterborough.

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	<b>4.1.3 – General Policies for Hazard Lands</b> 4.1.3.a. – This section includes a reference to “high water tables”. This term is not used in Section 3.1 or Section 3.2 of the PPS so the intent of its inclusion is not clear. Otonabee Conservation suggests that the inclusion of ‘high water tables’ in this policy be reviewed for the appropriateness of its inclusion and/or clarify as to how the City would define such lands/features and apply Official Plan policies.	Removed reference to “high water tables”
2	4.1.3.b. – This wording in this policy differs from the language used in the PPS. The PPS defines hazardous lands in a way that limits it to natural hazards and does not include human-made hazards. This section also includes the phrase “where there is an unacceptable risk to public health and safety or damage to property”, which as also differs from the language of Section 3.1 of the PPS. Otonabee Conservation recommends that in order to avoid confusion around “unacceptable risk” that this phrase be removed.	Removed “where there is an unacceptable risk to public health or safety or of damage to property” from this policy.
3	4.1.3.e – The wording contained within this policy is not consistent with the wording with Section 3.1.2 of the PPS. Section 3.1.2 of the PPS reads “development and site alteration shall not be permitted”, while the Official Plan reads “new development is prohibited in the following areas...” Otonabee Conservation recommends that the word “new” be removed from the OP policy and that the words “and site alteration” be included.	This policy has been removed.
4	4.1.3.g. – Special Policy Areas require approval from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as well as the Minister of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. Otonabee Conservation recommends that reference to these Ministries be included in this policy. You may wish to refer to Section 3.1.4 a) of the PPS for wording.	Revised 4.1.3(f) to refer to approval by the Province.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	4.1.3.j. – In order to consistent with Section 3.1.5 of the PPS, Otonabee Conservation recommends changing “an institutional use associated with...” to “an institutional use including...”	This policy has been removed and this section of the Plan has been revised to reduce repetition with the Provincial Policy Statement.
6	<b>4.2.2 – Residential Designation</b> 4.2.2.c.viii. – Section c. of this policy includes a list of criteria that will be considered when reviewing applications for residential development and intensification but it does not include natural hazards. Otonabee Conservation recommends that this criteria also be included in this section. In addition, subsection vii. identifies the prevention of the adverse impacts on significant natural and cultural heritage features. Given the policies related to the Natural Heritage System, is it the intent only consider impact on significant natural features or all natural features included in the Natural Heritage System?	No change required - this is covered in the General Policies for Hazard Lands.  The intent is to consider the impact on all natural features according to the natural heritage framework in Section 4.6 (Natural Heritage).
7	4.2.2.n.iv. – This section reads, “a secondary suite shall generally be directed to areas outside of hazardous lands...” In order to be consistent with Section 3.1.2 of the PPS, Otonabee Conservation recommends that the word “general” be removed from this sentence.	Removed “generally” from this policy. It is noted that the Zoning Bylaw (as amended by By-Law Number 18-048) states that “Secondary suites shall not be permitted within a floodway as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014, or any successor thereof.”
8	4.2.2.o, 4.2.2.p, 4.2.2.s, 4.2.2.x, and 4.2.3 – While it is understood that the natural hazard policies contained in 4.1.3 of the OP apply to all lands, given that the uses contained within these policies include those that are prohibited within a flooding hazard (e.g., day care facilities, schools, institutional uses), Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City consider including some reference to natural hazards to within these policies.	No change required - this is covered in the General Policies for Hazard Lands.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
9	<p><b>4.3.1 – The Central Area - Introduction</b></p> <p>4.3.1 – This policy section includes no reference to the Otonabee River, Little Lake or Jackson Creek. Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City consider whether it wants to include an objective that recognizes the ecological, hydrologic, historical and cultural significance of these features.</p>	<p>Added an objective to the Central Area to acknowledge the significance of the Otonabee River, Little Lake and Jackson Creek.</p> <p>Section 5.4.1 also states that “The City recognizes that there are many components that contribute to the City’s unique and vibrant sense of place for both residents and visitors to the community. These include Peterborough’s riverfront location on the Otonabee River and the Trent-Severn Waterway; its heritage resources, cultural amenities, rolling topography, scenic natural areas and waterfront trails; and the City’s distinctive public areas such as Little Lake, the Central Area, the Lift Lock and Jackson Park. In its approval of new development or redevelopment, the City will build on and enhance the amenity of these valued places, wherever possible.”</p>

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
10	4.3.1.e. – In the Little Lake Master Plan, discussion was included regarding potential daylighting of Jackson Creek when opportunities presented themselves. Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City consider including this as a consideration when evaluating re-use, redevelopment and intensification applications.	<p>The draft Plan indicates that the City will investigate the feasibility of rediscovering/daylighting Jackson Creek in the Downtown. Further, Section 4.3.2 (Downtown Core Area Designation) states that “the design of sites which abut Jackson Creek should recognize and enhance the relationship of the site to the creek” and 4.3.5 (Downtown Neighbourhood Designation) states that “Development applications should demonstrate how they meet the following criteria: (iii) Recognize the natural amenities of the site, particularly sites which abut Jackson Creek and respect the Creek as a public amenity and pedestrian corridor.”</p> <p>Added wording to deal with this more directly and added policy to the Downtown Open Space Designation that: “The City will consider opportunities for rediscovering/daylighting Jackson Creek in the Central Area through the creation of open space.”</p>
11	4.3.1.g. states “In most instances, lands within the Central Area will be pre-zoned to permit the full range of uses contemplated for various areas subject to site plan approval and other implementation processes. This Plan promotes developments that are mixed-use, either a mixture of permitted uses on an individual site, or within individual buildings.” – Otonabee Conservation has no concerns or recommendations for this policy but wishes to affirm the importance of recognizing the presence of natural hazards within the municipal Zoning By-law.	Noted.

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
12	<b>4.3.8 - Jackson Creek Special Policy Area</b> The implementation of a Special Policy Area (SPA) is floodplain management approach that can be used within the Province that allows communities to develop/re-develop if a pattern of development is already established and adherence to the one-zone policies is not feasible. In a SPA, the relevant agencies agree to reduce provincial floodproofing standards and accept a higher level of risk. SPAs are approved by the Ministers of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Natural Resources and Forestry.	No change required.
13	The SPA policies for Jackson Creek in Peterborough's downtown have removed definitions that were included in the original approved policies. These definitions include minor addition, or renovation, regional event, safe access or safe parking and are not included elsewhere in the Official Plan. The approved SPA definitions for development and redevelopment differ than those found in the definitions section of the Official Plan. Otonabee Conservation recommends that these definitions be included in Policy 4.3.8.	Revised to include definitions in the original approved policies at the beginning of section 4.3.8 (Jackson Creek Special Policy Area).
14	4.3.8.m. – The wording used in this section differs from the approved policies for the Jackson Creek SPA. Otonabee Conservation recommends that the original wording be used.	Changed “policies to this Plan” to match the existing Official Plan to the extent possible, including more specific policy reference.
15	4.3.8.q – Otonabee Conservation recommends that the phrase “The City will amend the Zoning By-law to identify those lands within the Jackson Creek Special Policy Area which are subject to the Special Area policies and Ontario Regulation 167/06: Regulation of development, interference with wetlands and alterations to shorelines and watercourses of the Conservation Authority” be amended to read “...shorelines and watercourses under the Conservation Authorities Act, as amended.” Otonabee Conservation notes that the implementation of the SPA via the municipal Zoning By-law not occurred since its approval in the 1990s. The Authority looks forward to their timely implementation following the adoption of the new Official Plan.	Revised 4.3.8 to read “...shorelines and watercourses under the Conservation Authorities Act, as amended.”  Pursuant to the Planning Act, the zoning bylaw will be updated no later than three years after the new Official Plan.

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
16	<b>4.5 – Employment Districts</b> While largely already developed, it is worth noting that the Employment Areas that are identified within the are significantly constrained by natural hazards and natural heritage features. This could create conflict with the general policies outlined in in Section 4.5.1., particularly 4.5.1.h. Otonabee Conservation recommends that policies be included in this section that recognize the influence that natural hazards and heritage features could have on development and design.	No change required - this is covered in Section 4.1.3 General Policies for Hazard Lands and the Natural Heritage policies.
17	<b>4.6 - Natural Heritage System</b> 4.6.1 – There is minimal reference to fish habitat and habitat of endangered and threatened species throughout this policy section. While the protection of these features are largely managed federally and provincially, obligations are placed upon the municipality to not permit development or site alteration within these features except in accordance with those federal and provincial requirements through Sections 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 of the PPS. Otonabee Conservation recommends that this section be reviewed in the context of Sections 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 and references made where appropriate.	Added Sections 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 PPS language to Section 4.6.2: “In accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements, development and site alteration may be permitted in Level A Fish Habitat or Level A Habitat of Endangered or Threatened Species.”
18	4.6.1.e. - Otonabee Conservation has concern over the sentence “the Natural Heritage System contains significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions that are currently identified as worthy of preservation within the urban environment of the City.” The word ‘significant’ is defined within the PPS, but the proposed NHS captures features that would not meet the provincial definition of significant. The inclusion of the word ‘significant’ could infer that only provincially significant features are part of the NHS. In addition, the word ‘worthy’ is highly subjective; Otonabee Conservation suggests using a less value-laden word.	Removed “significant” and “worthy” from Section 4.6.1.
19	4.6.1.e.i. – The objective of “provide opportunities for the protection of from the impacts of all significant natural heritage features” does not appear to be consistent with the language of Section 2.1 of the PPS. Otonabee Conservation recommends using stronger language.	Revised 4.6.1 to strengthen language and to state “Provide protection” rather than “Provide opportunities for the protection”.
20	4.6.1.e.ii. – While the intent of this objective is understood, the language of Section 2.1 of the PPS strictly prohibits development and site alteration within provincially significant wetlands. Additionally, development may not be appropriate in other significant features or their buffers. While the policy does include the language “where appropriate”, Otonabee Conservation recommends that consideration be given to using more restrictive language that accurately captures the intent of PPS policies.	Added language to 4.6.2 that development and site alteration will not be permitted in Level A features (except for fish habitat and/or the habitat of endangered species and/or the habitat of threatened species in accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements).



## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
21	4.6.1.g. – Otonabee Conservation recommends including the words “known” or “understood” within this policy to recognize that some natural heritage features contained within the designation have not been identified and a study may still be required.	Adjacent Land Overlay and framework has been replaced with the requirement of a Preliminary Natural Heritage Feature Screening. Also noted that 4.6.2(h) states that “Lands within the Natural Areas Designation are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. Additional features and functions may be added to the Designation as more detailed information becomes available.”
22	4.6.2a.iii. - This section reads that it is the intent of the designation to “protect all significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions” which is laudable. However, the policies in the following sections (4.6.2.b) suggest protecting/preserving beyond just significant features. This should be clarified to avoid confusion.	Removed reference to “significant”.
23	4.6.2.b. – Appendix I has not been provided as part of this review. Please provide at your earliest convenience.	A copy of the background study will be made available to the public concurrently with the next release of the draft Official Plan.
24	4.6.2.b.ii. – Within the provincial ‘A Wetland Conservation Strategy for Ontario 2017-2030’ (2017) one of the guiding principles articulates that wetlands should be conserved on three hierarchical priorities: protect, mitigate, and restore. Staff at the province have indicated that a mitigation hierarchy approach will likely be recommended in guidance materials designed to support the proposed PPS policy allowing municipalities to manage non-significant wetlands. Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City consider including a mitigation hierarchy approach to help provide direction as to when mitigation or compensation strategies will be entertained.	A mitigation hierarchy approach will be explored in the development of the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy (indicated in Section 7.13).
25	4.6.2.d.i. - This section is unclear. All wetlands are either provincially significant or non-provincially significant. Is this meant to address wetlands that are too small to be evaluated? Otonabee Conservation recommends that this be clarified.	Clarified this section to specify Level B criteria for non-provincially significant wetlands and unevaluated wetlands.
26	There appears to be a clerical numbering issue on page 86-87 of the document. The section numbering goes from 4.6.2.h on page 86, back to 4.6.2.d on page 87.	Noted - this formatting/numbering error has been corrected.



Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
27	4.6.2.d. and .e (page 87) – The language in these policies should be reviewed carefully to ensure consistency with PPS policies. Otonabee Conservation recommends using PPS language directly where applicable. Section 4.6.2.d.ii and .iii notes that trails and buildings could be permitted within the designated Natural Areas. This policy does not acknowledge that the PPS strictly prohibits development or site alteration within a provincially significant wetland.	Added language to indicate that development and site alteration will not be permitted in Level A features (except for fish habitat and/or the habitat of endangered species and/or the habitat of threatened species in accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements).
28	4.6.2.e.ii. – Similar to above, Otonabee Conservation recommends that a mitigation hierarchy approach be used when considering uses within Level B features.	A mitigation hierarchy approach will be considered in the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy that is indicated in Section 7.13(e).
29	4.6.2.e.iv. and v. – Otonabee Conservation recommends that examples of envisioned additional uses be included.	No change recommended – additional uses are site-specific and will vary widely; therefore it would not be meaningful to list uses within the policy.
30	4.6.2.f.– Otonabee Conservation recommends language recognizing that conformity with federal and provincial regulations and policies will also be required be included.	Added language to require conformity with Federal and Provincial requirements.
31	4.6.2.i. – While the science around buffer widths required to protect wetlands and other natural heritage features continues to evolve, Otonabee Conservation does not recommend buffers of less than 30 metres for wetlands, regardless of their status.	Policy 4.6.2 requires an EIS to determine the extent of the vegetation protection zones based on the function of the feature. The intent is that vegetation protection zones are not predetermined however a minimum is identified in Table A. The appropriate vegetation protection zone will need to be determined through site specific studies and not be less than the minimum in Table A.

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
32	While the natural heritage policies in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GPGGH) do not apply within settlement areas, Section 4.2.4 requires that a vegetation protection zone of a minimum of 30 metres be applied to all wetlands and intermittent and permanent watercourses. Existing planning policies (policy 2.3.2(6)) within the Otonabee Conservation 'Watershed Planning & Regulations Policy Manual' recommend that development and site alteration not be permitted within 30 metres of a non-provincially significant wetland, only entertaining a lesser buffer in select circumstances (typically infilling or redevelopment). Permitting policies (7.2(4)) similarly require that any development within 30 metres of a non-provincially significant wetland demonstrate that it is not feasible to located development at least 30 metres from the wetland boundary. Otonabee Conservation recommends that an approach requiring 30 metre buffers for non-provincially significant wetlands except in select circumstances be used instead of the proposed 15 metres.	No change recommended to the approach. The approach proposed in the draft Official Plan provides the minimum requirement, however the site-specific EIS will determine the appropriate vegetation protection zone that may not be less than the minimum described in Table A. The suggested approach of providing a recommended buffer width unless otherwise demonstrated may result in a buffer width less than what is described in Table A.
33	Similar to above, in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry's 'Natural Heritage Reference Manual' (2010) the minimum recommended buffer for warm water watercourses is 30 metres or 15 metres when in accordance with Section 2.1.6 of the PPS (2005 or Section 2.1.8 of the 2014 PPS). This policy reads "development or site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.4, 2.1.5 and 2.1.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that their will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions." As such, assuming that a lesser buffer will be sufficient is presumptive. Otonabee Conservation recommends that a 30-metre buffer be required except where a lesser buffer can be fully justified.	See response to comments #31 and #32 above.
34	4.6.2.j. – Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City consider replacing "no buildings or structures, nor the removal or placing of fill of any kind whether originating on the site or elsewhere" be replaced with 'development or site alteration' as per PPS language.	Revised to "development and site alteration" and added "site alteration" to the list of definitions.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
35	4.6.2.l. – Section 2.1.5 of the PPS does not permit development or site alteration within a provincially significant wetland. Otonabee Conservation recommends that the language in this policy be modified to achieve consistency with the PPS.	<p>Added language to indicate that development and site alteration will not be permitted in Level A features (except for fish habitat and/or the habitat of endangered species and/or the habitat of threatened species in accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements) and noted that the policy requires that “The application shall demonstrate conformity with the requirements of the Natural Heritage System Level that may be affected.”</p> <p>Added policy language that an application, except where prohibited by Provincial policy, for the expansion or enlargement of such structures and uses may be considered by the City, subject to the submission of an Environmental Impact Study, in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction. It is noted however, that the Official Plan cannot restrict the non-conforming rights of property owners beyond the Planning Act.</p>
36	4.6.2.m. – Otonabee Conservation supports the inclusion of this policy. It makes clear that pre-emptive destruction of natural features is not a means to circumvent policy. Having said that, Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City should give consideration to how this will be enforced and by whom. The Authority recommends continuing conversation around this item.	Added reference to site alteration bylaw to this policy.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
37	4.6.2.q. - Otonabee Conservation supports the inclusion of this policy. However, it should be articulated that, in the interim, if an existing evaluation has not been completed, it would be the applicant's responsibility to do so. The Authority further recommends including language that the evaluation of the significance of all natural heritage features is the responsibility of the applicant somewhere in the 'Development Policies' of this section.	No change required - Section 7.21.2 already states that Environmental Impact Studies are to be undertaken by the proponent in accordance with City/Conservation Authority requirements and Preliminary Natural Heritage Feature Screenings are to be undertaken by the proponent and prepared by a qualified professional in accordance with City/Conservation Authority requirements.
38	4.6.2.r. – As already noted, Otonabee Conservation recommends that a mitigation hierarchy approach be used in regards to mitigation and compensation. The Authority also recommends that the City give some consideration as to whether or not it will require compensation to occur on the same property or will allow it elsewhere in the same subwatershed.	A mitigation hierarchy approach will be considered in the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy that is indicated in Section 7.13.
39	4.6.3.a. – Otonabee Conservation recommends that language be added that any additional/unidentified features could also require an EIS as per the PPS.	Adjacent Land Overlay and framework has been replaced with the requirement of a Preliminary Natural Heritage Feature Screening. Also noted that 4.6.2(h) states that "Lands within the Natural Areas Designation are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. Additional features and functions may be added to the Designation as more detailed information becomes available."
40	4.6.3.e. - Otonabee Conservation recommends that language recognizing the requirement for conformity with federal and provincial regulations and policies also be included.	Policy 4.6.3 and the Adjacent Lands Overlay framework are replaced with the requirement for a Preliminary Natural Heritage Feature Screening. No further changes recommended - conformity with Provincial and Federal legislation is inherently required.

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
41	4.6.3.i.vi. – Otonabee Conservation supports this policy but notes that without a municipal Site Alteration By-law enforcing it will be difficult.	Noted - Policy 4.6.3 and the Adjacent Lands Overlay framework are replaced with the requirement for a Preliminary Natural Heritage Feature Screening. Section 7.9 states that “The City will pass a By-Law regarding site alteration of property to prevent the premature alteration of the natural state of land, including with respect to grading, stormwater drainage, excess soil and fill, prior to an approved plan for development. The By-Law will include the requirement for an account of the origins and destination of material associated with development of property within the City and the use of best practices for soil management.”
42	<b>5.3 – Parkland and Open Space</b> 5.3.a. – This policy refers to active and passive open space but does not define what that means. Does that include structures? Otonabee Conservation recommends that additional clarity around these terms provided.	No change recommended.
43	5.3.b. – Otonabee Conservation recommends that the references to watercourses, fish habitat and natural areas be replaced with “natural heritage features”.	Revised as suggested.
44	5.3.2.c – Otonabee Conservation recommends including some language specifying that buildings or structures will be located outside of hazardous lands.	This language is in Section 4.1.3 General Policies for Hazard Lands.

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
45	Otonabee Conservation also recommends some text should be included to 5.3.2(c) to establish a municipal position on the creation of trails within natural heritage features buffers. It is the experience of Otonabee Conservation that municipal requirements for trails are raised later in the planning and design process and are often directed towards ecological buffers. Buffer widths are established by way of an EIS that assesses the potential impacts of development on any natural heritage features present. Locating trails within buffers introduces impacts that are generally not considered in the EIS and the establishment of the buffer width. While trails can sometimes be accommodated within buffers, it is generally recommended that they be located in the outer third of the buffer. Narrow buffers are often unable to accommodate the late requirement of a trail. Clarity on this matter will prevent potential conflict.	<p>Revised Section 4.6.2 "No development or site alteration may be permitted within the Natural Areas Designation and [the associated vegetation protection zones], except with the approval of the City, in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction".</p> <p>It is also noted that in some cases, it may not be appropriate to locate a trail in the buffer, even at the outer extent of the buffer. Added language to the EIS requirements to consider trails and their associated impacts in Section 7.21.2. This will also be addressed in the future through the creation of a site alteration by-law.</p>
46	5.3.3b.iii. Otonabee Conservation recommends including wording specifying that buildings or structures will be located outside of hazardous lands. Otonabee Conservation also recommends that the City consider a policy that acknowledges that while stormwater management facilities can naturalize over time and provide habitat, their primary role is stormwater management and must be maintained in accordance with any federal or provincial regulations, and operation requirements.	Section 4.1.3 General Policies for Hazard Lands states that Development shall be directed away from areas identified on the Natural Heritage System and Environmental Constraints Schedule, consistent with Section 3.0 of the Provincial Policy Statement. Added language to Section 5.3.8 (Parkland and Stormwater Management): Stormwater management facilities must be maintained in accordance with any Federal or Provincial regulations and operating requirements. While stormwater management facilities can naturalize overtime, their primary role will be stormwater management.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
47	5.3.7.a - It is unclear what the term 'water' in the sentence "where substantial changes to grade are necessary as part of a stormwater management facilities, or the presence of water precludes the use of the portion of the land for parkland purposes, the stormwater management facility shall not be accepted as part of a parkland dedication" means. Is this referring to watercourses? Groundwater? Surface water? Should it also include natural hazards and natural heritage features? Otonabee Conservation recommends that additional clarity be provided.	The intent of this statement is that required stormwater facilities will not be considered as part of any parkland dedication where the lands are not useable for any other purpose. Underground stormwater facilities or other stormwater management works which allow the land to be usable for other purposes may be considered as part of parkland dedication. This policy (now Section 5.3.8) has been revised to improve clarity : "Where a stormwater facility precludes the use of portion of the land for parkland, the stormwater management facility shall not be accepted" (i.e., will remove reference to substantial changes to grades and presence of water).
48	5.3.7.b.iv. - Otonabee Conservation recommends that the term 'shore land' be replaced with 'lands' in the following statement: "Shore land immediately adjacent to watercourses shall be planted to establish riparian buffers for the protection of water quality."	Revised as suggested (note that this is now section 5.3.8).
49	<b>5.4 - Urban Design</b> 5.4.5.b. – This section refers to a municipal Restoration and Enhancement Strategy. Otonabee Conservation supports the creation of such a strategy and looks forward to its development.	No change required – this statement is in support of the policy language.

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
50	5.4.8.c. – There is no mention of extreme weather events and the role that climate change has in their size and frequency. Section 3.1.3 of the PPS reads “planning authorities shall consider the impacts of climate change that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards.” While no technical guidance has been received from the Province providing direction as to how municipalities should do this as of yet, Otonabee Conservation recommends that a policy articulating this PPS requirement be included.	Section 4.1.3(i) (General Policies for Hazard Lands) states that when reviewing an application for development, the City shall consider the potential impacts of climate change that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards. Added ‘or other applicable process’ to this policy: “When reviewing an application for development, or other applicable process, the City shall consider the potential impacts of climate change that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards.”
51	<b>6.0 - Infrastructure Policies</b> 6.0.a. - Otonabee Conservation recommends that this section also make reference to development as there are policies within that seek to demonstrate consistency with Section 2.2 of the PPS.	Revised Section 6.0 as suggested to make reference to development: “As this Plan requires the close link and relationship between land use planning, infrastructure planning [and development]”.
51	6.1.4.f. - It is unclear why this policy section is included under infrastructure policies. The imperative to include such policies in the Official Plan derives from Section 2.2.2 of the PPS. While some of the policies in 2.2 are directed towards broader municipal planning, this section speaks specifically to development and site alteration. As such, it appears to be misplaced in this section. Otonabee Conservation recommends considering placing this policy in Section 4.	This policy is regarding sensitive surface water and groundwater features is currently placed under the section on Water Resources. Disagree that the policy should be moved to another section.



## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
52	6.1.5.c. – Otonabee Conservation recommends adding the phrase 'or a natural hazard' to the end of the first sentence: "Stormwater management facilities, including stormwater management ponds, shall be permitted on lands in any land use designation, with the exception of the Natural Areas Designation."	Added to 6.1.5 (Stormwater Management): "Stormwater management facilities, including stormwater management ponds, shall be permitted on lands in any land use designation, with the exception of the Natural Areas Designation, the vegetation protection zone for a natural heritage feature, [or a natural hazard unless authorized by the Conservation Authority]". This is to acknowledge that there are instances that ORCA may consider the location of a new stormwater management facilities within a natural hazard if the municipal stormwater management facility is required to alleviate a non-regulatory flood problem associated with existing development and meets additional conditions. Policy was also revised to only permit minor engineering components in the Natural Areas designation subject to an Environmental Impact Study.
53	6.1.5.j. – It is unclear what is meant by the phrase 'significant adverse impact on the hydrologic cycle.' Otonabee Conservation, through its permitting process, will not permit development that in its opinion will have an effect on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or the conservation of land. Whether the impact is 'significant' or not does not factor into decision-making. Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City consider the use of the term 'significant' and the lens through which it is considering 'impact' (e.g., ecological impacts, hydrologic function, exacerbation of natural hazards) and provide clarity.	Removed reference to 'significant' from Section 6.1.5 to: "No Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment or Plan of Subdivision shall be approved if the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the hydrologic cycle".

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
54	6.2.3.j. Otonabee Conservation recommends that verbiage be added to this section that specifies that new trails and crossings should avoid natural heritage features and their vegetative protection zone/buffer where possible. This section should identify that trails within natural heritage features and their buffers should be supported by an EIS.	<p>Added language to 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) that "Any proposed trail within the Natural Areas Designation or the associated minimum vegetation protection zone will require the approval of the City, subject to the policies of this Plan".</p> <p>Further, Section 4.6.2 states that the establishment of any permitted use (e.g., trails and other associated passive recreational opportunities) shall demonstrate, through the required Environmental Impact Study" and Section 7.21.2 states that an Environmental Impact Study will also consider the appropriateness of locating trails in the minimum vegetation protection zone.</p>
55	<b>7.0 - Implementation</b> 7.7.d.iii. - Otonabee Conservation recommends that revegetation/buffer enhancement be added to the list of site design elements	Revised Section 7.7 (Site Plan Approval) to add "landscaping, [revegetation, buffering] and fencing".
56	7.9 – Otonabee Conservation strongly supports the inclusion of a requirement that the City pass a Site Alteration By-law. Many of the complaints that are received by Otonabee Conservation are due to large scale site alteration that is located outside areas regulated by Ontario Regulation 167/06 (this Authority's 'Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses' regulation under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act) and therefore beyond the scope of the Authority. Having robust policies around site alteration is an important part of the protection of the natural heritage and water resource system. Otonabee Conservation recommends that the City commit to a timeframe in which the by-law will be passed to ensure that this important aspect of development is not overlooked. Otonabee Conservation further recommends that any by-law require that grading and site alteration for large-scale development be done in phasing, and have a requirement for stabilization and revegetation in the same season that the work occurs, or before fall.	It is generally advisable to avoid stating specific timelines for specific initiatives in the policies. The commitments that are identified in the Official Plan will be discussed in a report to Council.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
57	7.13 - From reading the text of this section, Otonabee Conservation is of the understanding that the intent is to ensure that lands that are dedicated to the City as parkland are, in fact, usable as parkland. As such, it is recommended that the City use the language "steep slopes, erosion hazards and unstable soils," and give consideration to and clarify its position on whether or not flooding hazards will be accepted as parkland dedication.	Per Section 7.12 (Parkland Dedication) has been amended in accordance with the Planning Act and included a policy that "the City's Parkland Dedication By-law may include, but shall not be limited to, provisions for: ii. The identification of uses, or categories of uses that may be eligible for a waiver, or reductions to parkland dedication requirements.
58	7.21.2. - Otonabee Conservation recommends adding the following to the list of additional information that may be required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Floodline Delineation/Hydraulic Study</li> <li>o Fluvial Geomorphology Study/Meander Belt Analysis</li> <li>o Water Balance Analysis</li> <li>o Headwater Drainage Feature Evaluation</li> <li>o Landscaping Plans</li> <li>o Grading plans</li> </ul>	Added outstanding items from the suggested list (e.g., landscaping plan and grading plans are already stated). Note that this is now Section 7.21.2.
59	7.21.2.e.i. - Otonabee Conservation recommends this section be modified to "identify, delineate and evaluate the potential effects of a proposed development, redevelopment or site alteration on the Natural Heritage System and the features within the system."	Added "delineate", as suggested.
60	7.21.2.f.i. - Otonabee Conservation recommends using the wording "no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions" be used instead of "no adverse effects or negative impacts on" to ensure consistency with the PPS and add " and the natural heritage features within the system" to the end of the sentence.	Removed "adverse effects" and added the PPS definition of "negative impact" to definitions.
61	7.21.2.f.iv. - This section refers to a minimum 30-metre buffer while the language in Section 4.6 supports a variety of buffer widths. Otonabee Conservation recommends that this discrepancy be addressed.	Corrected this discrepancy: "Determine if the minimum vegetation protection zone identified in this Plan...".
62	7.21.2.f.vi. - "Core Natural Area Designation" is not language that is used elsewhere in the Official Plan. Otonabee Conservation recommends that this term be reviewed and replaced with one more appropriate to the Official Plan as appropriate.	Removed reference(s) to "Core"

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
63	<b>8.2 - Definitions</b> In general, Otonabee Conservation notes that some but not all of the definitions that are contained within the PPS are included in the definitions within the Official Plan. Definitions that have been omitted include flood plain, flooding hazard, floodway, hazardous sites, river and stream inland lake systems, sensitive, site alteration, Special Policy Area, and surface water feature.	Added definitions for the suggested terms where necessary.
64	Natural heritage system – The definition included in the Official Plan makes reference to the Provincial system. The NHS included in the Official Plan is locally developed. Otonabee Conservation recommends removing this reference.	Revised definition to “Means a system made up of natural heritage features and areas, and linkages intended to provide connectivity (at the regional or site level) and support natural processes which are necessary to maintain biological and geological diversity, natural functions, viable populations of indigenous species, and ecosystems. The system can include natural heritage features, hydrologic features, Federal and Provincial parks and conservation reserves, other natural heritage features and areas, lands that have been restored or have the potential to be restored to a natural state, associated areas that support hydrologic functions, and working landscapes that enable ecological functions to continue.”
65	Naturally occurring waterbodies (lakes/pond) – Otonabee Conservation has concerns with the definition of naturally occurring waterbodies. It could be argued that no waterbodies within the City of Peterborough occur and persist without anthropogenic influence. The Trent-Severn Waterway was constructed and requires on going maintenance and operation. A number important ecological and hydrologic features within the Otonabee Region watershed are the product of historical development and road creation. Their genesis does not diminish the important role that they play on the landscape or the potential applicability of other federal, provincial or local policies or legislation. If the intention of the definition is to create a distinction between maintained stormwater management facilities and other features, Otonabee Conservation suggests the definition be modified to better reflect this intent.	No changes recommended at this time.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
66	Non-provincially significant wetlands – Otonabee Conservation recommends that within the reference to non-provincially significant wetlands a reference be made to the wetland definition so that users are aware that wetland is further defined later in the definitions section.	Bolded references to “wetland(s)” to indicate that wetland is a defined term.
67	Significant wetland – Otonabee Conservation recommends that within the reference to significant wetland a reference be made to the wetland definition so that users are aware that wetland is further defined later in the definitions section.	Revised to “provincially significant wetland” and bolded references to “wetland(s)” to indicate that wetland is a defined term.
68	Significant woodland – Otonabee Conservation recommends that within the reference to significant woodland a reference be made to the woodland definition so that users are aware that woodland is further defined later in the definitions section.	Bolded references to “woodland(s)” to indicate that woodland is a defined term.
69	Valleyland – The definition of valleyland used in the OP differs in wording from that used in the PPS. Otonabee Conservation recommends using the PPS definition.	No changes recommended – additional language is required from the PPS definition to apply the City's prescribed NHS framework.
70	Watercourse – It appears that the watercourse definition has been inserted into the middle of the watershed planning definition.	Relocated definition to the appropriate location.
71	Woodland – While it is understood that the definition of woodland appears to provide greater specificity as to what a woodland is than is provided in the PPS, Otonabee Conservation recommends that the definition be reviewed to ensure that consistency with the PPS definition is maintained.	No change recommended – although the proposed definition of woodland in the draft Official Plan is more prescriptive than the PPS definition, the proposed definition is not inconsistent with the PPS.
72	<b>Recommended additions to list of Definitions</b> <b>Agricultural Source Material</b> includes a variety of materials that may be sources of nutrients or pathogens such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manure produced by farm animals, including bedding materials;</li> <li>• Runoff from farm-animal yards and manure storages;</li> <li>• Wash water that has not been mixed with human body waste;</li> <li>• Organic materials produced by intermediate operations that process the above materials (e.g., mushroom compost);</li> <li>• Anaerobic digestion output that does not include sewage biosolids or human body waste;</li> <li>• Materials produced by aquaculture; and,</li> </ul>	Added definitions for agricultural source material, intake protection zone, non-agricultural source material, significant drinking water threat (existing and future), and vulnerable area.

Otonabee Region Conservation Authority		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Regulated compost that is derived from compost containing dead farm animals. 1</li></ul> <p><b>Intake Protection Zone</b> is the vulnerable area delineated around surface water intakes for municipal drinking water systems and is comprised of subzones. The IPZ-1 (subzone) is the area immediately adjacent to the intake and is considered the most vulnerable area due to its proximity to the intake. The IPZ-2 is a secondary protection area that is located upstream of the IPZ-1 and represents the extent to which a contaminant could travel to the municipal intake within 2 hours of a release (due to a spill or leak). 1</p> <p><b>Non-Agricultural Source Material</b> includes a variety of materials that may be sources of nutrients or pathogens and are intended to be applied to land as nutrients, but are not necessarily produced on a farm. Such materials may include pulp and paper biosolids; sewage biosolids; anaerobic digestion output; and, materials from dairy product or animal food manufacturing.1</p> <p><b>Significant drinking water threat:</b> An activity which poses or has the potential to pose a significant risk to the source of a municipal drinking water system.1,2</p> <p><b>Significant drinking water threat, <i>Existing</i>:</b></p> <p>a) An activity being undertaken as of and prior to, January 1, 2015;</p> <p>b) An agricultural activity undertaken at some time between January 1, 2005 and January 1, 2015;2</p> <p><b>Significant drinking water threat, <i>Future</i>:</b> An activity that is to commence after January 1, 2015.2</p> <p><b>Vulnerable Area:</b> the area around a municipal drinking water source where activity may be a significant drinking water threat, now or in the future. 1</p> <p>1 Peterborough County Official Plan</p> <p>2 As per Trent Source Protection Plan Policy G-1(1-3)</p>	

## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
73	<p>The following Source Protection Plan Policies have not been addressed:</p> <p>a. <b>S-4(3) Sewage Systems as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 332/12 (Building Code)</b> requires a policy to support S-4(1) which reads as follows:</p> <p>“Require by means of a bylaw that the system is connected to a municipal sewage collection system where connection is feasible given financial and technical constraints. This bylaw must be established within one year.”</p> <p>b. <b>S-5(1) Sewage Systems as defined in section 1 of O. Reg. 332/12 (Building Code)</b> Policy Text: “Require a policy to support the following:</p> <p>a) Where connection to a municipal sewage collection system is feasible given financial and technical constraints, new development will be serviced by a municipal sewage collection system; and</p> <p>b) Where connection to a municipal sewage collection system is not feasible, new development will be serviced by a sewage system constructed to standards of the Ontario Building Code to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water treat.”</p> <p>c. <b>S-7(1) Wastewater collection facilities that collect or transmit sewage containing human waste</b> Policy text: “Requires that the activity complies with construction standards that will ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat.”</p>	<p>S-4(3): Policy already in draft OP (now Section 6.1.4(p)). By-Law Number 15-165 (a by-law to require properties located within Intake Protection Zone 1 and which are served by a small scale sewage system to connect to municipal sanitary sewer services where those services are available in an abutting road allowance and where those services are not available to make the small scale sewage system subject to the Mandatory Maintenance Inspection Program) took effect on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015.</p> <p>To address S-5(1): Policy has been added to Section 6.1.4(m) (Water Resources): “New development within the Intake Protection Zones will be serviced by a municipal waste water collection system where such a connection is feasible given financial and technical constraints. Where such a connection is not feasible, new development will be serviced by a waste water collection system constructed to the standards of the Ontario Building Code to ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat.”</p> <p>To address S-7(1): Policy has been added to Section 6.1.4(q): “Construction of waste water collection facilities that collect or transmit sewage containing human waste within the Intake Protection Zones shall comply with construction standards that will ensure that the activity is not a significant drinking water threat.”</p>



## Otonabee Region Conservation Authority

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
74	Section 6.1.4(h)(xv) - Item "xv" was omitted in error from the list of set out under G-7(2) in the current SPP and the process to update the SPP to include this activity in the list is currently underway.	Added "The establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act and the activity would not require a Prescribed Instrument."
75	Section 6.1.4(k) relates to: 1) SPP Policy OT-2(2) which is strategic, not mandatory, and states that the municipality cannot approve a proposal that would result in the creation of a Transport Pathway in the Intake Protection Zone 1; and, 2) SPP Policy G-9(3) which is articulated in Section 6.1.4(j)(iii).	1) Revised this to a consideration rather than a mandatory requirement (i.e., "changed from 'shall not' to 'should not'). 2) Noted – no change needed.
76	Section 6.1.4(o) relates to SPP Policy S-6(3), however draft OP does not "prioritize any maintenance and asset management activities to ensure that facilities located in vulnerable areas are given adequate priority" as set out in SPP policy.	Revised Section 6.1.4 (Water Resources) to "prioritize regular inspections, maintenance and asset management activities..."
77	Section 6.1.4(q) relates to Item "r" below and SPP Policy G-4	Noted - No change needed.
78	Link Official Plan Section 6.1.4 Source Water Protection policies to specific Source Protection Plan policy references e.g., "per Source Protection Policy G-9(3)"	Not necessary to include specific policy references from the Source Protection Plan. Section 6.1.4 already indicates that significant drinking water threat activities are subject to policies set out in the Trent Source Protection Plan.



## Peterborough and the Kawarthas Economic Development

Peterborough and the Kawarthas Economic Development		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	1.1a (Second Paragraph): Recommend deleting the word manufacturing and replacing it with industry. Peterborough has a diverse economy and is comprised of several sectors, manufacturing being one, but there are several emerging and developed sectors that have not been identified. I believe that the term Industry is more comprehensive than just manufacturing .	Replaced manufacturing with industry, as suggested and revised the sentence as follows: The City is the urban hub of the northeast portion of the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) and is the focus of the broader region for health, education, industry, commerce, entertainment and other services.
2	2.2.2 (iv): Consider the potential for Community Improvement Plans to be developed to encourage this type of building.	This comment refers to “Encouraging green buildings, infrastructure resilience, and sustainable development practices that mitigate and adapt against climate change;” Added criteria for sustainable design and climate change resiliency to Section 7.16 (Community Improvement Plans and Areas).
3	2.2.4 (v): Consider the potential for Community Improvement Plans to be developed to encourage this type of development.	This comment refers to “Ensuring that new development is barrier-free and easily accessible and that existing development is retro-fitted, wherever possible” Added criteria for accessible housing and universal design improvements to Section 7.16 (Community Improvement Plans and Areas).

## Peterborough and the Kawarthas Economic Development

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
4	2.2.5 (a): Consider adding the term “clean technology” in the list of diverse industrial sectors and the Trent Severn Waterway when discussing Peterborough’s favourable position with growing regional airport and convenient transportation links.	Added “clean technology” to 2.2.5(a): “A strong, diverse economy is integral to a successful community. Peterborough is fortunate to be home to an abundance of natural resources, world-class educational and recreational facilities, a modern regional health care centre, a strong government sector, a diverse industrial sector including clean technology, food services, manufacturing and aerospace, a dynamic arts and culture sector, and a highly skilled, creative workforce.”
5	2.2.5 (b) (i): Consider deleting “including employment in major institutions and the tourism industry”. It is unclear why those two employment opportunities are highlighted to the omission of others. I believe that it is a stand-alone statement: <b>Provide for a wide range of employment opportunities.</b>	Deleted text and revised as suggested.
6	4.3.2 Downtown Core Area Designation – Permitted Uses suggest, hotels and other tourism facilities as well as entertainment and cultural facilities but no mention of convention or conference centre. While in Major Mixed-Use Corridor a convention/conference facility is specifically identified. Is it presumed that a conference or convention centre would be included as a hotel or other tourism facility or as an entertainment and cultural facility? Or is it intended that a convention centre would only be permitted in a major mixed-use corridor when downtown has been identified as a significant concentration of retail, office entertainment and service commercial uses. There is a potential for inconsistent interpretations.	Revised list of permitted uses for the downtown to permit convention and conference centres. Convention and conference centres have been removed from the list of permitted uses in Major Mixed Use Corridors.
7	4.3.4 Industrial Conversion Area Designation - While it is recognized that more appropriate uses could be found in the Industrial Conversion area, it is important that employment lands be converted only if there is adequate supply elsewhere to accommodate employment and jobs losses during any conversion	This is considered and discussed in the Land Needs Assessment report. The policies of the Plan require any conversion to conform with the conversion requirements of the General Employment Designation.

## Peterborough and the Kawarthas Economic Development

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
8	<b>4.5 Employment Districts</b> – Comments: need to ensure that the land needs assessment is incorporated into the districts to ensure that there is appropriate designation to accommodate future needs.	Agreed – employment districts have been accounted for in the land needs assessment.
9	4.5.1 (a) The intent is ideal to ensure that there is a healthy supply of designated land intended to accommodate employment generating land uses is critical to the economic health and fiscal sustainability of the city. However, there is no tie back to a land needs assessment as well as having an employment lands strategy created will be required. There is no language in the OP that discusses the need for an employment land strategy. Given the significant challenges of supply of employment lands – a full comprehensive employment land strategy should be undertaken in partnership/collaboration with the surrounding County of Peterborough to develop a 25-year employment land strategy that supports both the City's OP and the County's OP.	Policy language has been added for the development of an employment land strategy to Sections 2.2.5 (Strong and Diverse Economy) and 3.3.7 (The Functional Urban Structure Components): "The City will prepare an Employment Land Strategy in collaboration with the County of Peterborough, other levels of government and appropriate agencies to ensure that there is a healthy supply of designated land to accommodate employment-generating uses."
10	4.5.1 c. Comments – given the challenge of limited employment land supply, the redevelopment of industrial uses to other uses should be contemplated only when there is a healthy supply of employment lands to manage the conversion.	Any conversion all must be in conformity with the conversion requirements of the respective employment designation. Notably with the Prestige Employment Designation (formerly Employment Area designation), consideration is given to the City-wide supply of, and demand for lands within the Prestige Employment Designation identifies a long-term oversupply of lands in the Employment Districts.
11	4.5.2 (b) Permitted Uses: Similar to the general comment above, it could appear to be limiting for future zoning with the list of permitted uses. As an example, food processing is missing, which we have several food processing plants, whereas pharmaceutical is singularly identified.	Added to permitted uses in the Prestige Employment and General Employment designations (formerly Employment Area and Employment Land Designations): "Processing and manufacturing in wholly enclosed buildings"

Peterborough and the Kawarthas Home Builders Association

Peterborough and the Kawarthas Home Builders Association		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	The City needs to provide identification of the Major Transit Station Area.	The Schedule identifies the Downtown Bus Terminal; however; any designation of a major transit station area requires further study to implement. All mention of MTSA's was removed, except as a definition.
2	Clarification should be provided on what is meant by "adaptation of inclusionary zoning policies" and provide accompanying policy wording.	With Bill 108 changes, inclusionary zoning policies may only apply to "protected major transit station areas" or an area to which a development permit system is established. The OP will be revised accordingly. Inclusionary zoning policies have been deleted, until such time as it can be confirmed that they can be implemented in the City.
3	How will inclusionary zoning policies be measured and monitored?	An Assessment Report is required and updated every 5 years per Planning Act. However, inclusionary zoning policies have been deleted, until such time as it can be confirmed that they can be implemented in the City.
4	The City needs to consult further with the PKHBA on the affordable housing target and section 5.2.3 as a whole.	Target has been increased from 10% to 20%.

## Peterborough Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee

Peterborough Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	Include regulations of the Ontario Heritage Act to section 5.1.2(c) and remove the bulleted list.	Section 5.1.2 (Designation of Cultural Heritage Resources) has been updated to remove the list of criteria; and reference to the criteria established under the Heritage Act has been added.
2	Height limit in the Downtown Core Designation should be reduced from 8 storeys to 6	Height has been maintained to 8 storeys; however, added language to Section 4.3.1 (The Central Area: Introduction) to include the need for Heritage Impact Assessment: "The maximum building height for each designation shall only be achieved subject to: ...ii. The provisions of any applicable Heritage Conservation District or Heritage Impact Assessment will establish appropriate maximum building heights. The City will complete a Heritage Conservation District study for the Central Area."
3	A subsection needs to be added to Section 5.1 that speaks specifically to Heritage Places of Worship.	No change recommended – it is not necessary/appropriate to specifically identify one type of cultural heritage built form.
4	A subsection needs to be added to Section 5.1 that allows for the creation of Cultural Heritage Character Areas.	No change recommended – cultural heritage should be protected through the tools under the Ontario Heritage Act.
5	Remove references to the Arts, Culture and Heritage Committee – they do not comment on built heritage matters.	Removed reference to ACHAC where appropriate.

## Peterborough Bicycle Advisory Committee

Peterborough Bicycle Advisory Committee		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	We would recommend that the 'intersections for intensification' within the Mixed Use Corridors be defined as Mixed Use Nodes (City of Burlington, 2018), and that they emphasize residential infill and transit-oriented street design alongside the commercial uses. Lansdowne/Spillsbury, Lansdowne/Monaghan/High, and Lansdowne/Park appear to be suitable candidates for intensification, and should be added alongside the other intersections indicated in the draft document.	Added suggested intersections to the list of "key intersections" under Section 4.4.2 (Major Mixed-Use Corridor Designation).
2	We would also recommend formalizing the 'clustered neighbourhood supportive uses' within a new designation such as Commercial Hubs (The City of Sarnia Official Plan, 2016), Local Nodes (Nodes and Corridors: A review of approaches to Nodes and Corridors planning and its potential application to Edmonton's context, Mike Vivian, 2019), Neighbourhood Mixed Use Nodes (City of Kitchener Official Plan, 2011), or Neighbourhood Centres (adapted from The City of Peterborough Official Plan, 2015).	No change recommended – there is already policy language with regards to the location of community hubs and do not believe a separate designation is necessary to implement community hubs.
3	Schedule A and B currently show large areas of our city, in the west end and east of the river, to be predominately Residential. Identifying intersections or blocks within these areas that can support the clustering of the neighbourhood supportive uses is integral to the development of the complete communities. We recommend that these new areas are defined and integrated into Schedules A and B. We also recommend that specific distances or ratios be referenced in 4.0 Land Use to ensure neighbourhood supportive uses are distributed fairly across the city, as is done for parks and food stores.	No changes recommended – this is too detailed.
4	We would like to see street types in Road Network defined by their use by all travel modes and their overall function as public space in the city. We prefer the classifications that have been used in the City of London's Official Plan. The definitions are more inclusive of various travel modes and street functions, speak to volume of all traffic (pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and vehicles), and provide direction for development of the public realm and urban design.	Added policy to Section 6.2.3 that the City will prepare road or area-specific cross-sections to illustrate required components of the right-of-way, where appropriate.
5	There are a few existing bikeways missing from Schedule D (e.g. Brealey, Ashburnham). Updates to this schedule, as well as an additional Schedule specifically for the Ultimate Cycling Network would more clearly identify the cycling potential in our city's Official Plan.	Separate Schedule was created and updated with the Ultimate Cycling Network shown.

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	<p><b>PLANNING FOR FUTURE GROWTH</b></p> <p>We note that the minimum intensification target for the Built-up Area has been increased from 40% (as stated in the City’s current Official Plan) to 50%. We are concerned that the minimum 50% intensification target is too high in the City of Peterborough context. We understand that policy 2.2.2.1 a) of the Growth Plan, 2019 establishes a minimum intensification target of 50% for the City. However, it is important to consider that policy 2.2.2.4 of the Growth Plan, 2019 also permits upper- and single-tier municipalities such as Peterborough to request an alternative intensification target if it can be demonstrated that 50% can not be achieved. Until we have seen the Land Needs Assessment and have had the time to review the various components that feed into this analysis, we cannot confirm whether the minimum 50% intensification target is appropriate or justified for Peterborough, and it is our initial opinion that this target may be too high.</p>	<p>Land Needs Assessment Report will be made available with the final draft Official Plan (late-July 2021).</p>

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
2	<p>We also note that the minimum density target in the DGA has been increased from 50 to 55 residents and jobs per hectare. However, we note that policy 2.2.7.2 a) of the Growth Plan, 2019 requires a lower minimum DGA density target of 50 residents and jobs per hectare. We are concerned that the minimum DGA target of 55 residents and jobs per hectare is not realistic or achievable. As noted previously, we have not had the opportunity to review the City's Land Needs Assessment completed as part of the City's Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process to properly assess and review how the City has justified a minimum DGA density target of 55 residents and jobs per hectare. This is a key input into the Land Needs Assessment and a thorough analysis should have been undertaken to determine what is an appropriate density target for the DGA. As with the minimum intensification target, the policy 2.2.7.4 of the Growth Plan, 2019 permits upper- and single-tier municipalities such as Peterborough to request an alternative DGA density target. Until we have seen the Land Needs Assessment and have had the time to review the various components that feed into this analysis, we cannot confirm whether the minimum DGA target is appropriate or justified for Peterborough, and it is our initial opinion that this target may be too high.</p>	<p>On March 18, 2018, Council endorsed the achievement of a minimum of 55 to 65 residents and jobs per hectare in new subdivisions. The City's lands needs to 2051 have been determined based on the achievement of an overall minimum density of 50 residents and jobs per hectare in the designated greenfield area. Detailed assumptions are outlined in the Land Needs Assessment Report.</p>



Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
3	<p>Related to the City’s Land Needs Assessment, the DRAFT Official Plan identifies a Rural Transitional Area. It is our understanding that the intent of the Rural Transitional Area designation is to identify lands within the City limits that are not required to accommodate population or employment growth within the time horizon of the Plan (2041), but are anticipated to do so beyond this horizon. It is also our understanding from discussions with City Staff that the Land Needs Assessment, once finalized, may result in the need to designate some of the Rural Transitional Area lands for urban land use purposes, as they may be required to accommodate population and employment growth to 2041. Until we have seen the Land Needs Assessment and have had an opportunity to assess land needs, we do not support the delineation of the Rural Transitional Area designation. Related to this, we note that some of the lands are currently designated for urban purposes in the City’s current Official Plan but have been redesignated as Rural Transitional Area, resulting in a “down-designation” of lands. We do not support this down designation, and we request that the City carry over the existing designations permitting urban land uses. In addition to this, we note that there are no actual land use policies that apply to the Rural Transition Area designation, so it is not clear what is and is not permitted on these lands. The permitted uses should be clarified.</p>	<p>The Urban Structure Schedule will be revised in accordance with the land needs assessment and August 2020 provincial land need methodology – the June 19, 2019 version does not reflect the total quantity of land needed to 2051.</p> <p>Revisions to the Rural Transition Area designation has been made to identify permitted uses and development policies.</p>

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
4	<p>It is important to note that the population and employment projections to the year 2031 in the current Official Plan do not match those of the Growth Plan, 2019 for the same year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Current Official Plan 2031 population: 88,000 (vs. 103,000 in the Growth Plan, 2019)</li><li>• Current Official Plan 2031 employment: 42,000 (vs. 52,000 in the Growth Plan, 2019)</li></ul> <p>As such, presuming that the existing designated lands within the City are designated to accommodate growth to 2031 based on the population and employment projections in the City's current Official Plan, the City's DRAFT Official Plan should, in addition to updating the planning horizon to the year 2041, account for the increase in population and employment to accommodate 2031 projections, and ensure that sufficient lands are designated to accommodate this growth. While this matter should be outlined in the Land Needs Assessment, in the absence of seeing that document, we wanted to bring this matter to the City's attention to ensure that the difference is properly accounted for.</p>	<p>Population and Employment projections have been updated to reflect amendment 1 of the Growth Plan (i.e., forecasts for 2051). The Land Needs Assessment has been completed in accordance with the August 2020 Provincial methodology.</p>

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
5	<p><b>LAND USE DESIGNATIONS</b></p> <p>With respect the Residential designation and the policies related to mid-rise and high-rise development, policies 4.2.2 j) i) and 4.2.2 l) i) of the DRAFT Official Plan state that these developments shall have direct access to a Collector or Arterial road. For mid-rise development, policy 4.2.2. j) i) states that direct access to a Local Road may be permitted, subject to the City’s approval. It is unclear what is meant by “subject to the City’s approval”. Clarification is requested with respect to this policy. However, for both mid-rise and high-rise developments, these policies may be restrictive in some cases where direct access to Collector or Arterial roads may not be possible or desirable. In our opinion, the policies should be revised to recognize that in some cases, it may be appropriate for mid-rise and high-rise development to have direct access to a Local Roads, and there should not be a restriction to limit access to and from Local Roads.</p>	<p>Flexibility is already provided with respect to mid-rise development. Secondary access may still be considered to and from Local Roads.</p>

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
6	<p>With respect to the land use designations within the Central Area, we note that the Draft Official Plan establishes maximum building heights within the Downtown Core Area, Business District, Industrial Conversion Area and Downtown Neighbourhood designations. In our opinion, the proposed maximum building heights may not be appropriate as the height limits could constrain opportunities for intensification. In certain areas, taller buildings may be appropriate, particularly in order to allow for the densities required to be accommodated within the City’s Urban Growth Centre. In addition, the policies should be updated to reflect the City’s Central Area Master Plan. In line with this, the policies should reflect the primary function of the Central Area as a cultural and entertainment centre, and reference should be made to the incentives for development that are discussed in the Master Plan.</p>	<p>Revisions were made to reflect Bill 108 changes. Additional building height may be considered by the City on a site by site basis through an Official Plan Amendment where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development is considered compatible development.</p> <p>There are several references in the draft Official Plan which identify the Central Area as the focus of cultural and entertainment uses. Some of the Central Area Master Plan policies are very specific/project-based and may not belong in the Official Plan. However, the draft Plan states that the City shall identify public realm improvement priorities and establish incentive programs, such as a Community Improvement Plan, to assist the private sector in improving their properties and to encourage the intensification of the Central Area. It is also noted that a number of incentives are already in place (e.g., development charge exemptions for development in the Central Area with 15 or more apartment units, façade improvement grant, and tax increment based grant).</p>

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	We note that the various Commercial designations in the City's current Official Plan have been redesignated for the most part to be within the Major Mixed-Use Corridor and Minor Mixed-Use Corridor designations. Within the Major Mixed-Use Corridor designation, policy 4.4.2 f) establishes a minimum building height of 2 storeys. There are many existing 1-storey commercial uses within the proposed Major Mixed-Use Corridor designation. This policy could become an issue for these uses and sites, where new stand-alone commercial uses are proposed, or expansions to existing 1-storey commercial buildings are proposed, and may be appropriate. <b>In our opinion, this policy is not appropriate for primarily commercial uses on sites along the corridors (which are permitted as stand-alone commercial uses), and the minimum building height policy should be removed.</b>	The intent of the policy is to encourage higher density development along Major Mixed-Use Corridors. Additional 1-storey development may require authorization from the Committee of Adjustment once the new zoning takes effect.
8	The Natural Areas designation in the DRAFT Official Plan identifies a much broader network of Natural Areas when compared to the City's current Official Plan. The policies establish three levels of natural features, which all form part of the Natural Areas designation delineated on Schedule B of the DRAFT Official Plan. In our review of this designation, it appears that the mapping does not accurately reflect the natural features that exist on the ground today in many cases. <b>We request clarification on how the Natural Areas designation was delineated and mapped.</b>	A copy of the background study will be made available concurrently with the next draft version of the Official Plan.

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
9	In addition, the mapping does not distinguish between the various levels of features that form part of the Natural Areas designation. It would be helpful to have a map that forms part of the Official Plan, perhaps as an Appendix, to distinguish between the various levels that form part of the Natural Areas designation. As such, we are concerned that the various levels of features have not been appropriately mapped.	The Natural Areas shown on Schedule E are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of all natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions with the City of Peterborough. Certain components lend themselves to being expressed in a mapping better than others. Some features (Level A and B woodlands, wetland and permanent watercourses) can be identified through aerial photo interpretation, background resources, and roadside surveys. However the differentiation between levels often requires detailed studies (e.g. 0.5 ha – 1.9 ha woodlands could be either Level A or Level B depending on attributes). Whereas other Level A components (Significant Wildlife Habitat, threatened or endangered species habitat) require site specific investigations and/or studies to identify or they exist as a function of an area rather than a specific feature and are therefore difficult to delineate within the context of the OP update. More importantly, they change over time, even over short time frames. These items do not lend themselves for mapping as part of the Natural Areas as shown on Schedule E or can not be shared in a public form due to feature sensitivity (e.g., location of an endangered species). It is important to note that the mapping is meant to be a tool for the expression of the NHS and that the ultimate identification, implementation and protection of the NHS will be determined through the OP policies.

Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
10	<p><b>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT POLICIES</b></p> <p>Policy 5.2.3 b) of the DRAFT Official Plan requires a minimum of 10% of new residential units to be affordable. Further, policy 5.2.3 f) of the DRAFT Official Plan states that the City will work with developers to maximize the provision of affordable housing by requiring new subdivisions to provide a variety of housing types and densities which contribute to meeting the City housing targets. While it is clear that the direction of the DRAFT Official Plan is to ensure the provision of affordable housing, the policies are not clear on how and when the City will require the provision of affordable housing through new development. We request clarification from the City on this matter in the form of more detailed policies. <b>In our opinion, while we agree that the provision of affordable housing is important for the City overall, it should not be a requirement for every development application. For example, if a developer or builder was proposing a small development with few units, the application of a minimum 10% affordable housing target may not be feasible, achievable or realistic. As such, we request that the City revise the affordable housing policies in this regard.</b></p>	<p>This policy has been revised to clarify that the target is on a city-wide basis and therefore not applied to each individual development application. This target has also been increased to 20%.</p>
11	<p>With respect to the policies on infill housing, policy 5.2.3 i) encourages infill housing in all residential areas. However, the policy states that off-street parking will be “<i>suitably buffered so as not to visually intrude on adjacent residential properties</i>”. While we appreciate that the City is recognizing and encouraging infill housing in all residential areas, <b>we request that this policy be revised to remove the above noted reference, as the policy is ambiguous as to what is meant by a visual intrusion.</b> Certainly, any change such as the provision of off-street parking on a property will have a visual impact as observed from adjacent properties. However, it is important to recognize that the addition of off-street parking, while contributing to a visual impact or change, is not necessarily an adverse impact.</p>	<p>Rephrased this policy to improve clarity and note that a landscaped buffer is intended to provide more attractive views to a property by reducing the prominence of parking areas.</p>

## Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
12	Policy 5.4.2 f) states that “ <i>all streets will be designed as important components of the public realm, providing a network that is appealing for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and motorists</i> ”. <b>While we agree with the principle of creating a network of streets that is functional for all users, we request clarification from the City that this policy is not to be interpreted such that a bike lane, for example, would be required on every street to accommodate cyclists.</b>	Revised to indicate that the transportation network will balance the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and motorists.
13	Further, policy 5.4.2 g. states that “ <i>cul-de-sacs, crescent streets, and loop streets will not be utilized unless they are located and provide pedestrian connections to adjacent or nearby significant infrastructure, or are abutting the Natural Heritage System</i> ”. <b>In our opinion, this policy should be deleted, as it is too restrictive in the context of subdivision development.</b> In some cases, the use of these streets may be required to accommodate an efficient subdivision design to maximize developable land and to ensure the achievement of minimum density targets, in line with Local and Provincial policies. Further, the policies of the DRAFT Official Plan already promote the provision of a connected street network and connectivity for all modes of transportation.	Revised to state “Where culs-de-sac, crescent streets, and loop streets are deemed necessary, every effort will be made to minimize their impact on the connectivity and walkability of the street network.”
14	With respect to the Urban Design policies on Buildings and Sustainable Design, policy 5.4.3 a) states that “ <i>new development shall be designed so that buildings reinforce street edges, have main entrances from the sidewalk and have a ground floor design and uses that help provide interest at ground level. Façades facing public streets should be articulated to provide interest and have significant windows; blank walls shall not face streets</i> ”. While this policy may be appropriate for commercial development, it may not be appropriate for residential development in all cases. <b>In our opinion, this policy should be revised to focus on commercial uses.</b>	This design guideline was taken from the Official Plan Charrette: Nodes, Corridors and Downtown Urban Design Guidelines prepared in August 2018. Council had received and approved in principle the Urban Design Guidelines for consideration in drafting the Official Plan. The design guidelines developed through the Official Plan Charrette were considered in the drafting of this OP and therefore do not need to be referenced. It was determined that the existing urban design policy cited in this comment is appropriate.



## Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
15	With respect to the Urban Design policies on the Urban Forest, policy 5.4.5(e) states that the City <i>"will require the replacement of any trees which must be removed, and require protection of trees during site development of construction where appropriate"</i> . <b>In our opinion, this policy is not clear in stating how the City will implement this. Further, the replacement of trees, where trees are required to be removed to accommodate development, may not be possible in some cases. This policy should be clarified and revised.</b>	Requirements associated with tree removal and replacement are implemented through the tree by-laws, site plan agreement or subdivision agreement. Section 5.5 (The Urban Forest) further states that if it is not feasible to replant trees on the same site, a cash-in-lieu fee of equivalent value will be paid to the City to support replanting trees on other available sites as determined by the City.
16	<b>INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES</b> Policy 6.1.5 m) of the DRAFT Official Plan requires a Stormwater Management Plan to be submitted in support of various types of development applications, including a one-lot severance. While we agree with the principle promoting stormwater management best practices in the City, it is our opinion that the requirement for Stormwater Management Plan to be submitted in support of one-lot severance applications is too onerous in terms of scale and cost of study for such applications. <b>As such, we request that the reference to one-lot severance applications be removed from this policy.</b>	One-lot severances were removed from this policy.
17	With respect to Complete Streets, the DRAFT Official Plan includes policies under Section 6.2.4 that require the City to build complete streets to facilitate bicycle, pedestrian and transit travel. Similar to our previous comment in this letter, we request clarification from the City that this policy is not meant to be interpreted to require certain active transportation and transit facilities within all public rights-of-way. <b>In our opinion, this policy should be revised or clarified to state that where opportunities exist to promote narrower rights-of-way within developments, these opportunities shall be encouraged to promote efficient development patterns.</b>	Section 6.2.4(d) (Complete Streets) revised to consider for the needs of all travelers. Section 6.2.4 indicates that the City will create a complete street guide to inform details of street/design requirements. Also added a policy regarding the preparation of road or area-specific cross-sections to illustrate required components of the right-of-way.

## Peterborough Developers/SGL Planning

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
18	With respect to Transit, the DRAFT OP includes policies under Section 6.2.5 to require development proposals to provide for and support pedestrian and cycling facilities and provide access to public transit services "within a walking distance of no more than 500 metres". <b>Similar to our previous comment, we request clarification from the City that this policy is not meant to be interpreted to require certain active transportation and transit facilities within all public rights-of-way.</b> Further, this policy does not address situations where transit service does not exist or is not planned to be accommodated within 500 metres of developable land. <b>As such, we request that this policy be re-worded or deleted.</b>	The intent of this policy is that development will support active transportation linkages to the transportation network and other amenities, such as bicycle parking. This policy was revised to note existing or planned public transit services. Section 6.2.4 (Complete Streets) further describes the City's Sidewalk policy.
19	<b>IMPLEMENTATION</b> With respect to the Implementation chapter, Policy 7.3.5. b. on Secondary Plans states that the City expects that planning approvals within Strategic Growth Areas, the Urban Growth Centre (Downtown Peterborough), Major Transit Station Areas, the Central Area and Mixed Use Corridors, " <i>will be facilitated through the preparation of comprehensive, area-focused Secondary Plans prepared by the City, and associated Zoning By-laws</i> ". The policy also states that where development approvals " <i>precede the approval of a Secondary Plan</i> ", there may be a requirement to prepare a Tertiary Plan to address key planning and engineering issues. In our opinion, this policy does not account for site-specific situations where development could proceed outside of a Secondary Plan or Tertiary Plan process. There are many sites and opportunities within Strategic Growth Areas that have the potential to be developed on an individual basis, irrespective of development potential on adjacent or nearby lands, due to certain characteristics that distinguish a site from others. <b>As such, we request that the policy be revised to remove the requirement for the preparation of such plans in advance of development applications for individual sites.</b>	No change recommended – the policy indicates that applicants <b>may</b> be required to prepare a Tertiary Plan that addresses a number of key planning and engineering issues. The policy was revised to only reference Strategic Growth Areas.

## Peterborough Food Action Network

Peterborough Food Action Network		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	To reflect the importance of community food security as part of a complete community, "healthy food options" in 2.2.1.vi could be expanded to include the following: adequate amounts of safe, nutritious, culturally acceptable food available to all (adapted from the City of Toronto Official Plan).	No change recommended. Approach has been to apply to all people and not have demographic specific policies.
2	Section 2.2.5.vii could be modified to highlight opportunities beyond traditional food production: Considering opportunities to offer incentives for business growth, particularly in the green and knowledge economies and food production, processing, and distribution.	No change - this may be considered through economic development strategy. Policy has been added for the development of an economic development strategy.
3	Consideration should also be given to the distribution of lower-cost food stores.	This is outside scope of the Official Plan. The Official Plan cannot speak to the cost/price point of products and business plans.
4	A possible strategy to promote physical access to healthy affordable food could be to use distance from grocery stores as an alternative or additional method than area per capita.	No change recommended. The sub-areas are with respect to major food stores only.
5	Parkland policies should specifically speak to the inclusion of water fountains and refill stations.	No change recommended. The City's Parks Development Standards speaks to requirements for water supply lines.
6	Provide stronger language in local food production section – from considering to supporting.	No change recommended - The specific language used throughout the policies of the Official Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing the Plan.

Peterborough Field Naturalists

Peterborough Field Naturalists		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	It would be our recommendation to include text that captures the following: “The design of sites which abut Jackson Creek should recognize and enhance the relationship of the site to the creek and expose buried sections of the creek wherever possible”.	Revised Section 4.3.2 (Downtown Core Area Designation): “The design of sites which abut Jackson Creek shall recognize and enhance the relationship of the site to the creek”.
2	Expand the list of benefits of natural heritage in section 4.6.1(a) to include those that also benefit other species.	The list is not meant to be exhaustive, ergo "but are not limited to".
3	An additional objective or two need to be added to 4.6.1(e) that reflect the goal to better connect people to nature, and to understand and value it through direct experience, community data gathering and education. Maintaining the size, configuration, integrity, connectivity and compatible surrounding context of natural heritage areas should also be an objective.	No change recommended - these points are already covered in the objectives.
4	OP should clearly set out the requirements for an EIS including required content and analysis. OP should reference the EIS Guidelines currently used by Otonabee Region Conservation Authority and cross-reference any current City guidelines and those for Complete Applications as an interim step until guidelines are further developed by staff in conjunction with the Peterborough Environmental Advisory Committee and approved by the City.	Added requirements for an EIS to Section 7.21.2.

## Peterborough Field Naturalists

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	Please include definitions for “minor nature” or criteria and include required consultation with the Peterborough Environmental Advisory Committee as to whether a project is of a “minor nature”.	Revised and moved policy to Section 7.21.2 to define minor nature as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Small scale and reasonably anticipated impacts to NHS are negligible;</li> <li>- Located in an area where recent previous studies have been approved by the City and provide sufficient detailed information, or</li> <li>- Located in a disturbed area</li> </ul>
6	The Natural Areas Designation should be limited to the permitted uses in paragraph d and not have these be expanded by the findings of an EIS through the operation of paragraph e.	No changes recommended – intent is that additional uses may be contemplated where the requirements of the Plan are met.
7	Some ephemeral watercourses are headwaters or cold water, and these and vernal pools should receive at least Level B protection, not Level C as proposed in this draft OP.	As per the definition in the Official Plan an ephemeral watercourse is a feature in which water flows for a short period of time in response to localized precipitation events (e.g. spring freshet or storm events) and the surface water channel is above the local groundwater table. Therefore, ephemeral watercourses identified for Level C protection would not typically be a cold water system. Systems with groundwater contribution sufficient enough to support a cold water thermal regime would by definition be classified as at least an intermittent watercourse (more commonly permanent). Headwater evaluation tools such as the <i>TRCA/CVC Evaluation, Classification, and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guidelines</i> indicate that for headwaters with ephemeral hydrological classifications mitigation level management is appropriate. This approach is most accurately represented through a Level C designation. The function of vernal pools is more appropriately captured through the Significant Wildlife Habitat component and associated policies.

## Peterborough Field Naturalists

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
8	Insert text to state that any extension of infrastructure through a natural area or Adjacent Land Overlay is subject to a preference for avoiding the natural area and associated impacts on it.	No change recommended - Section 6.1.2 (General Policies for Infrastructure) states that the location of public utilities should avoid lands designated Natural Areas. Where the construction of any municipal infrastructure project is proposed within the lands designated Natural Areas or on lands within 120 metres of natural heritage features, the project shall be required to submit an Environmental Impact Study, and/or other appropriate studies, in accordance with the policies in the Plan.
9	Change "minimum vegetation protection zones" to "preferred protection zones". Delete "standard". Change Table A by deleting single value minimums and replace with a range (e.g. change 30 m to 30 m – 120 m).	Replaced "standard" with "minimum width specified in Table A". Table A states the absolute minimum; a site-specific EIS will need to justify why greater vegetation protection zones is not required.
10	Insert that, in addition to consultation with the Conservation Authority, consultation will also occur with the Peterborough Environmental Advisory Committee.	No change - PEAC will apply based on scope of By-law 19-052 (PEAC Terms of Reference).
11	Delete 4.6.2 e. i. and insert a category in Level A (new 4.6.2 c. viii.), "Wetlands that are as yet unevaluated."	No change recommended, noting that there is policy commitment in the Plan for the City is complete a city-wide wetland evaluation.
12	Improve explanation of when compensation can be used by inserting text that ensures avoidance and mitigation have been addressed first; and compensation only applies to suitable situations, if negative impact has been explicitly measured, the restoration values and timeframe are demonstrably feasible, and uncertainties and risks have been full accounted for in the loss-gain calculation (i.e., replacement ratio).	A mitigation hierarchy approach will be considered in the Restoration and Enhancement Strategy that is indicated in Section 7.13.
13	Enhance and insert text, "Stewardship can make existing natural areas more resilient and improve connections, and foster human connections with nature."	The general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document.
14	Change the word "may" to "will provide" an annual budget for the Land Securement Fund.	Revised Section 7.13 to "should" instead of "may" – the requirement for an annual budget for the Land Securement Fund will ultimately be determined by Council.

## Peterborough Field Naturalists

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
15	Change the land designation for lands north of the railway tracks next to Harper Park from "Major Open Space" to "Natural Area". Connect Harper Park to Kawartha Golf and Country Club by changing part of the intervening "Minor Mixed-Use Corridor" and possibly part of the "Major Mixed-Use Corridor" blocks to "Major Open Space" and a Proximity Linkage.	The areas next to Harper Park, north of the railway tracks that are mapped as Major Open space are currently dominated by the City compost site and industrial uses. Harper Park and Kawartha Golf and Country Club should not be linked through the usage of a proximity linkage as this area does not meet the definition of being Level A and/or Level B features within 60m as well the area is bisected by Lansdowne Street, a major roadway within the City.
16	Add the city's natural geography and high citizen interest in the environment, and the climate and biodiversity crisis as a critical factor in our future, to the Context section of the OP so that the distinct nature, structure and issues of the city here then sets the stage for forthcoming natural, environmental and climate change policies in the rest of the Plan	Added some additional detail regarding climate change and the physical landscape to the Context section of the Official Plan. However, the general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document.
17	Strengthen the wording for many of the natural heritage protection policies – use "will" rather than "should/may"	In certain instances, where appropriate, stronger wording such as "shall" has been used. The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan.
18	Recognize Traditional Ecological Knowledge, Indigenous rights and the duty to consult with local Indigenous communities	Section 7.1 (Indigenous Peoples of Canada and the Duty to Consult) has been revised in consultation with Treaty 20 First Nations. Added to Section 7.1 that in acknowledgement of traditional knowledge that involvement and engagement with Indigenous Communities will occur as early as reasonably possible on future planning proposals.



## Peterborough Field Naturalists

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
19	Expand the areas that are marked as Proximity Linkages on Schedule E and in the text to those where a barrier might potentially be removed or mitigated and support broader connectivity of the Natural Heritage System	It is not within the scope of the Official Plan to identify connectivity creation opportunities. Barrier removal could be the type of undertaking identified through a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy as committed to in Section 7.13 (Securement of Lands within the Natural Heritage System). However it is recommended that any restoration and enhancement be addressed as a concept with enough detail to evaluate priorities without pinpointing areas on mapping. Should a barrier be removed and a proximity linkage be established the policies of the OP could apply.
20	Reference Kawarthas Naturally Connected and Township or County natural areas or the equivalent as appropriate areas with which to plan for ecological connectivity	Section 4.6.2 revised to refer to the applicable Natural Heritage Systems for the adjacent areas in the County instead of referencing the provincial Natural Heritage Systems for the Growth Plan specifically.
21	Replace development designations next to watercourses with Natural Area Designation, such as along northern Water Street and riparian areas downtown	Revised Schedule B: Land Use Plan to add Major Open Space along both sides of the river.
22	Add a target of 30% natural cover and support regeneration in the City, as generally recommended by scientists, and track where we are at for this target over time	The tree canopy target is under Section 5.5 and has been increased from 30% to 35%, or as otherwise directed in the Urban Forest Strategic Plan. Section 7.3.3 (Planning Studies) has been updated to include information regarding the results from monitoring activities may be used to inform future policy direction and updates to the OP.
23	Remove all references to the "Future High Capacity Arterial" (i.e. the Parkway extension) from Schedule D, and designate the proposed route as Open Space or Natural Area and as a Regional Park, because the Parkway extension route contains many important natural features, watercourses and sources, and wildlife habitat, and helps with nature connection for many nearby residents	Road Network Schedule has been revised to identify future roads (noting the referenced "Future High Capacity Arterial" has been removed and will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan).



## Peterborough Field Naturalists

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
24	Further consideration of the Urban Forest Strategic Plan and how it can be fully reflected in the Official Plan once a natural heritage feature or function has been identified in some fashion, including through an EIS or EA, then no complete application or approval of development, site alteration or infrastructure can occur until all studies, evaluation and planning for protection are put in place	The Urban Forest Strategic Plan is currently mentioned within Section 5.5, as the mechanism by which urban forest management is guided.
25	There should be a timeline for evaluating all wetlands, a recognition of the need to do inventories and accumulate data outside of just the development process	No change recommended - It is generally advisable to avoid stating specific timelines for specific initiatives in the Official Plan policies.
26	Evaluate natural heritage features, functions and systems first in any expansion areas outside of the current city boundaries, and in any secondary plans for current or new areas of the city	Natural heritage considerations for a settlement area boundary expansion are in 2.2.8(3) of the Growth Plan (where key hydrologic areas and the Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan should be avoided where possible) and Section 7.3.5 for secondary plans.
27	A reference that by-laws to protect wetlands and other natural heritage features are permitted under the Planning Act should be included in order to clearly support any such necessary by-laws	This is addressed through the zoning by-law.
28	Reference throughout the OP the early involvement of the Peterborough Environmental Advisory Committee and other public engagement wherever there are requirements for an Environmental Impact Statement, Environmental Assessment, or other City or agency consideration of development, site alteration and infrastructure that relates to the Natural Area Designation, Adjacent Lands Overlay, Regional Connection, Proximity Linkage, Intake Protection Zones or watercourses	Consultation will be completed in accordance with By-Law 19-052. City staff will also consult the Environmental Advisory Committee on the final draft Official Plan.
29	PFN supports having stewardship plans and community partnerships for all Regional and Community Parks, with key requirements outlined, since this will help encourage inventories, good planning, conserving the NHS and stewardship activities	Section 5.3.1 has been updated to include the "preparation of management plans to address practices such as the reservation of natural buffer strips in relation to water courses and the limitation of pesticides, herbicides and road salt being applied on lands adjacent to natural heritage features."

Peterborough Field Naturalists

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
30	PFN supports Level A protection for the Trent Nature Areas, and reconsideration of the boundaries of the TNAs and other Natural Area Designations due to the evaluation of the Nassau Wetland Complex as a PSW	No change recommended; additional study is required to determine the applicable NHS Level(s).

Peterborough Immigration Partnership – New Canadians Centre

Peterborough Immigration Partnership – New Canadians Centre		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	All city departments must work together and there is a need to re-create a position/portfolio responsible for an immigration strategy within City Hall.	This may be considered as part of the economic development strategy. Added policy that the City will develop an economic development strategy.
2	The City will play an important role in developing a welcoming community thus encouraging more newcomers to migrate to Peterborough. This means that there must be leadership through Council as well as through all city departments.	Beyond policies to encourage complete communities and high quality of life, this is generally outside the scope of an Official Plan (and the Official Plan does not preclude such actions).
3	Other community partners must commit to developing a comprehensive economic strategic plan and a social infrastructure plan in order to create strategies to build the new Peterborough.	Added policy for an economic development strategy to 7.3.3 (Planning Studies).

## Peterborough Public Health

Peterborough Public Health		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	5.2 Housing (p. 101) should include reference to how housing can contribute to a high quality of life, as indicated in the Vision Statement.	Provided more description regarding how the guiding principles provide more detailed direction for achieving the future vision under Section 2.1.1, rather than circling each section back to the vision and guiding principles.
2	6.2 Transportation: A Linked Community (p. 146) should include reference to how the Transportation policies set out in the OP can support a high quality of life that is indicated in the Vision Statement, as well as how it will support the Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability Guiding Principle.	More description regarding how the guiding principles provide more detail direction for achieving the future vision has been provided.
3	4.2.2.s Policies for Neighbourhood Supportive Use (p. 35): Include an additional bullet that states "Depending on the type of neighborhood supportive use and proximity to schools, daycares, and recreation centres, the City will apply a Minimum Distance Separation as outlined in the Zoning Bylaw." The purpose of this requirement would be to ensure an appropriate buffer between youth/young children and unhealthy options.	As a high-level document, it is not appropriate to attempt to outline detailed separation requirements in the Official Plan.
4	Policies for Mid-Rise Residential Development (p. 32), Policies for High-Rise Residential Development (p. 33), General Policies Applicable Throughout the Central Area (p. 49-50) should include indoor and outdoor areas to foster social connections as part of the list of on-site amenities. These amenities could include vegetable gardens, courtyards, gathering and programming spaces, etc.	This is too much detail for the Official Plan and is more appropriate in urban design guidelines. The general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document.
5	Section 3.4.5 Neighbourhoods (p. 20): Include a bullet that acknowledges use of a spatial equity lens to assess and evaluate new development and intensification to ensure even and equitable growth across the City.	In Section 2.2.1, reference to spatial equity has been included. However, the Official Plan is not seeking even growth across City and is focused in Strategic Growth Areas - flexibility has been added to commercial uses and there is Provincial direction on where public service facilities should locate.

Peterborough Public Health		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
6	7.2.1.c General Policies "Community engagement will be conducted in accordance with The Planning Act, the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, <i>The City of Peterborough Community Engagement Guide</i> , and other applicable legislation, policies, and regulations." (p. 163).	No change recommended. The City does not have an in-force community engagement guide.
7	7.21.2.a.v Complete Application Requirements – Development Impacts include " <i>Health Impact Assessment</i> " as one of the study options.	A health assessment has been added as additional information that may be required when submitting an application in Section 7.21.2 and a policy was added regarding the creation of a health assessment tool.
8	6.2.3.b Active Transportation "Sidewalks, bike lanes and multi-use trails....The winter maintenance of active transportation facilities will be <i>addressed as an important consideration</i> , particularly..." (p. 149).	No changes recommended - The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan.
9	4.2.2.l.ii Policies for High-Rise Residential Development "Be at a highly accessible location – within 250 metres of an existing or planned transit route and, <del>where possible</del> , be generally within 500 metres of <i>active transportation routes</i> , schools, commercial facilities..." (p. 34). This change will ensure that high-rise residential development will be in proximity to active transportation, similar to the mid-rise residential development as stated in Section 4.2.2.j.iv (p. 33).	Reference to the connection to the active transportation network has been added and "where possible" was deleted from Section 4.2.2 – it seems very unlikely that a suitable location for a high-rise residential building will be more than 500m from any of the listed amenities, and "generally" provides some flexibility.
10	4.3.1.h The Central Area Designations "Exemptions may be granted from all or part of the off-street parking....and as supported by appropriate parking studies and the proximity of the subject lands to transit facilities <i>and active transportation routes</i> ." (p. 47).	Added reference to active transportation routes to Section 4.3.1.
11	4.2.2.q.ii The Central Area Designations "Be at a highly accessible location – within 250 metres of an existing...be generally within 500 metres of <i>active transportation routes</i> , schools, commercial facilities..." (p. 50).	Reference to the active transportation network has been added to Section 4.3.1 and "where possible" was deleted – it seems very unlikely that a suitable location for a high-rise residential building will be more than 500m from any of the listed amenities, and "generally" provides some flexibility.
12	6.2.3.j Multi-Use Trails "The City will <del>strive to</del> expand and enhance its trail systems to promote connectivity, mobility, accessibility, and active transportation..." (p. 151).	Revised Section 6.2.3 to state that the City will continue to expand and enhance its trail systems.

## Peterborough Public Health

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
13	To ensure the City is planning and designing an active transportation system within the context of all populations (including vulnerable groups), popular travel routes, and projected growth we suggest that the intent of the City to complete a Municipal Active Transportation Plan be indicated as a “will develop” as opposed to the “should develop” that is presently listed in 6.2.3.r (p. 153).	No change recommended - The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan. This policy was moved to 6.2.3 (Active Transportation).
14	3.4.5.g.iii Mixed Use Corridors “Provide alternative development standards, such as reduced parking standards with <i>enhanced active transportation amenities</i> .” (p. 21)	Within the development policies of the Major and Minor Mixed-Use Corridors, reference to active transportation routes and facilities has been included when considering an application for development.
15	4.2.2.g Policies for Low-Rise Residential Development multi-unit low-rise residential built forms must provide for adequate on-site amenity, <i>including active transportation amenities</i> , and on-site garbage pickup...” (p. 32).	Reference to active transportation routes has been added to Section 4.2.2 (Policies for Low-Rise Residential Development).
16	4.2.2.j.iii Policies for Mid-Rise Residential Development “Be on a site of suitable size...on-site amenity features and spaces, on-site parking ( <i>including bicycle parking</i> ), on-site garbage pickup...” (p. 33).	Added new parking section (see Section 6.2.7) that bicycle parking and off-street parking will be addressed in the zoning bylaw.
17	4.2.2.l.iii Policies for High-Rise Residential Development “Be on a site of suitable size...on-site amenity features and spaces, on-site parking ( <i>including bicycle parking</i> ), on-site garbage pickup...” (p. 34).	Added new parking section (see Section 6.2.7) that bicycle parking and off-street parking will be addressed in the zoning bylaw.
18	4.4.2.j Major Mixed Use Corridor Designation Development Policies “....and as supported by appropriate parking studies and the proximity of the subject lands to transit facilities <i>and active transportation routes</i> .” (p. 70).	Added reference to “active transportation routes” in Section 4.4.2.
19	6.2.3.l Multi-Use Trails should include a bullet about lighting. We suggest adding the same language listed in 5.4.1.i.vi Urban Design “Lighting that is energy efficient (e.g., PV, LED), Dark Sky/Nighttime Friendly compliant, and adequate for vehicular, cyclist, and pedestrian requirements.” (p. 123).	Added language under 6.2.3 (Active Transportation) that multi-use trails shall be designed to “accommodate lighting that is energy efficient (e.g., PV, PED), Dark Sky/Nighttime Friendly compliant, and adequate for vehicular, cyclist, and pedestrian requirements where deemed appropriate.

Peterborough Public Health		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
20	6.2.4.d Complete Streets "The City will establish a <i>Complete Streets policy that will outline a Complete Streets approach for the design of new streets, as well as the refurbishment and reconstruction...</i> " (p. 154).	This is already addressed under Section 6.2.4.
21	5.2.3.b Remove the 10% target and indicate that City affordable housing targets will follow targets set out by the Housing and Homelessness Plan.	The Plan states that The City will strive to achieve the targets for the provision of affordable housing identified in the Housing and Homelessness Plan. The target has been increased from 10% to 20%.
22	5.2.1.a Housing Production "...In an effort to provide housing opportunities, the City will <del>strive to</del> maintain a supply of land through..." (p. 101).	No change recommended - The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan.
23	5.2.3.a Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing "...The City will <del>strive to</del> achieve the targets for the provision of affordable housing..." (p. 103).	No change recommended - The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan.
24	5.2.3.e Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing "The City will encourage and assist, <del>where possible,</del> in the creation of affordable housing by..." (p. 104).	No change recommended - The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan.
25	5.2.2.c Housing Supply "It is important to maintain and improve the existing housing stock to <i>ensure high quality design and acceptable</i> property standards and to allow for the appropriate intensification <del>to of new, high quality, safe, and innovative housing ...</del> " (p. 103).	No change recommended – do not agree with the proposed change.
26	Ensure that the Community Improvement Plans as indicated in 5.2.2.c have programs to enhance and support the quality of housing built across the City.	This is addressed under Section 7.16.



## Peterborough Public Health

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
27	Section 4.2.2.s.i (p. 37) indicates that application to permit a Neighbourhood Supportive Use will be evaluated "whether the use will contribute to a walkable and complete community". We propose that the tool used to evaluate the walkability to small-scale food stores in neighbourhoods align with the tool used to measure the walkability of grocery stores in Peterborough's 2019 that is scheduled to be released by Susan Sauvé and partners in the Fall 2019.	Note: The 2020 Active Transportation & Health Indicators Report looks at neighbourhoods within walking distance of a food store (i.e., within 400m or 800m).  No changes recommended. The official plan policies are intended to be high-level and goal-oriented – do not believe a detailed approach is necessary or appropriate in this case.
28	Under the Planning + Design Guidelines for Regional Parks and Other Open Spaces (p. 110), Community Parks and Other Open Spaces (p. 111), Neighbourhood Parks and Other Open Spaces (p. 112), and Urban Park Spaces add the following statement "Include a water stub to support future community garden use".	This is too detailed of a requirement for the Official Plan – requirements for water lines are in the City's Parks Development Standards.
29	Instead of having multiple indices to measure proximity to food stores, we suggest that large-scale food stores use a walkability indicator, as opposed to a per capita indicator as proposed on p. 28.	No change recommended – the intent of the food store floor space per capita is to encourage the equal distribution of food stores.
30	An additional bullet that states "Be designed such that they provide 50% of the area of the park in tree canopy by the end of the tenth year after its opening" should be added to Regional Parks and Other Open Spaces (p. 110), Community Parks and Other Open Spaces (p. 111), Neighbourhood Parks and Other Open Spaces (p. 112), and Pocket Parks (p. 114).	No changes recommended – City's Parks Development Standards.
31	Require a minimum amount of tree canopy for non-permeable surfaces, such as parking lots.	No change recommended – not aware of an appropriate percentage of tree canopy coverage with respect to non-permeable surfaces.
32	Water fountains or water refill stations be included in the planning and design guidelines for new and refurbished public parks, specifically for the parks that attract large numbers of residents and visitors.	This is too detailed of a requirement for the Official Plan – requirements are in the City's Parks Development Standards.
33	5.3.2.c.xii – "Regional Parks that accommodate large public gatherings and sport tournaments should include public washroom facilities, <i>including water fountains or water refill stations</i> , as well as off-street parking facilities, wherever possible."	This is too detailed of a requirement for the Official Plan – requirements are in the City's Parks Development Standards.



Peterborough Public Health		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
34	5.3.3.b.v – “Community Parks that accommodate public gatherings and sport tournaments should include public washroom facilities, <i>including water fountains or water refill stations</i> , as well as off-street parking facilities, either on-site or in conjunction with adjacent lands, wherever possible.”	This is too detailed of a requirement for the Official Plan – requirements are in the City's Parks Development Standards.
35	5.3.6.1.b.vi – “Include seating and a full furniture program (e.g., lighting, facilities for dogs, facilities for seniors, facilities for children and youth, water features and public art), <i>as well as publicly accessible drinking water through the provision of water fountains or water refill stations</i> .”	This is too detailed of a requirement for the Official Plan – requirements are in the City's Parks Development Standards.
36	To increase the feasibility and support for community gardens, water stubs should be required in new and refurbished parks.	This is too detailed of a requirement for the Official Plan – requirements are in the City's Parks Development Standards.

Reimagine Peterborough

Reimagine Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	The Context also does not provide the background that describes current challenges and opportunities that then drive the needed shifts and resulting policies in the OP. It also does not set much of a natural/ecological history, with no mention of glaciation, resulting drumlins and spillways, the Otonabee River or Jackson Creek, and its ecological zone. This description needs to be rounded out to set the stage for how we plan for the future of our city.	Revised the Context section to provide additional information on issues (e.g., climate change) and the physical landscape. It is noted however, that the general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document. This section is a high level discussion of the current and historical context of Peterborough - ample discussion around climate change is provided throughout the Official Plan.
2	Wording needs to be strengthened throughout and leave less for discretion (particularly with respect to Natural Heritage, cultural heritage, parks, climate change)	In certain instances, where appropriate, stronger wording such as “shall” has been used. However, the language in the Official Plan is intentional and flexibility is needed in certain circumstances to allow for context-sensitive options.
3	Need to elaborate and more fully reference and operationalize the concept of daylighting Jackson Creek downtown with a mid-block walking corridor, as supported at the charrette	Added to policies of the Central Area Downtown Open Space Designation to investigate the feasibility of rediscovering/daylighting Jackson Creek. This policy is also already included in the Urban Design section. Also revised Section 4.3.2 to state that the design of sites which abut Jackson Creek shall recognize and enhance the relationship of the site to the creek.
4	The Plan does not consider Bill 108 changes. Why does the document not allow two, not just one, secondary suite on properties?	Secondary suite policies under 4.2.2 have been revised to reflect Bill 108 changes – Bill 108 permits secondary suites (additional residential units) to occur both within the primary residential unit as well as within a structure that is accessory to the primary unit.

Reimagine Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	Why 60 metres for Proximity Linkages? Solutions should also look at areas where there are barriers that could be addressed and are within 60-100m of A and B features; this only analyzes where opportunities exist currently, but needs to also anticipate and plan for future ones.	<p>The 60 metre approach has been applied elsewhere/other municipalities and also reflects overlapping feature buffers (in some circumstances). It is an appropriate scale to use on the landscape of the City given the relatively built out nature and roadway pattern of the City.</p> <p>It is not within the scope of the OP to identify connectivity creation opportunities. Barrier removal could be the type of undertaking identified through a Restoration and Enhancement Strategy as committed to in Section 7.13.</p>

Reimagine Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
6	Where are Level A features and how much of the Natural Heritage System/Natural Areas Designation are these?	<p>The Natural Areas shown on Schedule E are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of all natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions with the City of Peterborough. Certain components lend themselves to being expressed in a mapping better than others. Some features (Level A and B woodlands, wetland and permanent watercourses) can be identified through aerial photo interpretation, background resources, and roadside surveys. However the differentiation between levels often requires detailed studies (e.g. 0.5 ha – 1.9 ha woodlands could be either Level A or Level B depending on attributes). Whereas other Level A components (Significant Wildlife Habitat, threatened or endangered species habitat) require site specific investigations and/or studies to identify or they exist as a function of an area rather than a specific feature and are therefore difficult to delineate within the context of the OP update. More importantly, they change over time, even over short time frames. These items do not lend themselves for mapping as part of the Natural Areas as shown on Schedule E or can not be shared in a public form due to feature sensitivity (e.g., location of an endangered species). For these reasons it is not possible to provide a meaningful representation of the the area of Level A features and/or delineate to indicate location of all Level A features. It is important to note that the mapping is meant to be a tool for the expression of the NHS and that the ultimate identification, implementation and protection of the NHS will be determined through the OP policies.</p>

## Reimagine Peterborough

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	It seems counter-productive to permit proposals outside Strategic Growth Areas (with some factors considered). If permitted, then what distinguishes what is in and out of SGAs, and prevent wider spread development? It may be better to require an OPA for intensification proposals outside SGAs. If this policy is permitted, then we recommend adding another factor: "v. the proposal does not impede intensification in Strategic Growth Areas or appropriate phasing of development, or cause discontinuous development patterns." This then would correspond better with similar policies later in the OP.	Disagree that intensification should not occur outside of Strategic Growth Areas – this direction is not consistent with Provincial direction.
8	The definitions or policies that outline housing types should clarify or add policies that co-housing and similar co-living arrangements are permitted, or are included within the scope of other housing terms (e.g. communal, group homes, special needs, etc.). The limits and details can be further defined in an occupancy by-law. There is currently considerable interest in developing co-housing projects by at least one local company and a growing list of residents, and such a residence has been earlier suggested for Trent University.	No specific recognition for co-housing is needed. It is permitted and the Official Plan does not preclude the creation of these living arrangements.
9	Need to elaborate and more fully reference and operationalize the concept of daylighting Jackson Creek downtown with a mid-block walking corridor, as supported at the charrette: setbacks, vegetation plantings, build connectivity, trails, strategic acquisitions and land trades, shifting City and other facilities over time, use management and securement approaches, enhance views, signs and markings, distinctive crossings, etc.	Added to policies of the Central Area Downtown Open Space Designation to investigate the feasibility of rediscovering/daylighting Jackson Creek. This policy is also already included in the Urban Design section. Also revised Section 4.3.2 (Downtown Core Area Designation) to state that The design of sites which abut Jackson Creek shall recognize and enhance the relationship of the site to the creek.

## Reimagine Peterborough

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
10	Schedule C – why is it the Business District on the south side of the railway north of Ware Street, and Neighbourhood on the south side of the railway by Princess Street?	Revised Schedule C: Central Area Plan to remove Business District sliver on the south side of the railway north of Ware St – this sliver is shown in the existing Official Plan Schedule J. The Business District boundary along Princess St. has also been adjusted to extend west to the intersection of Princess St and Haggart St – these properties were captured as having redevelopment potential in the urban design charrette.
11	Are there protection policies as well as those for development for the Jackson Creek Special Policy Area?	Development will also need to consider the policies of the Natural Areas designation and requirement for a Preliminary Natural Heritage Feature Screening.
12	Remove MUCs on Schedules where close to the water, e.g. Otonabee River; north end of George Street on east side	Revised Schedule B and C to add open space designations along both sides of the river.
13	With respect to the Level C Natural Heritage Features, is the replication of the function on site or elsewhere in the City possible?	Replication is possible in select cases – it is noted that these features are in the minority.
14	Site specific studies/Environmental Impact Studies may not identify nearby better options; add language to expand the possibilities, explorations; tools include compensation and securement.	The Restoration and Enhancement Strategy (see Section 7.13) will provide recommendations with respect to priorities.

## Reimagine Peterborough

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
15	Why does the text for the Rural Transitional Area say that the area “contributes to the local economy”, if not developed, then does it much? Or does it contribute more to other aspects of the community? This Area could more clearly promote rural uses, including agriculture, on a long-term interim basis, particularly where prime agricultural lands are situated.	This section acknowledges existing farm uses and allows for these uses to continue. The Growth Plan prohibit further development of these lands. The boundaries of the Rural Transitional Area has been revised to reflect the City's land needs assessment.
16	The policy should express the preference for avoiding infrastructure placement in the Natural Heritage System and linkages. The extension of any service beyond city limits should be sized only to serve City-owned facilities.	Section 6.1.2 states that “Public utilities, including sanitary sewage infrastructure, storm sewer systems, stormwater management facilities, municipal water, hydro, gas, telecommunication infrastructure, or any other utilities shall be permitted within any land use designation of this Plan. The location of public utilities should avoid lands designated Natural Areas.” Section 6.1.7 states that “Municipal utility services, sanitary sewer and water supply shall not be extended beyond the City boundaries, except in the case where such infrastructure is to serve City owned facilities such as the Peterborough Airport.”
17	Important here to add analyses, equity assessments, a balance between capital and operations (both are needed for implementation), assessment of need, priorities and responsibilities. Stating the principle that growth should pay for growth would be helpful. Identifying gaps and implications in financing is helpful when designing budgets and by-laws. Full-cost/lifecycle accounting, including maintenance and replacement, and how this should be reflected in the Asset Management Plan, could be mentioned in this section. Indicate that the City will explore ways to account for its natural capital value and a triple bottom line.	The City may request a Municipal Financial Impact Assessment as part of a complete application. Section 7.10 (Municipal Finance) has been revised to indicate that the City will assess the fiscal impact of planning decisions.

Reimagine Peterborough

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
18	<p>As in part identified in policy recommendations from the Kawarthas Naturally Connected initiative, add further policies that achieve NHS and related securement to Section 7.12 (Securement of Lands within the NHS), as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Where securement is in the public interest, parkland, community benefits, fees and other requirements shall ordinarily be waived.</li><li>• Either cross reference our proposed conservation severance policy in s.7.5.3, and/or briefly mention it here, since it relates to NHS securement.</li><li>• Requiring that, before declaring City and its agencies' lands surplus and disposing of them, they will be assessed for NHS and cultural heritage values, including restoration and connectivity. Further, the City will similarly assess any tax sale lands.</li><li>• The City will act on behalf of other community interests in federal or provincial surplus procedures to identify and, where feasible, secure community benefits (see also s.5.2.3 e iii).</li><li>• The City will develop a Natural Areas registry program whereby property owners may register all or specified parts of their property for conservation purposes, and as such these lands will then become subject to one or more City by-laws and associated protections and benefits. (This is a common program in the U.S. Mid-West)</li></ul>	<p>No changes recommended. Policies have been added with respect to community benefits charge. The City may exempt some, or all of the Community Benefits Charge, or exempt certain development, or redevelopment from the Community Benefits Charge, as a means to promote specific development, redevelopment or revitalization objectives in accordance with this Plan.</p>



Richard Taylor Law

Richard Taylor Law		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	<p>A new provision should be added to Section 2.2.1 that adds a (vi) by recognizing the pursuit of economic growth in accordance with the stated principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) To sustain existing uses and existing employment base including opportunities/strategies that would prevent, abate, reduce, or even eliminate job losses and loss of employment land inventory;</li><li>b) To allow an adequate and appropriate opportunity for any new growth, associated with greenfield sites, or the conversion of other properties to employment land opportunities;</li><li>c) To create opportunities, in land use terms, for the pursuit and objective of the realization of (a) and (b) herein before described in a proper manner.</li></ul>	<p>The suggested principles are more appropriate considerations under Section 2.2.5 Strong and Diverse Economy rather than Section 2.2.1 Complete Community. It is noted, however, that the five identified guiding principles of the Official Plan are not mutually exclusive and are in fact interconnected.</p> <p>Section 2.2.5 captures the suggested principles – notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) Providing for a wide range of employment opportunities,</li><li>iii) Planning for, protecting and preserving Employment Districts for current and future employment uses and ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is provided to support current and future needs; and,</li><li>iv) Protecting Employment Districts for the long term by limiting the conversion of such areas to other uses or permitting the infiltration of uses which would undermine the function and viability of Employment Districts</li></ul>

## Richard Taylor Law

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
2	What is the Growth Management Plan that forms the basis of the draft Official Plan document? My specific interest relates to employment lands and how the Growth Management Plan for the City has assessed the existing inventory, the depleting inventory, and projected needs associated with employment opportunities and employment lands. The commentary that has pre-dated the release of the City of Peterborough Draft Official Plan in June 2019 is general in nature. Hopefully, the City's Growth Management Plan, undertaken as a prerequisite to the City's Official Plan review, will provide more specific assessment and data.	<p>The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and its associated density targets, intensification targets, population forecasts and employment forecasts (Schedule 3) form the basis of the draft Official Plan's Growth Management structure.</p> <p>Details regarding employment land need are described in the Land Needs Assessment report and made publicly available with the final draft Official Plan.</p>
3	Will the Official Plan be assessed in relation to the Transportation Plan Policies and Schedule B in the Official Plan?	The Transportation Master Plan is to be completed in 2022. The Official Plan will be amended thereafter to incorporate any necessary changes.
4	Will a further Schedule be released which addresses Residential Density? There is no particular Schedule that designates Residential Density for Medium and High Density.	There will not be a Schedule that identifies specific sites for medium and high density residential. The draft Official Plan provides greater flexibility in the location of medium and high density uses provided the proposed development is consistent with the policy language in the Official Plan which provides guidance on the location, built form and other considerations.

Richard Taylor Law

#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
5	<p>It is our position that it is now mandatory to engage in a consultation process, particularly in reference to the identification of appropriate employment area land opportunities in both the City and the County.</p> <p>Please advise as to the steps presently undertaken by the City of Peterborough incidental to its draft Official Plan review to undertake an employment area lands assessment. The need for employment area lands is urgent. We have referenced the closure of General Electric and the potential sterilization of the property on Plastics Rd. as only two examples of parcels now presently sterilized for any employment area opportunities. It is highly improbable that those sites would be regenerated or decommissioned in the near future. If you should have any information that would suggest that these particular properties can be appropriately decommissioned within the next five (5) years, then the foregoing would be of assistance. Otherwise, the depletion of such employment area lands from available inventory is of significant concern.</p> <p>The 2019 Growth Plan places an obligation upon the City of Peterborough to ensure that there is an availability of sufficient land, in appropriate locations, for a variety of employment to accommodate forecasted employment growth to the horizon of the subject Provincial Growth Plan. Any information that you might be able to provide in order that the City will realistically achieve such an objective would be of help and I look forward to the receipt of that documentation. This needs to be addressed in relation to the City and its present Official Plan review.</p>	<p>Details regarding employment land need are described in the Land Needs Assessment report and made publicly available with the final draft Official Plan.</p>

Richard Taylor Law		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
6	<p>We would specifically request that the Airport Road Corridor be identified as an area that is near "major goods movement facilities" and a "major goods movement" corridor. In that regard, we note that the 2019 Growth Plan for the Province of Ontario identifies any such corridors to include major highway interchanges. We herein specifically request that particular areas in the County, noted as constituting a highway corridor, in proximity to major highway interchanges, such as my client's lands be classified as having a particular status, in accordance with the provincial Growth Plan. The subject corridor would commence at the Airport (to the south) and proceed northerly along Airport Road to the CPR rail crossing of that road.</p> <p>Furthermore, the new Growth Plan obligates single-tier Municipalities, (including the County of Peterborough and the City of Peterborough) to act in consultation with lower-tier Municipalities (including the Township of Cavan Monaghan) in relation to the designation of all employment areas in Official Plans and to protect them for appropriate employment uses over the long term. We note that the obligation for consultation is now mandatory in the 2019 Growth Plan. The new Growth Plan also identifies (for greater certainty) that employment area designations may be incorporated into upper- and single-tier Official Plans by amendment at any time in advance of the next Municipal comprehensive review.</p> <p>Information provided by the City of Peterborough, in relation to its own Official Plan review, would suggest that there is an urgent need for employment lands to be made available to the market. Employment opportunities are being lost because sufficient land areas are not available for appropriate development to service manufacturing, warehousing and logistics, and appropriate associated uses and ancillary facilities.</p>	<p>This may be considered through an economic development strategy. Added policy direction regarding the completion of an economic development strategy in partnership with the County and other stakeholders.</p> <p>New employment areas have been identified on the updated Official Plan schedules in accordance with the results of the Land Needs Assessment.</p>

## Richard Taylor Law

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	The Needs Assessment, presently to be undertaken by the City of Peterborough, must evaluate the loss associated with those contaminated sites and provide immediate relief by appropriate consultation with its political neighbours in identifying replacement employment opportunities. Unfortunately, there is no sign that this has actually been undertaken or implemented by the City of Peterborough.	Details regarding employment land need are described in the Land Needs Assessment report and made publicly available with the final draft Official Plan.
8	<p>Please advise whether the subject draft document has now been formally submitted to the Approval Authority. In addition, please advise as to when the foregoing was submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.</p> <p>Can you provide me with the Growth Plan projections that have been utilized in reference to the formulation of the draft Official Plan that has now been released to the public for its consideration, review and comment?</p>	<p>The draft Official Plan and Land Needs Assessment report were submitted to the Province for preliminary feedback in Summer 2019. Another land needs assessment was submitted in December 2020 to address the new land needs methodology issued by the Province in August 2020.</p> <p>The population and employment forecasts in Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe form the basis of the draft Official Plan's Section on Growth Management.</p>
9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the Harper Park wetland presently viewed as provincially significant wetland, pursuant to the City's existing Official Plan?</li> <li>2. Has the City ever received a communication from the Ministry of Natural Resources, or any other entity, including the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing that the Harper Park wetland should be assumed or deemed to be a provincially significant wetland, even if it does not have an Official Plan designation of that nature?</li> <li>3. Does the present Official Plan review (with the draft as circulated) contemplate that the Harper Park wetland will be designated as provincially significant, pursuant to the new proposed Official Plan?</li> </ol>	Provincially Significant Wetlands are wetlands meeting the point scoring threshold through an Ontario Wetland Evaluation System valuation and designated by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. A portion of Harper Park has been evaluated and identified as a provincially significant wetland. PSWs and other natural heritage features are within the Natural Areas Designation of the draft Official Plan.

## Richard Taylor Law

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
10	Can you advise whether the mapping associated with this Schedule E: Natural Heritage and Environmental Constraints accords with the most up-to-date ORCA evaluations? Can you advise whether the mapping accords with the most current and up-to-date information provided to you by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry?	The mapping used the data available at the time, including data from Land Information Ontario. Draft Official Plan and Schedules has been reviewed by ORCA and Provincial staff.
11	I oppose the deletion of Schedule E - Residential Density from the City of Peterborough Official Plan. Particulars in reference to the reasons associated with my opposition to that deletion will follow in due course.  Clarity is an essential component within the context of the Official Plan and planning documents. We note that you have introduced a new Schedule E that does not deal with residential density in any aspect. As you have noted, Schedule E in the DRAFT Official Plan is labelled "Natural Heritage and Environmental Constraints". This causes confusion in its own aspect. Schedule E of the existing Official Plan should be updated showing various residential densities and proposed high and medium density designations.  Accordingly, the Natural Heritage and Environmental Constraints designations should be shown on a different Schedule, with a different Schedule reference.	The draft Official Plan provides greater flexibility in the location of medium and high density uses provided the proposed development is consistent with the policy language in the Official Plan which provides guidance on the location, built form and other considerations. The Schedules will be labelled accordingly noting that the new Official Plan would repeal and replace the former (i.e., existing) Official Plan.
12	In light of the importance of Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW), as noted in the Growth Plan, both 2017 and 2019, as well as the Provincial Policy Statement (present and in draft form), the areas that have been identified by the MNRF or the Otonabee Region Conservation Authority as PSW within the City of Peterborough boundaries should be shown on an appropriate map. As a consequence, the Schedule of the City's Draft Official Plan denoting Natural Heritage Features should specifically identify those PSW as delineated, mapped or identified by the MNRF or ORCA. Furthermore, existing known PSW boundaries should be updated by use of the most current information as supplied by MNRF, ORCA or any Ratepayer Group that has undertaken an evaluation of the PSW boundary. The foregoing mapping for any PSW within the City should be based upon the most recent and updated information.	No change recommended - It is not necessary for PSWs to be specifically identified on the Official Plan schedules. They are captured in the Natural Areas designation (shown on Land Use and Natural Heritage System Schedules). All PSWs from Land Information Ontario are included in the Natural Areas Designation in their entirety.

Silverthorn Holdings

Silverthorn Holdings		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	It is important to clarify to the average reader that the document only provides guidelines and principals for future planning; the plan is not set in stone and will always allow new ideas of development, living styles, and fit needs of the community on an as and how basis.	This is generally inherent in the policy language that allows for flexibility.
2	Mixed use developments in support of intensification, close to transportation nodes, should allow flexibility in the application of parking allocation standards/restrictions or any other restrictions.	Reduced parking standards are already considered in the Official Plan.
3	The Plan must respect the interests of landowners against the plan's principles.	The land use planning process is a balance of both.
4	It is important to educate and raise awareness among the general public about projects and community changes as a result of the new OP or latest provincial planning and community planning guidelines. This could be done by featuring case studies and community profile updates that inform the public about how their community is shaping in the 21st century.	To be considered outside the scope of the OP document itself.
5	Work with developers and citizens to plan new projects that engage the city planning department early in the process to avoid challenges and reduce red tape. Align approvals for projects across departments in an efficient and seamless manner.	This is covered in Section 7.21.1 (Pre-consultation).

## Sustainable Peterborough

Sustainable Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	The policies and bylaws that will be developed to actualize the Official Plan should support/promote development of food processing, storage and distribution sites for local food. We encourage the idea that future development of community centres should include the physical infrastructure for activities including community food preparation, handling, processing, education and/or training.	This is too detailed of a consideration for public service facilities. The OP only speaks to locational considerations.
2	We recommend that Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 lands not be annexed for development and that this be embedded in the OP. Further, future annexation should only occur if/when all intensification targets have been met and all abandoned lands within the City have been repurposed and developed.	No change recommended. Settlement Area Boundary Expansion requirements are outlined in Section 2.2.8 of the Growth Plan.
3	We recommend that the OP permit and encourage the integration of community gardens with industrial land uses; such partnerships could be considered as cash-in-lieu of parkland. Additionally, community gardens should be permitted widely throughout the community in the central area, mixed use corridors and employment districts, as well as neighbourhoods.	No change recommended due to land use compatibility issues and potential contamination issues.
4	It is important that the City ensures that they actively promote and support local food activities and urban agriculture.	No change recommended – policies supporting local food and urban agriculture are already outlined in Section 5.6 (Local Food Production).
5	The City can use underutilized resources to develop greenhouses for food production.	This is considered through Section 5.6 (Local Food Production: "Considering the expanded use of City land for growing food, including edible landscapes;"
6	We recommend a wording change to section 5.4.6 b. ii. In order to leave maximum leeway for interpretation, we recommend replacing the possibly restrictive term 'food hubs' with the more general word 'spaces'.	Replaced term with "food spaces", as suggested.



Sustainable Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
7	We recommend removing the following words from section 5.4.6 b.v.: ‘(i.e. food co-ops, community food centres)’ as it limits rather than expands the possibilities afforded to increasing access to local food.	Revised Section 5.6 to “e.g.” instead of “i.e.”

Sustainable Trent

Sustainable Trent		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	As part of building and maintaining relationships, seat(s) should be given for Indigenous representation at council meetings.	This is outlined in Section 7.1 (Indigenous Peoples of Canada and the Duty to Consult). Indigenous representation at council meetings is outside the scope of the Official Plan.
2	The creation of an Urban Land Trust would protect both the natural environment and cultural heritage. Environmental Assessments need to occur prior to development.	This is addressed through Major Open Space designation. Section 4.6.2 indicates working with other levels of government, the Conservation Authority, local First Nations and the community to gather data on natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions and support education, outreach and landowner stewardship programs. This is the case for both EISs and EAs.
3	Peterborough should recognize and ensure that Provincially Significant Wetlands and the Otonabee river are protected from development in perpetuity and that buffers are extended to a minimum of 120 meters compared to 30 meters today for Provincially Significant Wetlands and that non-Provincially Significant Wetlands should receive improved buffers.	The recommendations of an approved site-specific Environmental Impact Study will determine appropriate buffer widths that is no less than those specified in Table A.

## Sustainable Trent

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
4	Development near wetlands should not be approved without a wetland evaluation as is the case with the Clean Tech Commons and Twin Pad Arena developments.	Requirement for EIS and city-wide wetland evaluation is in the draft OP. Development applications within 120 m of a wetland will need to assess the impacts of the undertaking on the wetland through an EIS. An evaluation of a wetland under the provincial Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) is different from an EIS assessment of impacts and would not be feasible in many development situations as these features almost always extend over multiple properties where access or even agreement to conduct an evaluation is not always possible. Furthermore, it is unreasonable to ask a neighbour to undertake an evaluation of an adjacent landowners land who may have no interest in the matter. In recognition of these limitations the City has committed to Policy 4.6.2 (q) which states that " <i>The City, in coordination with appropriate parties, will evaluate all of the wetlands within the City following the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System for Southern Ontario to determine significance.</i> " The intent of this policy is to allow for an understanding of wetland significance under OWES prior to a development application scenario. However, even with all the wetlands within the City being subject to consideration for evaluation there still will remain individual wetland areas that are "unevaluated" as they will not meet the MNRF OWES criteria for inclusion in a formal OWES wetland evaluation.
5	Flooding event frequencies are increasing and we feel that planning for 1 in 100-year floods is outdated as in section 4.3.8.c.	This is consistent with the current Official Plan, which received approval from the Province.
6	Affordable housing should be more of a focus and there should be communication with Trent University and Fleming College on the number of students enrolled.	No change recommended – the approach is to avoid demographic-specific policies.
7	The City should consider having housing designated specifically for students and housing designated specifically for low-income residents.	Student residences may be considered as part of an institutional use; however, it is not appropriate for the Official Plan to identify types or classes of people.



Township of Cavan Monaghan

Township of Cavan Monaghan		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
1	The policy framework should be amended to permit the consideration of cross-border servicing for mutually benefitting projects	Policy has been added to develop an Economic Development Strategy in co-operation with the County of Peterborough, other levels of government and key agencies and stakeholders. It is a policy of the Official Plan to liaise with the County of Peterborough and surrounding municipalities in managing its future growth and development.
2	Provide written confirmation that there is no need to continue boundary adjustment discussions for the planning horizon of the Plan (i.e. until after 2041)	Based on City Council direction on May 25, 2021, City staff are to finalize the Official Plan and focus land use designations within the City's boundary and that upon completion of the Official Plan, the City continue discussions with the province, the county, and the townships for equitable regional economic development.
3	The proposed "future roadway corridor" in the North Monaghan Ward be removed from Schedule D: Transportation Plan because the City has no jurisdiction on these lands	These corridors are shown on the existing/in-force Official Plan Schedule B (Road Network). Section 6.2.6 (Road Network) has been updated to clarify that final alignments will be determined in partnership with the County of Peterborough.

Transition Town Peterborough

Transition Town Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	Official Plan needs to express stronger sense of urgency regarding the climate crisis.	Added reference to Context section to frame the issues around climate change. However, the general approach has been to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document. Ample discussion around climate change is provided throughout the Official Plan
2	Section 5.4.3 (Policies for Buildings and Sustainable Design) needs to use “maximum effort” tone and language as used in other sections.	No change recommended – The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan.
3	Transportation polices need to provide for direction towards electrification.	No change recommended. The Official Plan does not speak to specifics of transit vehicle operations.
4	Since life sustaining natural elements are so seriously affected by the climate crisis, we strongly urge buffer zones more than 30 metres in keeping with Provincial standards for Significant Wetlands e.g. 60 -120 metres .	No change recommended – a site-specific EIS will prescribe why buffer does not need to be greater than 30m

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	No portion of the University’s lands should be included in the Rural Transition Area. The Land Needs Assessment needs to report the assumptions around: the number of jobs associated with the University including the assumed growth in university related jobs; assumptions regarding spinoff benefits of planned growth of the University; assumptions regarding existing and future student housing needs and how that relates to the housing capacity in the city; and finally, if the assumptions in the LNA has taken into account the City and University’s plans for Cleantech Commons as a mixed-use innovation hub. It is also important to understand the criteria that will be used to determine which lands will be developed, particularly with respect to the RTA designation.	This information will be considered and documented in the Land Needs Assessment report.
2	It is unclear how the University was considered in the Designated Greenfield Area policies – institutional uses are not mentioned.	<p>Section 3.3.4 (The Designated Greenfield Area) states that the designated greenfield area is anticipated to develop with new residential neighbourhoods, mixed use areas, business parks and public service facilities, contributing to a healthy and complete community. Public service facilities include institutional uses.</p> <p>Further, 3.3.4 states that the development of the Designated Greenfield Areas will be planned to be compact and transit-supportive through Secondary Plans that will provide: (c) A diverse mixture of land uses, including residential, institutional and local commercial or other employment opportunities;</p>

## Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	It is unclear if the natural heritage system mapping includes all three levels in the Natural Areas designation and/or the associated setbacks. The inclusion of the minimum vegetative protection zone widths and the adjacent lands overlay in the mapping are not appropriate for the Official Plan. Appropriate setbacks and buffers should be determined through the development review process and through an Environmental Impact Study rather than in the Official Plan.	The Natural Areas shown on Schedule E are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of all natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions with the City of Peterborough. Setbacks will be determined through a site-specific Environmental Impact Study; however, the Official Plan policies prescribed the minimum setback required.
4	The City should provide opportunity to review the Natural Heritage System criteria and associated Appendix (Natural Heritage Background Study) used to categorize the natural heritage features and identify what is proposed to be included in the system mapping. It is important that the mapping realistically reflect the part of the system to be protected. In our view it is not appropriate to require an Official Plan amendment to change designations that were made without completion of detailed groundwork. There should be much more flexibility with respect to changes in the Natural Area mapping that are justified by detailed studies.	Consultations on the Natural Heritage System and level classification system date back to 2018. Public open houses were held on November 26 and December 5, 2018 to discuss the natural heritage system specifically in addition to six public open houses to discuss the draft Official Plan. This policy already states that minor adjustments may be facilitated through an EIS without needing an OPA.
5	The Level A classification for woodlands only accounts for the size of the woodlot and does not account for the quality of the woodlot or connectivity value.	See response to Comment #35 and 36.



Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
6	<p>The University's lands should be identified as a Special Policy Area or the Major Institutional designation should be amended accordingly. The policies should allow for flexibility to respond to the changing needs of the institution and address community housing, employment, social and recreational needs. The land use permissions for Cleantech Commons should support the provision of complete communities. Major Office should also be permitted on University lands and not restrictive to a research facility with supportive office.</p> <p><b>Proposed List of Uses</b></p> <p>d. Despite the policies within Section 4.1.4, Permitted uses on lands designated Major Institutional, as identified on <b>Schedule B: Land Use Plan</b>, may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>University, school and college buildings including academic, office, research, laboratory, administrative and maintenance facilities; Hospitals, health offices and health clinics, medical laboratories; Major office, office and business parks including offices, research and development, university premises and teaching laboratory space and associated light industry; Manufacturing and employment uses that are related to a research and development facility or are compatible with the intent of this Designation; Commercial, medical, social service, administrative, government and institutional uses of all types; Low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise residential uses, including student accommodation, live-work units, home occupations and communal or special needs housing; Long-term care facilities and seniors housing; Retail, service commercial uses, financial and personal service uses and restaurants of all types and scales; Social, cultural and recreational facilities, including private athletic clubs, parks, places of worship and daycare facilities; Agricultural, Natural areas and Conservation uses; Convention/conference facilities, including related temporary uses; Hotels and motels, including ancillary uses; Utilities and infrastructure; and Parking facilities at-grade and/or in structure.</li></ul>	<p>Do not agree that special policy area designation is warranted for post-secondary schools, as the flexibility may be accommodated through the Major Institutional Designation. Do not agree with all the proposed uses (e.g., purpose-built convention centres, major office) – flexibility has been provided in the draft policies for uses functionally associated with the university/major institution. Some of the proposed uses (e.g., public and private utility installations and public service facilities such as long term care facilities, parks, places of worship) are already permitted in all designations per Section 4.1.2(a) (General Policies for All Designations).</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	The role of the University and students should be included in the vision statement	The approach here is to avoid adding additional explanatory text to create a more concise document. Students are already included in the vision statement (as the statement speaks to all residents and visitors).
8	Further direction is needed to clarify how much growth will be accommodated in the Central Area, in particular with respect to employment and assumptions regarding Major Institutions. Further in Section 4.3, the policies in this section do not include policies for non-residential uses.	Assumptions regarding employment will be in the Land Needs Assessment report. It is not clear what policies are being requested here.
9	The food store policies should consider on-campus student housing, though it is unclear what the intent of monitoring student housing and food store floor space growth would be. One of the greatest challenges for those living and working at Trent is the lack of local commercial offerings.	The intent of monitoring population growth is to encourage the equal distribution of food stores. Section 4.1.4 was revised to read "The City will monitor population growth, post-secondary student housing..."
10	<p>Clarification should be provided to confirm that the Neighbourhoods designation and housing policies address existing and future needs for student housing. This also needs to be discussed in the Land Needs Assessment.</p> <p>The following should also be added to the Intent of Neighbourhoods in Section 4.2.1(b):</p> <p><b>"ii. Permit and facilitate the intensification, expansion and diversification of land uses associated with Major Institutional designated areas to make efficient use of land, provide enhanced facilities and promote economic development;"</b></p>	<p>The approach has been to not address specific demographics/have demographic-specific policies. Certainly, the Residential Designation will include housing used by students.</p> <p>The objectives for Neighbourhoods in Section 4.2.1 already indicates "(v) Support the continued success and growth of Peterborough's institutions to ensure access to wide range of services and opportunities for Peterborough residents"</p> <p>(vi) Ensure that the character and array of institutional uses contribute to the image of the City and its desirability as a place to live and invest in".</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
11	It is not clear in the Source Water Protection policies (Section 6.1.4(h)) whether land use activities would continue to be permitted on sites where the activity existed prior to the approval of the new Official Plan.	<p>Existing uses/activities are subject to the Trent Source Protection Plan, based on the nature and circumstances of the activity and potential threats to drinking water. Existing and future significant drinking water threats require action to minimize or eliminate the threat per the policies of the source protection plan. If the activity is not listed as a local threat or Prescribed Drinking Water Threat Activity (e.g., handling and storage of fuel, organic solvent, road salt), it does not fall within the scope of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>All subsequent decisions for future development proposals made under the Planning Act must conform to the significant drinking water threat policies of the Source Protection Plan.</p>
12	The minimum gross floor area of 4,000 square metres in the Major Institutional definition should be deleted because it would not provide for the integration of smaller scaled institutional buildings into the fabric of the City, particularly on sites outside the main campus. The definition of public service facilities should be updated to confirm if it includes the University. The definition of vegetation protection zone also applies more broadly than the definition in the Growth Plan, which is limited to Greenbelt lands.	Revised boundary to include the Traill campus in Major Institutional designation and removed the minimum floor area requirement of 4,000 square metres for Major Institutional. Revised definition of vegetation protection zone.
13	Policies requiring that development in the Designated Greenfield Areas only be considered following the approval of a Secondary Plan prepared by the City are too restrictive. This is of particular concern for Cleantech Commons where there is no Secondary Plan in place.	<p>Revised Section 7.3.5 (Secondary Plans) to indicate "Where a secondary plan is required for lands within the Designated Greenfield Area, planning approvals for those lands will only be considered upon approval of a comprehensive secondary plan, prepared by the City" and allow for flexibility as opposed to requiring a secondary plan in every case.</p> <p>It is noted that CleanTech Commons is within the delineated built boundary, not the designated greenfield area.</p>

## Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
14	Students should be mentioned as a driver of Peterborough's population growth in the Context section. This section should also be reorganized to build context and hierarchy of importance when the OP is read as a whole, i.e. education/health institutions more important to the Peterborough economy than tourism.	Disagree that the order in which items appear in the Context section represent any hierarchy/ranking or importance. The context has been reorganized however into chronological order (i.e., past, present, future).
15	Revise 2.2.1 a. to include the following: "A complete community is one that meets people's needs for daily living throughout their lifetime by providing convenient access to a mix of jobs, services, housing, food, public service facilities [including education opportunities], open space, and transportation choices. Peterborough will continue to grow as a complete community by	No change recommended – it is not necessary to list one specific type of public service facility for a more concise document.
16	<p>Add the following text to Section 2.2.5 Strong and Diverse Economy:</p> <p>(a) "With respect to post-secondary education facilities, Peterborough is home to Fleming College and Trent University; both institutions are recognised globally for leadership in teaching, innovation and research. The importance of these post-secondary institutions to the city's economic prosperity and resilience is recognised within Peterborough Economic Development's 2020 – 2024 Strategic Economic Objectives; it is acknowledged that these post-secondary institutions, along with many other educational and skills training facilities in the area, favourably position the Peterborough region to take advantage of the new information, knowledge and creative economy."</p> <p>(b) "Recognising and protecting the important economic role post-secondary education institutions play within the city by establishing planning policies and regulations that give institutions the flexibility to adjust to changing programmes and technologies; to meet evolving campus and community needs; to enable opportunities to collaborate with the private sector and the municipality; and to ensure economic sustainability by pursuing alternative revenue streams where core public funding is constrained;"</p>	The approach has been to limit the amount of explanatory text to ensure a more concise document.

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
17	<p>It is noted that the forecasts are drawn from the Growth Plan Schedule 3 figures which did not factor in student population.</p> <p>We recognize that the Province's Land Needs Assessment methodology provides for 'units not occupied by usual residents' which can include students and acknowledges that in smaller communities the percentage of post-secondary student housing will be greater.</p> <p>Please can you advise how student population growth for Trent and Fleming has been factored into the OP plan making process, noting 85% of Trent students move from outside the region.</p> <p>Please can you advise how job growth/the economic role of Trent University has factored into employment growth forecasts?</p>	<p>Students are accounted in the Land Needs Assessment as units not occupied by usual residents and non-household population.</p> <p>The job growth associated with Trent University and CleanTech Commons are factored into the employment figures for population-related job growth and employment land job growth.</p> <p>Details are in the Land Needs Assessment Report.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
18	<p>Add the following text to Section 4.2.3:</p> <p>a. The Major Institutional Designation is intended for institutional uses that are of a community or regional scale. Major Institutional uses are intended to be integrated into the City fabric, and are a crucial part of a <b>complete community</b>. [Our major health and educational institutions are important employers and service providers and will continue to grow to serve the needs of an increasing city and regional population.</p> <p>c. Strong linkages between major institutions and the private sector for joint research, innovation, the creation of new products and services, and meeting of community needs will be encouraged by permitting firms to collaborate with a major institutions, research and development facilities and professional offices affiliated with, or in combination with major institutions, to locate in Major Institutional areas.</p> <p>d. Major institutions, particularly post-secondary institutions, are important both as resources and key players in a changing and increasingly information based economy. The City will support this role and will adopt land use and development controls that permit sufficient flexibility for these institutions to carry out their roles and to adjust to funding constraints, changing programmes and technologies; to meet evolving campus and community needs; to enable opportunities to collaborate with the private sector, the municipality and other governmental entities; and to ensure the economic sustainability of such institutions by accommodating the pursuit of alternative revenue streams where core public funding is constrained.]</p>	<p>Added policy text to Section 4.2.3 that “Major institutions, particularly post-secondary institutions, are important both as resources and key players in a changing and increasingly knowledge-based economy”. However, the approach has been to limit the amount of explanatory text.</p>

## Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
19	The use of Major Open Space designation is not appropriate on the privately owned TU lands, particularly along Pioneer Road as it would prevent utilization of the servicing infrastructure that was recently installed. Major Open Space designations should be removed from TU lands and the boundaries within the Schedules amended accordingly.	It is noted that these lands are designated as Major Open Space in the current Official Plan. Institutional/quasi-institutional uses (and associated accessory structures) are permitted in every designation (except the Natural Areas designation).
20	<p>Notwithstanding the comment above, does the list of permitted uses in the Major Open Space Designation appropriately include experimental/research farm and market gardens, associated facilities and services (e.g. wells, storage sheds, teaching shelters, washrooms – these uses/development should be added in to section c. ii.</p> <p>TU is considering including an indigenous traditional area south of and along Pioneer Road, with a medicine garden and a ceremonial teaching house (ranging from a natural material long house, to a larger 'off the grid' building – this would not be possible in the Open Space designation as described but would be used to teach about the land.</p> <p>4.2.4 e – would prohibit TU from developing the peninsula lands – this has consistently been identified as a development opportunity as a northern gateway to the city and should not be designated Major Open Space.</p>	<p>Institutional/quasi-institutional uses are permitted in every designation (except the Natural Areas designation).</p> <p>The northern portion of Armour Rd from Nassau Mills Rd to TAS (i.e., a portion of the peninsula lands) has been added to the Minor Mixed-Use Corridor designation. The June 19, 2019 draft Official Plan schedules did not reflect the land needs assessment – the schedules have been updated accordingly.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
21	<p>Suggested Text Amendments (to be incorporated/in lieu of at 4.6.2 b) and n)):</p> <p>“The natural heritage system is illustrated on Schedule E: Natural Heritage and Environmental Constraints; this plan indicates the approximate location of the natural heritage system boundaries, following a desk-top review.</p> <p>When development is proposed on or near lands shown as part of the natural heritage system, the proposed development’s impact on the system is to be evaluated and an impact study may be required. As part of the evaluation, the natural heritage features on or near the land in question and their location will be more precisely defined. Where development is proposed adjacent to natural features, buffer widths should be established through an impact study. Adjustments to the boundary of the Natural Areas Designation in accordance with the Level classification may be facilitated through an Environmental Impact Study without the need to amend this Plan. Where an adjustment to the boundary of the Natural Areas Designation is justified by an Environmental Impact Study and is approved by the City, in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction, the adjacent land use designation as identified on Schedule B: Land Use Plan shall apply, without the need to amend this Plan.”</p>	<p>The City seeks to protect what is important within the City of Peterborough, the proposed policy would not achieve that objective.</p> <p>Added requirement for preliminary natural heritage feature screening and requirement for EIS (in Section 7.21.2) to clearly identify and map all natural heritage features on site, including Natural Heritage System Level A, B or C features and other features.)</p>



Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
22	<p>The City of Peterborough occurs within the Growth Plan area for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019). The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019) reinforces the objectives of the PPS (MMAH 2020) and provides a framework for applying provincial initiatives at a regional scale to protect and efficiently manage finite land development resources. While the Growth Plan includes provisions for minimum vegetation protection zones (VPZs) for certain key features in Non-Settlement Areas, there are no guidelines for the designation of VPZs within Settlement Areas. Since the Growth Plan identifies substantive constraints to development through the application of VPZs within Non-Settlement Areas, the lack of prescribed VPZs within Settlement Areas provides a logical balance that allows for increased urban density. The Growth Plan provides conditions for development or site alteration within Settlement Areas and allows for site-specific adaptive management and mitigation strategies to be applied, as needed, to achieve these objectives. In the context of the City of Peterborough Draft Official Plan (2019), all lands are designated as Settlement Areas. Based on the direction provided by the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019), greater provisions for adaptive management and mitigation should be considered in Settlement Areas in order to accommodate urban intensification targets. However, guidelines for the delineation of VPZs provided in the Draft Official Plan (2019) more closely align with planning strategies applied in a Non-Settlement Area context.</p>	<p>Recognizing the critical importance of establishing VPZ that are appropriate to ensure no negative impact to natural features and functions, the City of Peterborough has taken a Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone (MVPZ) approach. This approach sets out the minimum width allowed for a VPZ based on feature type, meaning that the VPZ can exceed but not be less than the MVPZ. This allows for the incorporation of adaptive management and mitigation in the establishment of feature specific VPZ. MVPZs established in the policies of the Official Plan will not be sufficient to protect all natural heritage features and functions. There will be instances where VPZ's that exceed the minimum may be necessary allowing for the incorporation of adaptive management and mitigation options. Furthermore, for some features the range of appropriate VPZ's is so variable that setting a MVPZ is not possible without detailed studies and site specific considerations (i.e. Significant Wildlife Habitat) or input from regulatory authorities (i.e. habitat of endangered or threatened species). The overall objective is to protect natural features for the future, the City already has limited natural features and seeks to ensure that those remaining are protected for future generations to enjoy. It would be inappropriate to only provide adequate protection to natural features when they are in non-settlement areas as land development doesn't generally occur in those areas. The MVPZs applied in this Plan are very much consistent with protective buffers that have been applied in many parts of Ontario.</p>

## Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
23	It is acknowledged that these boundaries may change as more information becomes available or as natural communities regenerate. Official plan policies should indicate that more detailed assessments of natural heritage features and areas will be required to determine the location and nature of the feature or area present. Furthermore, "an official plan should acknowledge that it may not reflect the most up-to-date information on the location and boundaries of significant features that are identified or approved by MNR as set out in the PPS."	Added requirement to Section 7.21.2 (Environmental Impact Study) that an Environmental Impact Study will be required to clearly identify and map all natural heritage features on site, including Natural Heritage System Level A, B or C features and other features.
24	The City of Peterborough Draft Official Plan (2019) outlines watershed-scale policies and regulations for planning, growth, land use designations, development and infrastructure within the City. Given the high-level scope applied to the development of these policies, the Draft Official Plan (2019) is limited in its capacity to effectively define fine-scale level protections within the watershed. Therefore, the application of fine-scale protection measures should be informed by detailed studies (e.g., Environmental Impact Study) that consider both the landscape context and site-specific conditions. These detailed studies occur later in the planning process (i.e. secondary plan, block or draft plan) rather than during the Official Plan stage.	<p>Policies (not regulations) developed to achieve the objectives of the OP are applicable to the City of Peterborough and not watershed scale.</p> <p>Policies to guide the "fine-scale" protection of NH features and functions within the City are necessary to define a consistent approach to NHS management and protection. The applicability of the policies to specific lands are to be informed through detailed studies (such as an EIS).</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
25	<p>Section 4.6.1 states the following as an objective to the natural heritage system:  <i>i. "Provide opportunities for the protection from the impacts of development of all significant natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions that are of Provincial significance and additional natural areas which, in the view of the City, have local or regional significance or value in complementing the urban environment;"</i></p> <p>The City of Peterborough Draft Official Plan (2019) identifies Significant Life Science or Earth Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs) as locally or regionally significant features. Additional clarity is required with regards to Objective (i) to confirm that no additional feature types are considered locally or regionally significant in the view of the City.</p>	Regional significance has been removed from the mentioned objective.
26	<p>Proposed refinements to the City of Peterborough NHS are shown on Figure 1 (Attachment 1) and summarized in Table 1 (Attachment 2). These refinements are based on detailed background and ecological field studies conducted on the University lands to inform the Trent Lands and Nature Areas Plan.</p> <p>Key areas of concern requiring further refinement (16) identified on Figure 1 (Attachment 1) should be verified prior to the finalization of the Draft Official Plan mapping. The features identified do not align with the natural heritage feature and area boundaries, sensitivity and/or significance assessments defined through detailed studies conducted on the Trent Lands. Furthermore, given the high-level nature of the Draft Official Plan, proposed proximity linkages may not appropriately represent movement corridors on the landscape; the location of these features should be determined through feature specific evaluations.</p>	<p>In response to Figure 1 and Table 1: Colours on the Schedules have been adjusted to improve legibility. The Adjacent Lands Overlay has been removed and replaced with a requirement for a preliminary natural heritage feature screening. Reviewing, vetting and incorporating site-specific study details from individual landowners is beyond the scope of the development of the NHS mapping for the purposes of the OP. It is critical to note that the mapping is meant to be a tool for the expression of the NHS and that the ultimate identification, implementation and protection of the NHS will be determined through the OP policies. Proximity Linkages have been identified with a symbol on Schedule F to indicate the general pathway of connectivity. These symbols are not intended to represent the precise location of linkage/corridors. The exact location of corridors should be established through site-specific investigations to determine the location and dimensions best suited to the function. In instances of development</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
		<p>applications in the vicinity of Proximity Linkages (and Regional Connections) connectivity solutions should be determined based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge of the species present and likely to use a connection in a given landscape;</li><li>• Review of the most current data of habitat needs and mobility of those species in the context of the landscape matrix (i.e., agricultural versus urban landscapes which have significantly different opportunities and constraints in their ability to support biota);</li><li>• Analysis of the most suitable linkage options available in a given landscape; and</li><li>• Consideration for the minimum requirements of the selected species and/or those with the broadest needs.</li></ul>
27	<p>The Adjacent Lands Overlay depicted on Schedule E of the City of Peterborough Draft Official Plan (2019) delineates a 120 m setback from the boundary of the Natural Areas Designation and is intended to act as a trigger for the completion of an Environmental Impact Study (EIS). Savanta agrees that this is a standard approach to defining the need for an EIS. However, the Adjacent Lands Overlay has been mapped in a manner which may allow this layer to be misinterpreted as a constraint. Savanta would recommend that the Draft Official Plan (2019) acknowledge that associated ecological functions and linkages may be present on these lands, and that these lands may not contain constraints to future land use.</p>	<p>Removed the Adjacent Lands Overlay framework and mapping and replaced with the requirement for a preliminary natural heritage feature screening.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
28	<p><b>Level A Features</b></p> <p>Although the PPS (MMAH 2020) permits development and site alteration, subject to demonstration through an appropriate study that no negative impacts shall occur, development and site alteration within significant woodlands, significant valleylands, SWH in natural features and significant ANSIs (considered Level A) through the City of Peterborough Draft Official Plan (2019) is prohibited. Considerations for net gain and no negative impacts are deferred to Level B features. Therefore, the policies of the Draft Official Plan (2019) are more restrictive than provincial guidelines and have the potential to limit growth opportunities within the City of Peterborough, especially where SWH criteria for significance, as presented in the provincial Ecoregion Criteria Schedules (MNR 2015), may be vague or unclear. Savanta recommends that the permitted uses within Level A features be refined to allow development and site alteration where it can be demonstrated that no negative impacts to natural features or their ecological functions will occur in order to remain consistent with the policy direction provided within the PPS (MMAH 2020), especially as it pertains to SWH.</p>	<p>Municipalities can elect to go beyond the provincial minimums, as authorized under the PPS and in the Planning Act. Based on the objective to Provide protection from the impacts of development on natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions that are of Provincial significance and additional natural areas which, in the view of the City, have local importance or value in complementing the urban environment the City of Peterborough has decided to extend protections beyond the provincial guidelines for certain NH features and functions.</p> <p>With regards to SWH, the manner in which significant wildlife habitat has been incorporated in the City of Peterborough NHS has relied on the guidance of the Significant Wildlife Habitat Ecoregion 6E Criteria (OMNR 2015) developed by the Province but viewed through a “made in Peterborough” lens to ensure it is relevant and applicable to the context of the City. These criteria are provided in Appendix A of the NHS Background Report.</p> <p>Added policy text to provide exemption for development and site alteration in fish habitat and/or the habitat of endangered species and/or the habitat of threatened species in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
29	<p><b>Level B Features</b></p> <p>Development and site alteration proposed within Level B features must address impacts and compensation from a no negative impact perspective. However, no negative impact often prohibits the disturbance/removal of natural features while a no net negative impact approach allows for compensation and mitigation opportunities to be considered. A no net negative impact approach may also be more applicable in an urban systems-based management context by balancing growth potential with opportunities to enhance the robustness and connectivity of high-value features within the NHS.</p> <p>Savanta recommends that phrasing within the Draft Official Plan (2019) referring to no negative impact be adjusted to state no net negative impact in order to permit flexibility in compensation, mitigation and avoidance efforts. No negative impact is the test of the PPS (MMAH 2020), while no net negative impact includes the opportunity for the replication of features and functions elsewhere. Net negative impact is the accumulation of all tenets of the impact assessment hierarchy: avoidance, mitigation and compensation.</p>	<p>It is the intent of the City that Level B features are preserved (while allowing limited flexibility when no negative impact is anticipated). This reflects the PPS process where “no negative impact” is permitted (for example on significant valleylands) while no development is permitted on the lands with the highest level of protection (for example significant wetlands). It is Level C features that permit the level of flexibility proposed by Savanta.</p> <p>It is also worth noting the kind of features that comprise this Level. It includes wetlands 0.5 ha (or 0.2 with other attributes), woodlands 0.2 ha, valleylands, local ANSIs, natural waterbodies and significant wildlife habitat. All of these are important features in the City of Peterborough.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, per Section 4.6.2: Where a negative impact is unavoidable within a Level B Natural Heritage System feature, then the City at its sole discretion, and in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction, may accept a compensatory mitigation approach.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
30	<p>Schedule E (Natural Heritage and Environmental Constraints) of the Draft Official Plan (2019) identifies natural areas and environmental constraints within the City of Peterborough. Areas defined as Level A, Level B and Level C features have not been distinguished. With regards to Level B features, those features that have been mapped by regulatory authorities (e.g., MNRF), including wetlands, ANSIs and waterbodies, should be included in the NHS mapped within the Draft Official Plan (2019). However, where the presence of Level B features, such as SWH within semi-natural features, has not been confirmed, these features should be omitted from the Official Plan mapping.</p>	<p>There are no ANSIs currently within the city boundary. The Natural Areas shown on Schedule E (now Schedule F) are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of all natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions. Certain components lend themselves to being expressed in a mapping better than others. Some features (Level A and B woodlands, wetland and watercourses) can be identified through aerial photo interpretation, background resources, and roadside surveys. Whereas other components (significant wildlife habitat, threatened or endangered species habitat, ephemeral drainage features) require site specific investigations and/or studies to identify and are therefore difficult to delineate within the context of the Official Plan Update. More importantly, they change over time, even over short time frames. These items do not lend themselves for mapping as part of the Natural Areas as shown on Schedule F. Some can not be shared in a public form due to feature sensitivity (e.g., the location of a sensitive endangered species). It is important to note that the mapping is meant to be a tool for the expression of the NHS and that the ultimate identification, implementation and protection of the NHS will be determined through the OP policies.</p>



## Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
31	<b>Level C Features</b> It is unclear how the replication of Level C functions elsewhere in the City would provide supporting functions as they relate to the NHS. Replication efforts should include consideration of local features and associated functions if replicated functions are intended to continue to support natural heritage areas within the subwatershed, not broadly throughout the City. Accordingly, if local features and functions are not proposed to be factored into replication efforts (i.e., replication can be carried out anywhere in the City) then the value of replicated Level C functions to the NHS is unclear.	The location for replication of Level C functions will be determined based on the function provided by the feature as determined through detailed study.
32	With regards to Level C SWH, artificial features do not meet the definition of habitat types to be considered for the assessment of SWH according to the Significant Wildlife Eco-Region Schedules for Eco-Region 6E, with the exception of rocky island or peninsula Colonially – Nesting Breeding Bird Habitat. If SWH identified within Level C is referring to this feature type only, this should be clearly stated within the Draft Official Plan (2019). Otherwise, SWH within or associated with artificial features should be removed from the features designated for Level C protection.	Revised definition of significant wildlife habitat and removed this feature from the Level C framework.
33	It is unclear whether Level C features have been included in the Draft Official Plan mapping of the NHS. However, given the subjectivity and level of detailed associated with evaluating these feature types, Savanta recommends that Level C features be excluded from the natural areas identified on Schedule E (Natural Heritage and Environmental Constraints) until such time as these features can be appropriately assessed.	See response to Comment #30 related to features mapped on Schedule F: Natural Heritage System and Environmental Constraints.



Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
34	<p><b>Wetlands</b></p> <p>Savanta recommends that the definition of Non-Provincially Significant Wetlands be revised in accordance with guidance provided by the OWES Manual (MNR 2014). Non-Provincially Significant Wetland features should include wetlands greater than or equal to 2 ha, or wetlands greater than or equal to 0.5 ha that provide an important ecological benefit. Subject to an OWES evaluation to confirm the presence/absence of significant and/or sensitive habitat, these features may be removed. For features less than 0.5 hectares in size, documentation and rationale for the inclusion of vegetation communities should be provided and these features must support a highly specialized plant community. It is unclear if wetlands less than 0.5 hectares in size have been included in the draft mapping for the NHS. As previously noted for Level B features, for non-provincially significant wetlands only those features that have been confirmed on the landscape through mapping provided by regulatory authorities (e.g., MNR, Land Information Ontario) should be included in the Draft Official Plan mapping.</p>	<p>Definition of non-PSWs has been updated as follows –</p> <p>Non-Provincially Significant Wetlands</p> <p>Wetlands that are evaluated using the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) and confirmed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry to not be provincially significant. This may be because they were evaluated and do not score sufficient points or because they were purposefully not included in an OWES evaluation.</p> <p>See response to Comment #30 related to features mapped on Schedule F: Natural Heritage System and Environmental Constraints.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
35	<p><b>Level A Woodlands</b></p> <p>The application of these criteria for the determination of a Level A woodland is not consistent with the recommendations presented in the NHRM (MNR 2010). As suggested in the Draft Table prepared by Beacon: City of Peterborough: Preliminary Natural Heritage System Components and Level Definitions, the current percentage of woodland cover in the City of Peterborough is approximately 15.86%. As per the NHRM (Table 7.2), where woodland cover is between 15% to 30% of the land cover, woodlands greater than or equal to 20 ha in size should be considered significant. Based on the guidance provided within the NHRM (MNR 2010), Savanta would recommend that the City apply the NHRM (MNR 2010) woodland size criteria (&gt;20 ha) for the designation of significant woodlands under the Draft Official Plan (2019).</p> <p>In addition, the proposed application of a 0.5 ha threshold for woodland significance due to the presence of other factors is overly cautious and does not address potential functions and features associated with the woodland. In most cases, woodlands less than 0.5 ha in size provide little ecological benefit to a NHS and do not support interior woodland habitat (&gt;100 m from the forest edge).</p>	<p>The NHRM is not a policy document, it is intended to provide guidance and the province recognises that municipalities can develop their own approaches that make sense for their community.</p> <p>The City of Peterborough is committed to increase woodland cover over time, and at a minimum the maintenance of woodland cover. Accordingly, the protection of significant woodlands has been elevated above the requirements of the PPS. Area thresholds based on patch size analysis were incorporated in the development of the significance criteria that reflect existing woodland cover within the City of Peterborough.</p> <p>An important tenant in the management of biodiversity is that any given jurisdiction must act to address that which lies within its own jurisdiction. Accordingly, the City of Peterborough seeks to maintain and enhance its woodland cover over time.</p>

## Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
36	<p><b>Level B Woodlands</b></p> <p>Size criteria for Level B features do not consider stem density or basal area criteria that are often applied to the evaluation of smaller woodlots. Preventing development and site alteration within these small features without regard for the quality and function of habitat does not align with provincial objectives to direct development to suitable areas (PPS 2020). It is recommended that this broad definition be refined to include more specific woodland quality information and not simply the minimum size requirement. In addition, should Level A criteria for the designation of significant woodlands be refined based on the NHRM (MNR 2010), the size threshold for the subsequently lower percentage of woodland cover may be applied as the size criteria for Level B woodlands (e.g., Level A: 20 ha, Level B: 4 ha as per NHRM woodland size criteria). Clarity on whether these features have been mapped on Schedule B would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Policies of the OP for Level B woodlands do not prevent development and site alteration. Per Section 4.6.2: Where a negative impact is unavoidable within a Level B Natural Heritage System feature, then the City at its sole discretion, and in consultation with the Conservation Authority and any other agency having jurisdiction, may accept a compensatory mitigation approach. Where compensatory mitigation is proposed, development and site alteration will only be considered if it can be demonstrated that a net gain of Natural Heritage System function will be achieved through compensation (e.g., replacement, restoration, and/or enhancement) as well as conformity with Provincial and Federal policies/regulations.</p> <p>See response to Comment #35 related to size criteria for woodland level categorization.</p>
37	<p><b>Level C Woodlands</b></p> <p>Level C woodlands are identified as Non-Provincially Significant Woodlands that are less than 0.2 ha in area. The evaluation criteria (Table 7-2; MNR 2010) used to define a woodland patch less than 0.2 ha in size are unclear and there appears to be little value in replicating a woodland feature that does not meet significance criteria and provides little to no ecological value to the NHS.</p> <p>Savanta recommends that the designation of Level C woodlands be refined in accordance with the recommendations provided for Level A and Level B woodlands (e.g., Level B: 4 ha, Level C: 2 ha as per NHRM woodland size criteria). Clarity on whether Level C woodlands have been mapped on Schedule B would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Woodlands have been removed from the list of Level C NHS features and the definition of woodlands has been revised as woodlands greater than 0.2 hectares.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
38	<p><b>Proximity Linkages</b></p> <p>Based on the information provided within the Draft Official Plan (2019), proximity linkages have been identified solely based on a 60 m separation between natural heritage features with no justification for this linkage length provided. The proposed 60 m distance is in excess of the suggested proximity linkage used to assess ecological connections when assessing significant woodland features (i.e., 20 m) within the NHRM (MNR 2010). In addition, the application of a 60 m linkage distance would result in the capture of unnecessary and anthropogenic features.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that linkage assessments be required as a component of secondary plans or detailed site-specific studies rather than mapped at the Official Plan stage. It is proposed that linkages defined by the Draft Official Plan (2019), and as shown in mapping (i.e. Schedule E), be removed.</p>	<p>The 60 metre approach has been applied elsewhere/other municipalities and also reflects overlapping feature buffers (in some circumstances). It is an appropriate scale to use on the landscape of the City given the relatively built out nature and roadway pattern of the City. Proximity linkages are identified only where there is a functional linkage (i.e., free of barriers) present.</p> <p>The linkages shown on the schedule are meant to indicate the general pathway of connectivity. These symbols are not intended to represent the precise location of linkage/corridors. The exact location of corridors should be established through site specific investigation to determine the location and dimensions best suited to the function.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
39	<p>Buffer criteria should consider landscape elements and site-specific conditions, in conjunction with alternative mitigation strategies, to provide the most effective protection to natural heritage features and their associated functions. Although buffers can help serve to conserve biodiversity and species at risk, enhance water quantity/quality attenuation and improvement, moderate microclimate (including cooling, shading), protect against human influences (access, noise, dumping of refuse), provide bank stabilization, limit species invasions into core areas, etc., the application of standard linear buffers as the primary or sole mitigation tool to protect sensitive features may be less effective than a combination of mitigation techniques. This approach may blend buffer objectives with objectives related to connectivity and restoration and therefore must also consider the size and character of the VPZ.</p> <p>A more comprehensive approach to the delineation of the VPZ would consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Area-based buffers;</li><li>• Functional buffers; and</li><li>• Linear buffers.</li></ul> <p>Generally, these prescribed minimum buffer widths do not apply to Urban Areas, as higher population densities are encouraged to reduce the amount of greenfield land required to support development, and to allow municipalities to achieve targets identified in the Growth Plan. Site and hazard specific studies are often required to adequately establish and refine buffers. Therefore, many low-tier authorities and regulatory agencies align policies more closely with scientific literature, which bases buffer widths on site-specific conditions.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #22.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
40	<p>As per Section 13.5.4.2 of the NHRM (MNR 2010), buffers are a mechanism for softening or reducing impacts to natural heritage features, however, the function and value of ecological buffers varies by feature type and the proposed adjacent land use. As such, it is recommended that buffers be refined through detailed studies informed by the nature of the proposed land use change and the extent of potential impacts in order to demonstrate no negative impacts to natural features or their ecological functions. In this regard, the application of a minimum VPZ may not align with a systems-based approach to the protection of natural features and functions.</p> <p>Though minimum VPZs are often prescribed in an effort to prevent reduced buffer widths, it is recommended that the City of Peterborough consider removing the table of proposed buffer widths entirely from the Draft Official Plan. Instead, consider incorporating provisions to permit the implementation of innovative alternative mitigation measures to supplement the VPZ. A systems-based approach that uses science-based drivers to guide the final adjustment of buffer boundaries within the VPZ is recommended. This approach will appropriately identify boundaries through baseline studies conducted at later phases of the planning process such as at draft plan stage, and apply an impact assessment-based approach to design and refinement decisions. The identification of impacts of concern at the onset of project planning in later planning phases, through an appropriate environmental study such as an EIS, will help to ensure that the selected mitigation strategies will effectively perform their intended function. This approach will offer a higher degree of precision in the delineation of ecological buffers and a higher degree of confidence that biological diversity and ecological function will be preserved and enhanced. The proposed approach is intended to improve land use planning decisions by accurately capturing the flexibility of buffer boundaries in order to accommodate necessary urban land use changes and achieve long-term protection of native biodiversity.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #22.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
41	<p><b>Dedication Policies</b></p> <p>As described in the Draft Official Plan (2019): "lands within the natural area designation may be dedicated to the City or other public authority, subject to the approval of the City, without cost and shall not be considered part of the required parkland dedication." Although it is acknowledged that there is usually no cost associated with the dedication, the value of these features should be acknowledged and factored into compensation discussions, including alternative forms of value such as carbon credits.</p>	<p>Per Section 7.12 (Parkland Dedication) has been amended in accordance with the Planning Act and included a policy that "the City's Parkland Dedication By-law may include, but shall not be limited to, provisions for: ii. The identification of uses, or categories of uses that may be eligible for a waiver, or reductions to parkland dedication requirements.</p>
42	<p>Given that no Secondary Plan is currently in place, it is recommended that the Cleantech Commons be afforded a Special Policy Area designation under the Draft Official Plan (2019) in consideration of the range of permitted uses required to support this initiative. Further, a provision for 30 m wetland VPZ, green buffers and landscape buffers was included in the CleanTech Commons block under the Master Plan. It is requested that the agreed upon buffers also be reflected in the Draft Official Plan (2019).</p>	<p>The proposed Major Institutional designation permits a range of land uses that are complementary to the university. Policy language has been added to Section 4.6.2 (Natural Areas Designation) to acknowledge existing planning approvals.</p>

Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
43	<p><b>Definitions</b></p> <p>Several definitions within the Draft Official Plan (2019) provide language that is not consistent with the PPS (MMAH 2020) and reference federal legislation where it is not applicable to provincial interests, except in the case of aquatic species. Examples of such include the definitions of Endangered Species, Threatened Species and Habitat of Endangered or Threatened Species. Should the intent of these definitions be to carry weight for federally listed species on Schedule 1 to address the inclusion of protection for aquatic species only, this should be clarified as the intent.</p> <p>Threatened or Endangered species are defined through the Draft Official Plan (2019) as species that are listed or categorized on the official provincial Species at Risk list or on Schedule 1 of the federal Species at Risk Act. This definition is not consistent with the PPS (2020), which includes species on the Species at Risk in Ontario List only; the federal Species at Risk Act does not apply for the purposes of the PPS (MMAH 2020). The inclusion of federally listed species in the definition of Habitat of Threatened or Endangered species within the Draft Official Plan (2019) is inappropriate unless there are other protections (e.g., federal land) in place that would prohibit the removal, disturbance or destruction of habitat.</p> <p>Additionally, the definition of Fish and Fish Habitat may more appropriately include reference to the governing federal Fisheries Act given that the Draft Official Plan (2019) uses this Act to guide the removal of Level A Fish Habitat.</p>	<p>Federal SARA applies on non-federal lands to aquatic species and migratory birds species listed as threatened or endangered on Schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act. It also applies to all species listed as threatened or endangered on Schedule 1 on federal lands (i.e. Trent Severn-Waterway). The definition of Habitat of Endangered or Threatened Species has been revised: "A) Habitat for species listed as endangered or threatened on the Species at Risk in Ontario Regulation 230/08 (under the Endangered Species Act, 2007) and/or B) Habitat for aquatic species or migratory birds species listed as threatened or endangered on Schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act on non-federal lands.</p> <p>Added reference of the Fisheries Act to the definition of Fish Habitat: "[As defined under the Fisheries Act,] means spawning grounds and any other areas, including nursery, rearing, food supply, and migration areas on which fish depend directly or indirectly in order to carry out their life processes."</p>



Trent University/Bousfields Inc./Savanta		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
44	<p>Most concerning is the draft Schedule E (Natural Heritage and Environmental Constraints), wherein many features have been identified as part of the NHS that may not exhibit characteristics that would prohibit development as per the PPS (MMAH, 2020) or the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (NHRM; MNR 2010). It is possible that rationale for the development of the mapping presented in Schedule E is provided in Appendix I (The Natural Heritage System Background Study), however this appendix has not been made available for review in concert with the Draft Official Plan (2019).</p>	<p>As with any large-scale mapping projects, the mapping shown on Schedule E (now schedule F) will need to be verified based on site-specific information. However, it is important to note that it is the principles of the NHS and the criteria used to identify the components that is the final determinant of whether or not any particular area is part of the NHS and protected through the policies of the City of Peterborough Official Plan. It is also important to note that the NHRM provides only guidance and suggestions. Municipalities can elect to go beyond the provincial minimums, as authorized under the PPS and in the Planning Act. NHS features mapped do not necessarily prohibit development as the NHS includes a multi-level approach to defining the features of the City of Peterborough NHS which considered the sensitivity, significance (including provincial significance), and function of the NHS components. This approach allowed for natural heritage features to be incorporated into the NHS in a way that is reflective of their current form and function, ties into the intent of the Official Plan, and allows a policy framework that considers each of the levels separately.</p>

Trent University Natural Areas Committee

Trent University Natural Areas Committee		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	We recommend that the extent of the Natural Areas as defined in the City of Peterborough Schedules be updated to include the full extent of the Trent University Nature Areas.	The Natural Areas shown on Schedule E are not intended to represent an exhaustive inventory of all natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions within the City of Peterborough. Certain components lend themselves to being expressed in a mapping better than others. Some features (Level A and B woodlands, wetland and watercourses) can be identified through aerial photo interpretation, background resources, and roadside surveys. Whereas other components (Significant Wildlife Habitat, threatened or endangered species habitat, ephemeral drainage features) require site specific investigations and/or studies to identify and are therefore difficult to delineate within the context of the Official Plan Update. More importantly, they change over time, even over short time frames. These items do not lend themselves for mapping as part of the Natural Areas as shown on Schedule E. Some can not be shared in a public form due to feature sensitivity (e.g., the location of a sensitive endangered species). It is important to note that the mapping is meant to be a tool for the expression of the NHS and that the ultimate identification, implementation and protection of the NHS will be determined through the OP policies.
2	We recommend that the Trent Nature Areas extent be designated Natural Areas Designation, to offer those areas the greater protection that comes with the Natural Areas Designation.	See response above to comment #1 above.

Trent University Natural Areas Committee		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	We recommend that the Trent Nature Areas be set to Natural Areas Designation "Level A", which offers the highest protection.	Natural Area Designation Level A is intended to be applied to features or functions described in Policy 4.6.2. Portions of the Trent Nature Areas that contain features or support functions of Level A will be protected in accordance with the policies of the plan. Features or functions with the Trent Nature Areas that are described in policies 4.6.2 will receive the corresponding levels of protection as identified in the plan. In many cases detailed studies will be necessary to determine the function of an area and delineate the extent of the feature to determine the appropriate level designation.
4	We request and recommend that permitted uses be limited to the list in 4.6.2 section d: conservation, trails and recreation, and buildings only in support of recreational uses and erosion control.	No changes recommended – intent is that additional uses may be contemplated where the requirements of the Plan are met.
5	We recommend that the Peterborough Official Plan incorporates this criterion [no net loss of wetland function] for determining the minimum vegetation protection zones for wetlands in the Trent Nature Areas. These buffers would help to protect the integrity of the Natural Areas.	Existing draft Official Plan does this - Policy 4.6.2 speaks to the need for vegetation protection zones to protect ecological and hydrological function of the feature. Policy 4.6.2 also requires an EIS to determine the extent of the minimum vegetation protection zones based on the function of the feature. The intent is that vegetation protection zones are not predetermined however a minimum is identified in Table A. The appropriate vegetation protection zone will need to be determined through site specific studies and not be less than the minimum in Table A.
6	We recommend that work should be done to attempt to strengthen connections both between each of the Trent Nature Areas and between Trent Nature Areas and surrounding natural regions. These connections will encourage help support the persistence of native biological communities. This need for connectivity aligns well with the goals of Section 2.2.2 a. iii. of the Proposed Official Plan and 6.1.2(i).	No change necessary. When the new Official Plan is in-effect, decisions with respect to the University lands will address the in-force policies.

Trent University Natural Areas Committee		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	We recommend an examination of options for protecting the Trent Nature Areas in perpetuity, recognizing the important role that Trent Nature Areas play in a. providing a large proportion of the City of Peterborough's current forest cover (see 5.4.5.b), and, b. providing essential ecosystem services to the City of Peterborough.	The protection of natural heritage features and areas are contemplated in Section 4.6.2.

Unitarian Fellowship of Peterborough

Unitarian Fellowship of Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	Ask representative from the local First Nations for input into the Context and Visions sections and be guided by their input.	Revisions have been completed in consultation with Treaty 20 First Nations.
2	Expand the Context by naming the reality of the treaty process that is an essential part of context/history of this region and the subsequent impact on First Nations as treaties were ignored and/or violated. Include a deeper acknowledgement of the pain of broken relationships and a commitment for action toward Indigenous-settler relationship-building.	Input from Treaty 20 First Nations has been integrated.
3	In the Vision, include reconciliation with the First Peoples of this territory.	Input from Treaty 20 First Nations has been integrated. There is no discussion of the Vision section in comments provided by the Treaty 20 First Nations.

Unitarian Fellowship of Peterborough		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
4	Include the requirement that, in the early planning stages of projects that impact Natural Heritage Systems, the City will access Traditional Ecological Knowledge and consult with local First Nations and community members.	<p>Under this Plan, Peterborough will continue efforts to engage with local and regional Indigenous Communities on protocols for land use and development approvals. This approach will balance the growth and development requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement while acknowledging the traditional knowledge and cultural heritage of the Treaty 20 First Nations and other Indigenous Communities.</p> <p>Section 7.1 states that the City acknowledges the value of the traditional knowledge and cultural heritage of Indigenous Communities and will encourage further partnerships to achieve the objectives of this Plan, support mutual learning and understanding and strengthen relationships. Involvement and engagement with Indigenous Communities will occur as early as reasonably possible on future planning proposals. Further, Section 4.6.2 states that the City may “Work with other levels of government, the Conservation Authority, local First Nations and the community to gather data on natural heritage features and their associated ecological functions and support education, outreach and landowner stewardship programs.”</p>
5	Use stronger language that provides specific direction to City staff. For example, rather than 'intends to continue' or 'continue efforts', make consultations and engagement a requirement, as in "The City will not make decisions without consultation with, and/or the approval of, the First Nations communities who would be affected by those decisions."	<p>Stronger language has been adopted within Section 7.1 in response to comments made by Treaty 20 First Nations.</p>

## Unitarian Fellowship of Peterborough

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
6	Recognize and address the significant component of Peterborough/Nogojwanong's residents who are Indigenous and have specific needs, whether these be artistic, housing, ceremonial or otherwise.	The Guiding Principles speaks to providing opportunities for Indigenous placemaking and working with Indigenous communities to celebrate and commemorate Indigenous history and/or culture in public spaces. The approach has been to avoid demographic-specific housing policies.
7	In the acknowledgement (section 7.1.b), acknowledge our obligation to protect and uphold the Constitutionally protected rights of the First People of this land and our commitment to protect and uphold these rights.	Revised Section 7.1 to acknowledge rights.
8	Establish an Indigenous Council to advise City staff and council, with appropriate responsibilities and processes to be taken seriously.	This is outside the scope of the Official Plan and more appropriately dealt with by the City and First Nation Councils.
9	Provide a more diligent, funded program to incorporate the Ojibwe language in visible ways throughout the city, including informal (and formal) use of "Nogojwanong" as our city's name.	This is generally acknowledged in the City's Naming Policy.
10	Require cross-cultural training and learning for city staff, with an invitation to participate in that training to business owners, service providers, and the average citizen as well.	It is not appropriate for the Official Plan to speak to corporate training opportunities and the Official Plan does not preclude the adoption of such training.

YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish

YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish		
#	Comment/Question	City’s Response / What We Did
1	<p><b>Strengthen Indigenous Consultation and Public Engagement</b></p> <p>We value the fact that the OP recognizes that Peterborough is "[p]art of the traditional territory of the Michi Saagiig and Chippewa Nations" and commits to continue working "on building a new relationship with the diverse Indigenous peoples who call Peterborough home," in the spirit of reconciliation. We also appreciate the acknowledgment of the need for "free, prior and informed consent" as laid out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. We feel, however, that this opportunity for supporting right relationships based on respect and shared power is often qualified, yet not systematically woven into the OP.</p>	<p>Relevant policies have been revised in consultation with Treaty 20 First Nations.</p>
2	<p>Establishing an Indigenous Council would ensure that Indigenous protocols are thoroughly followed and Indigenous residents are fully integrated into any future plans. Another avenue to strengthen this commitment is by offering cross-cultural training for all city staff, council members as well as community members involved in committees, as the TRC and others have recommended. Being essential to strengthening relationships, traditional knowledge needs to be valued and well understood by all involved. These approaches need to be further explored with local Indigenous communities.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of the Official Plan and more appropriately dealt with by the City and First Nation Councils.</p>



## YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
3	Indigenous Consultation and Public Engagement can be mutually reinforced by moving beyond consultation as an aspiration and actually entrenching public engagement as a core guiding principle of the OP. It would follow the recognition that public wisdom, just like traditional knowledge, is a valuable resource, which, once meaningfully sought after, will be beneficial to city staff, council and our community at large.	Section 2.2.3 of the Guiding Principles states that the City will involve residents, Indigenous communities and stakeholders in the decision-making process through continuous, mutually respectful, meaningful and inclusive engagement. Further, Section 7.2 provides direction with regards to community engagement and public consultation. The objectives to this section state to progressively seek input from residents, agencies, and other stakeholders on planning matters and provide equitable opportunity for a wide demographic to be informed and involved on planning matters.
4	Meaningful engagement could also benefit from the adoption of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) framework. The values and approaches adopted by the City will need to go beyond the ones identified in the Planning Act and other legal procedures. Since timing is essential to community consultations, any information would have to be shared early, fully and in a transparent fashion. The consultation process will need to take place prior to any decision. Advisory committees with significant public presence will also be critical. Clear expectations of public input and influence, woven into every aspect of OP processes and based on the involvement of community organizations and committees in supporting decision-making will also provide a clear sign that we are entering a new culture of engagement and meaningful community input.	<p>The City may develop public engagement framework/guidelines that are guided by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) framework. These guidelines may be developed outside of the Official Plan. However, Section 7.2 (Public Consultation and Community Engagement) provides direction.</p> <p>Further to the response to comment #3 above, Section 7.2 states that community engagement will take place early in the planning process and on a continual basis as practical and appropriate.</p>

YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish		
#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
5	<p><b>Elaborate Background, Opportunities and Priorities</b></p> <p>As it currently stands, the OP does not fully reflect the social, environmental, and economic context in which we find ourselves, or to where we need to move. Peterborough is at a critical point in its history due to poverty, homelessness, opioid and drug crisis, climate crisis, our aging population and unmet youth needs. How can the OP ensure that the health of our community is brought to the forefront of planning and needed directions are set out from the beginning? We feel that it is essential to prioritize housing, build more community and neighbourhood connectivity, encourage active transportation; address social isolation, and facilitate more connections with nature, and other environmental actions. The OP offers an opportunity, not yet fully realized, for tapping into our collective wisdom and priorities and to prevent further entrenchment of existing challenges.</p>	<p>Revised Context section to speak to future challenges. The draft Official Plan does address objectives and improvements towards housing, community and neighbourhood connectivity, active transportation, social inclusion, connections with nature and other environmental actions.</p>
6	<p><b>Translate Principles into Implementation</b></p> <p>The principles outlined in the OP are critical but we feel that the way they are expressed in policies is too weak. In particular, the language used around the principles and actions is often not strong enough. Language is key. It shapes our thoughts and guides our action. We fear that where language is more discretionary, actions will not be as fully or as quickly implemented as in the areas where language is stronger. In fact, this may lead to some areas potentially taking over other important needs.</p> <p>To address this challenge we recommend adopting multiple lenses on all policies, and strengthen wording used (adopting "will," rather than "may") throughout, and especially in the section focusing on Principles, as well as in the non-Growth sections such as Land Use Designations and Community Development. Participants also identified the need for clear definitions/ terms as well as references. In addition, new targets across all themes need to be integrated. Right now, most targets focus on growth management. For example, we would like to see targets advancing heritage recognition, poverty reduction and environment, among others.</p>	<p>The specific language used throughout the policies of this Plan is intentional and indicates the level of flexibility, or lack thereof, that exists in implementing this Plan.</p>

## YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
7	We also feel that it is key to articulate ways in which these principles will be translated into implementation. In particular, we noted the need for monitoring and evaluation of progress over time. This approach will also offer an avenue to correct and/or adjust directions over time, if they are no longer following the plan as initially outlined.	Added text to Section 2.1 (Vision Statement) to clarify that the policies of the Official Plan have been developed to work together to achieve the Vision and Guiding Principles and Section 7.3.2 (Monitoring) to indicate that the results from monitoring activities may be used to inform future policy direction and updates to the Official Plan.
8	<p><b>Promote Justice, Equity and Inclusivity</b></p> <p>This theme resonated throughout our conversations. We identified the need to bring a strong Equity and Inclusion Lens to consider the impact the OP will have upon groups of people who are most at risk of exclusion. This Lens will also need to adopt a clear intersectional perspective able to articulate the connections between poverty, racism, colonialism and sexism in particular, to ensure that the Plan will ultimately foster an inclusive and accessible city for all, including the non-humans within our environment.</p> <p>To that effect we suggest that the OP strengthens community building and reconciliation (as mentioned previously), by integrating opportunities for community hubs and centres, building neighbourhood connections, while also offering avenues to boost easy access to parks.</p>	<p>The Guiding Principles speaks to supporting a high quality of life by encouraging initiatives that improve social equity.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan does provide direction for the location of community hubs and improving connectivity.</p>

## YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
8	<p><b>Emphasize Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>For several decades now, our community has been facing a crisis in housing. Yet housing is central to people's health and well-being. While the OP identifies the need for affordable housing, this issue is not given strong enough priority. The recently released <i>Housing is Fundamental 2019</i> stipulates that Peterborough needs "[a]n Official Plan that provides a vision and directions committed to housing affordability for renters and owners." We recommend that the ratio for affordable housing be raised to 15% and that this rate is reassessed at the next comprehensive review in 10 years. Affordable housing needs to be incorporated into and across most projects. We also identified the opportunity to develop a community trust as a tool to acquire and use land for furthering our collective capacity to boost affordable housing and other community benefits. In addition, the OP needs to identify and prioritize resources for community-based solutions such as co-operatives, community land trusts, and Peterborough housing projects. The OP can also address limitations in availability of upper storey spaces downtown and put a cap on housing starts every second or so year, if the 15% target has not been achieved, so as not to overly unbalance the unmet target over time.</p>	<p>Affordable housing target has been increased from 10% to 20%. Section 5.2.4 (Accessible, Assisted and Affordable Housing) also states that the City will strive to achieve the targets for the provision of affordable housing identified in the Housing and Homelessness Plan.</p> <p>The Planning Act requires that the Official Plan be reviewed in 10 years after the new Official Plan comes into effect and every 5 years thereafter.</p>
10	<p><b>Support Artists' Roles and Cultural Districts</b></p> <p>Cultural districts and artists play a key role in enhancing the local vitality and economy of a community. The lack of recognition for this role means that artists are often under valued and poorly supported. Consequently, artists tend to live on limited incomes even though they support other businesses. The OP offers yet another opportunity to address this issue by exploring more avenues to establish appropriate studios and working spaces for artists and support a vibrant art scene. This is the reason why we need to designate cultural districts in the Central Area that will facilitate the development of working spaces as well as facilitate the establishment of creative worker-centred housing forms, support arts groups and enable the cultural community to advance heritage sites.</p>	<p>Artisan studios are a permitted use within residential designation, Central Area (Downtown Core Area, Business District, Industrial Conversion Area, Downtown Neighbourhood Designations) and Employment Lands designation. A cultural district may be considered through CIP and/or update through Central Master Plan/Secondary plan.</p>

## YWCA Peterborough Haliburton and Nourish

#	Comment/Question	City's Response / What We Did
11	<p><b>Focus on Complete Communities, Sustainability and Intensification</b></p> <p>The final theme that resonated among participants was the need to ensure that the plan focuses even more on Complete Communities and Intensification. Growth seems to take centre-stage. It dominates the first discussion in the Plan and many policy sections. While it is a necessary component of the document, it does not reflect residents' first priority- neither for content, development or use of resources. In fact, our conversation highlighted the fact that growth needs to have more of a focus on sustainability and intensification (i.e. more people in the existing build area and corridors). This approach will enable a more complete, resilient community and ensures that natural systems will be better protected.</p>	<p>Complete communities and intensification objectives are considered throughout the Official Plan. Further, Section 3.2 states that all planning approvals will be undertaken in a financially responsible and environmentally sustainable manner that matches the growth, intensification and density targets of this Plan. Natural heritage systems are protected according to the Natural Areas designation policies regardless.</p>
12	<p>The OP needs to embody the intensification target for the built area at 60% (whereas it is currently proposed at 50%), to save on infrastructure costs, reduce property taxes, support more local businesses downtown and in Multiple Use Corridors, facilitate more active transportation and environmental design, pave less open spaces, support artists and cultural venues, and foster commercial nodes and smaller geographies for neighbourhood grocery stores.</p>	<p>The 50% intensification rate currently stated in the draft Official Plan is a minimum target. Exceeding the target is permitted where sufficient infrastructure capacity and transportation can be supported (noting also that the minimum target in the current Official Plan City has not prevented the City from going over and above the prescribed target in previous years).</p>



## What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

City of Peterborough Official Plan Update

September 2021

## 1.0 Introduction

This is a summary of questions and comments received at the online public information sessions held on September 1 and 2, 2021 to discuss the final draft Official Plan and the City's respective responses. Two sessions were held each day – an afternoon session (3:00-4:30pm) and evening session (6:30-8:00pm) for a total of four sessions. In total, there were approximately 110 attendees. Video recordings of each session are available on the [Official Plan Update](#) dedicated project webpage and [ConnectPtbo](#).

## 2.0 Session 1: September 1, 2021 at 3:00-4:30pm

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	Why are unevaluated wetlands provided less protection than PSWs in Table A of the draft plan?	Table A prescribes the minimum vegetation protection zones for unevaluated wetlands that have been considered for inclusion in an evaluation under Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) but do not meet the criteria. This is a minimum requirement and site-specify study is required to determine the appropriate width. Additional policy language has been added to require that the vegetation protection zone demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement.



What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
2	What makes Peterborough unique? City's view of the unique?	<p>There are a number of characteristics that make Peterborough unique, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The history of the area, being part of the traditional territory of Michi Saagiig peoples;</li> <li>- A vibrant and healthy downtown and cultural heritage;</li> <li>- The community and identity;</li> <li>- Peterborough's landscape and natural features and areas, such as the Otonabee River, Jackson Creek &amp; Trent Canal; and,</li> <li>- Cycling and trails network system.</li> </ul>
3	Schedule C: Central Area Plan & Schedule D: Road Network Plan appear to have a lack of coordination with regards to the classification of roads. I can foresee a number of transportation issues in the East City Area.	The City is in the process of creating a Transportation Master Plan and East Side Transportation Study that are intended to address traffic issues in the area. Once the plans are established, any differences in the road classifications in the Schedules will be addressed by way of an Official Plan Amendment.
4	How and where is the additional intensification is being directed?	The focus of intensification is within Strategic Growth Areas to meet the prescribed Urban Growth Centre (UGC) density target and annual residential intensification target. Strategic Growth Areas include the Central Area and Mixed-Use Corridors. These areas are identified on Schedule A: Urban Structure and Schedule B: Land Use Plan. Designated Greenfield Areas will also be planned to achieve a higher density target of 60 residents and jobs per hectare in new subdivisions.



What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
5	What are some actionable items proposed through the plan to pay tribute to the Indigenous Communities in the Peterborough Area? Are we going to promote the Indigenous place names around the city e.g., Nogojiwanong?	A guiding principle of this draft Official Plan is that the City will provide opportunities for Indigenous placemaking and working with Indigenous communities to celebrate and commemorate Indigenous history and/or culture in public spaces. More specifically in Section 5.1.1 of the Plan states that Indigenous place names shall be acknowledged on the physical landscape of the City (e.g., street names, parks).
6	Regarding Coldsprings special study area....is it feasible to have industrial use so close to River? What about sewer and water to property? Also, how are you going to integrate industrial usage among the homes that are now in the area and on Wallace Point Road.	The intent is to do additional studies to determine the appropriate urban structure and land uses. Through the secondary plan process, there will be additional studies (e.g., soil and water studies, land use compatibility studies, environmental studies) and the buffers between residential and employment uses will be determined. The integration of industrial uses with the surrounding area must be done in accordance with the Province's land use compatibility and noise guidelines. The adoption of secondary plan will require additional public consultation.
7	Does this plan look at repurposing existing buildings that are no longer in use for adding "employment" areas rather than securing acreage? A good example is Noblegen in the old Quaker building.	Yes, these assumptions regarding the intensification of existing employment areas are described in detail in the Land Needs Assessment report.
8	Wondering if under urban design guidelines or built form, is there anything aside from the 45-degree plane from existing housing, that specifically limits new building heights when they are close to existing low-rise neighborhoods?	The angular plane is a good tool to regulate height. However, the zoning by-law will implement the various tools (i.e., angular planes, setbacks, absolute height limits, and landscaped buffers).

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
9	Glad to see the environment and climate change included in master plan.	Noted.
10	Referencing the discussion of the Coldsprings area: Can you differentiate between employment land and industrial land usage?	These two terms are synonymous with each other. "Employment area" and "employment land" are terminology used in Provincial policies and plans to described industrial areas. "Employment areas" are given specific policy direction in Provincial plans and municipalities need to mimic that language. It is important to note that the nature of industrial uses have also changed over time and does not necessarily pertain to only heavy industrial uses.
11	There is frequent feedback regarding the strength of the language in the Official Plan and a desire to compel or require. Where can we see a list of the commitments/studies/implementation tools resulting from the Official Plan? What will the opportunities be for public engagement?	<p>Planning tools are identified in Section 7 of the Plan – those require public consultation as they relate to by-laws or amendments to policy. Other large studies outside of the Planning Act has involved public consultation in the past, though this is subject to the direction of Council.</p> <p>Every sentence in the draft Official Plan has been reviewed in terms of the strength of the language. Municipalities are given authority in provincial legislation to compel on certain policy statements, but not all statements. It has been the approach of this draft Plan to use the strongest language where it has the authority to do so, and to soften the language (e.g., consider/encourage/may) where no full authority is provided.</p> <p>An implementation plan will be identified in a report to Council. Those items are subject to budget approvals. Some items will be led by Planning and other initiatives will be led by other departments.</p>

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
12	What are the immediate priorities for urban design guidelines or secondary plans for Minor Mixed-Use Corridors?	This will be considered further in an implementation strategy for the official plan.

## 3.0 Session 2: September 1, 2021 at 6:30-8:00pm

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	Do we have any tools to mandate this Rent geared to income (RGI) Housing within the City?	<p>The plan provides consideration for this type of housing, however, RGI housing is a specific type of subsidized housing that we are not able to mandate.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan has language and policies in regard to the City's ability to do this type of development on its own lands.</p>

## What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
2	<p>A number of cities have taken the opportunity to include concise and strong opening statements about particular challenges the Plan is responding to and why it is necessitated in the choices in those Plans (e.g., London, and Ottawa). The planning horizon has changed to 30 years (i.e., 2051) which is one year different than the year reference in climate targets for net zero (i.e., 2050). There is an increase in the cost of severe weather events. Why is there no dramatic and informative statement regarding climate change in this Plan?</p> <p>Suggest adding a 2-4 page opening statement regarding key challenges, with the climate change emergency being explicitly mentioned.</p>	<p>Agreed that the planning horizon is a long time, however, the Official Plan is a living document that will be amended over time as information and circumstances change, including changes in government. There are three big moves in this draft Official Plan in regard to climate change:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>Intensification:</b> This Plan includes more efficient use of land and lower carbon footprint per person though significant targets (e.g., 50% of annual residential units through intensification and 60 residents and jobs per hectare in new subdivisions in the designated greenfield area).</li> <li>2) <b>Sustainable transportation:</b> There is a focus on alternative modes of transportation and getting people out of cars (e.g., transit, walking and cycling). The Plan also focuses on establishing an urban structure that will support an enhanced transit system over time (e.g., though the identification of strategic growth areas – corridors and centres that form the basis of an enhanced transit system). In addition, there are policies promoting active transportation supportive facilities and transit supportive development.</li> <li>3) <b>Natural Heritage and Source Water:</b> Protecting the Natural Heritage System and Source Water Protection throughout the city.</li> </ol> <p>These big moves represent significant changes to existing policy. There are certainly other actions that the City will need to pursue – the Climate Change section (Section 5.7) of the draft Plan directs the City to do more work (e.g., community energy plans, green development standards, carbon neutral design). Some communities have gone further in their climate objectives, most have not.</p>

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
3	Aside from building height, are there other considerations for changes to the zoning by-laws to reduce things like minimum setbacks and parking minimums in commercial, residential and mixed-use zones? I know that parking minimums were most recently in the news in regard to everything that went down with Kawartha Gymnastics.	The Official Plan is intended to set out a high-level framework. Once the new Official Plan is adopted, a comprehensive review of the zoning by-law will need to occur within three years to conform with the new Official Plan. The Official Plan does not address setback and parking minimums because that is to be addressed in the zoning by-law. The draft Official Plan contains policies to explore urban design guidelines to address these considerations.
4	Recommendation to add climate change targets (i.e., 2030 and 2050 targets in the climate change emergency declaration). Is it appropriate for this plan to include "will" statement in regard to the 2030 and 2050 targets?	<p>The City's climate change targets have already been endorsed/adopted by Council and it is not necessary to duplicate the targets into the Official Plan. Therefore, it is on the public record that is those targets are the City's objectives – there is not any added benefit of adding that same language to the Official Plan.</p> <p>An Official Plan is not a very nimble document, noting amendments are a public process which are subject to appeal and time constraints – whereas documents outside the official plan may be updated/amended through Council recommendation and noting technologies and targets will change.</p> <p>This is especially an important consideration with regards to green building technology because the Ontario Building Code changes much more rapidly than an Official Plan. For that reason, an Official Plan can become quickly become out-of-date and irrelevant if those details are included in the Plan.</p>

## What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
5	Regarding Coldsprings Special Study Area. How will existing homeowners on Wallace Point Road be impacted by this future development. 80 Hectares of development dedicated to Prestige Employment. Will there be a buffer zone protecting their homes from commercial property? What about property values, privacy, wells, etc.	See response to Comment #6 from Session 1 of the Public Information Sessions.
6	Other than bike paths are there any other specific plans for recreational resources like an outdoor pool or outdoor recreational skating rink?	Recreational facilities are a type of public service facility, which is permitted in every land use designation except for the Natural Areas designation. The draft Official Plan provides direction with respect to the strategic location and coordination of public service facilities (see Section 4.1.2 General Policies for All Designations).
7	In addition to review of the impacts of projects on natural features through an Environmental Impact Study, can the Official Plan recommend that there also be review by the Environmental Advisory Committee?	Subsequent consultation sessions for the final draft Official Plan includes consultation with advisory committees, including the Peterborough Environmental Advisory Committee (PEAC). Subsequent consultation will be completed in accordance with the Terms of References for PEAC.
8	Are there any additional incentives for the Brownfields Remediation? i.e., General Electric property or Outboard Marine Corporation of Canada (OMCC) property	<p>We have a Central Area CIP Brownfields program intended to assist with cost recovery of contaminated lands remediation. The plan is to expand that program city-wide.</p> <p>With respect to the General Electric property in particular, this site has been identified as a priority site for key strategic development and investment areas – which are to be the focus for a range of planning and financial tools to facilitate redevelopment.</p>

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
9	Where does staff anticipate the need for Secondary Plans? Would these be developer funded?	The draft Official Plan identifies need for secondary plans for strategic growth areas, Coldsprings, and revisiting the Central Area Master Plan (which has followed a secondary plan approach). However, they are not limited to these areas alone. They are planned to be funded by the City.
10	If residents have specific comments on this draft, what is the deadline to send them? What is the best approach to make them useful to staff at this stage? How much will they be considered — to what extent are you going to make changes?	The deadline for comments to be included in the October report to Council is September 10th. We recommend that comments to be as specific as possible by addressing specific sections and/or policies of the plan.
11	London made a declared, public point of including vision statements in its OP, to give those statements clear, quotable meaning.	Noted. See response to Comment #2 to Session 2 of the public information sessions.
12	In the downtown core is the plan going to continue to encourage replacement of industrial sites with mix commercial and residential zones?	The Central Area includes an Industrial Conversion Area designation. The intent of is designation is to facilitate the utilization of industrial buildings/ sites for a wide variety of uses including retail commercial and service commercial uses, office and artisan studio uses, and institutional, cultural and recreational uses.
13	How are road classifications changed in the Official Plan? What is the process?	The Official Plan Schedule D: Road Plan Network would need to be amended though an Official Plan Amendment.



## 4.0 Session 3: September 2, 2021 at 3:00-4:30pm

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	Is there a target percentage (%) area for green and open spaces?	The City's Park Development Standards sets targets for various parks and open space types. The draft Official Plan states that the development of parks and recreation facilities will be guided by the Strategic Plan for Recreation, Parks, Arenas and Culture.
2	Woodlands less than 2 hectares and significant wildlife habitat have been removed from level C. Have they disappeared from consideration, or are they now in a different category?	For clarification, woodlands less than 0.2 hectares and significant wildlife habitat within artificial features have been removed from level C feature based on comments received by the Province. Both are removed from the natural heritage system level categories.
3	What is the scope of the environmental studies?	Several requirements and considerations have been added to environmental impact studies, including but not limited to delineating Level A, B and C features and providing a description of the timing of the studies. A detailed list of the scope and requirements are outlined in Section 7.21 of the Plan.

## What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
4	Can you speak more to the addition of Armour Road as a strategic growth area? Its presently a highly naturalized area.	The lands along Armour Road (northern portion) have been designated as Minor Mixed-Use Corridor; however, appropriate protection of the Natural Heritage System needs to be considered as part of any proposed development in accordance with the policies of the Natural Areas designation. The City is currently in the process of completing an Environmental Assessment for the realignment of Armour Road. Armour Road is a key secondary transportation route and there is development opportunity in this area which lends itself to the Minor Mixed-Use Corridor designation.
5	Can you explain how the land needs of excess land is being dealt with.	Excess Lands has been identified through the criteria presented to Council in May this year (e.g., servicing considerations, development potential). Excess lands are identified as Rural Transitional Area on Schedule A: Urban Structure and Schedule B: Land Use Plan.
6	Thanks for this overview. I'm wondering how you will use input and feedback from these info sessions - will you be incorporating these into changes into this draft plan? I think this would be important as you asking for input so if you aren't going to be incorporating comments, I'm wondering why you wouldn't want to incorporate feedback. Thanks.	Planning Staff will continue to receive comments up until the date of the statutory public meeting in November. However, to be included in the October 4 <sup>th</sup> report to Council, staff will need to receive any comments by September 10 <sup>th</sup> . There will also be a another report to Council in November which will report on comments received.

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
7	Where will the water come from to support the population growth?	The Water Utility (Peterborough Utilities Group) has participated in the development of this Plan. Generally speaking, Peterborough gets its water supply from the river. The Water Utility monitors capacity and future needs. At this time, there are no concerns with regards to capacity at the wastewater treatment facility. However, some site-specific improvements may be required in the future.
8	It doesn't look like the city has the ability to meet the land requirements - are there recommendations in the plan to allow for this?	Based on the land needs assessment, the City's has more lands than what is required to accommodate forecasted growth to 2051, noting there has been direction from Council to reconcile lands within the City Boundary given earlier this year.
9	Could you give us a synopsis of the current status of the Parkway Extension in the current draft of the Official Plan?	The Parkway extension is not incorporated on the Transportation Schedule of this draft Plan. Detailed recommendations and strategies for the transportation system will be assessed through the Transportation Master Plan and changes will be made accordingly to the Official Plan. It is not the intent of the Official Plan policies to preconceive the outcomes of the Transportation Master Plan.
10	With the increase expected in population. What will be the impact on Peterborough Water System? Water purification?	See comment #7 from Session 3 of the Public Information Sessions.

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
11	What is a level c framework?	This question refers to the Level A, B and C classification system for natural heritage features. The draft Official Plan proposes a graduated protection approach, reflecting the significance and functions of natural heritage features and areas. The NHS Level C Category allows for development and site alteration where there is an opportunity to replicate the function on site or elsewhere in the City.
12	How would you say the climate change/emergency provisions in the draft Official Plan stack up against global standards for Municipal actions in this regard? In other words, how would Peterborough's Official Plan rank in terms Municipal leadership globally on climate change?	<p>See comment #2 from Session 2 of the public information sessions for a detailed response on how Peterborough is Addressing Climate Change. Overall, the draft Plan does a good job when comparing with basic city plans, noting there are many differences globally. The City works within a particular framework in the Province - Ontario has legislation that mentions climate change.</p> <p>Municipalities are dealing with climate change in a number of ways, in accordance with Provincial change that are related to climate change (e.g., intensification, sustainable transportation and protecting the natural heritage system and source water protection).</p>

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
13	The effect of the shift from Adjacent Lands Overlay designation to the preliminary natural heritage feature screening is unclear without more detail about the screening process and criteria. Please provide more detail about this. What are the requirements of the screening?	This is a different approach than most official plans, however, Planning staff believe this approach is overall better for the environment. The initial approach was to map 120m from natural areas and assign those lands as the Adjacent Lands Overlay, which covered nearly all of Peterborough and essentially rendered it a moot point. Noting, every application also has to complete a screening for endangered species and species at risk. The Preliminary Natural Heritage Screening has to be done for every development and if any features are identified within 120m of the subject site, an Environmental Impact Study is required to be undertaken. In many ways, this approach goes beyond the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement. The screening is intended to be completed by an environmental consultant. The preconsultation process identifies the need for specific studies. The draft Plan also speaks to development Environmental Impact Study guidelines.
14	In terms of affordable housing are there specific areas in Peterborough that have been targeted for this type of development? Are there large-scale structures in the works?	No specific areas have been flagged because it is a public benefit and should generally be permitted in all areas of the City. We have an Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to provide additional incentives for this type of structures. Some of the projects occurring right now include: Woodland and Water Street, Rink Street and Olive Avenue, and development on Bonaccord Street.
15	Similar question in terms of considering social equity and equality. How well would you say this draft Official Plan does in terms of seeing City development and growth via this lens?	Official Plan is never specific to any demographic and is applied to everyone equally. An exception is with regards to Affordable Housing policies, which are intended to be targeted to a particular economic group based on the definition from the Province. The Official Plan is intended to be written in a non-discriminatory way.

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
16	For properties where the decision was made to change the land use from a developable land use to Rural Transition, was any consideration given to the implication for existing/pending planning applications on those lands?	The identification of excess lands looked at areas that are likely not going to develop at all within the planning horizon or the anticipated timing of development. Existing/pending planning applications were considered; however, difficult decisions needed to be made to conform to Provincial policies, which includes de-designating lands.
17	I'm disappointed that climate change isn't more prominent in this draft plan. The city has declared a climate emergency but there's no mention that I could see about this in this plan - can you comment on why not? Also, under strategies, there doesn't seem to be any commitment on these only considerations. Climate change is a key issue for me, as a resident of Peterborough and I'm just surprised it is not a theme running through this plan.	See comment #2 from Session 2 of the public information sessions for a detailed response on how Peterborough is Addressing Climate Change.
18	In February, Trent's Board of Governors approved the relocation of their farm to a location that is within the Major Open Space Designation. When reading on the permitted uses, no agricultural uses are listed. Only horticultural uses, which are not defined in Section 8.2 of the draft Official Plan, Definitions section. My question is twofold: What permitted uses will be allowed on Trent's land as defined by 'horticultural uses'? And more specifically, what limitations might this have on its regenerative agricultural specialization, in relation to farm machinery use, livestock grazing for soil regeneration, and field trials research?	Discussions are ongoing with Trent University regarding this issue.

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
19	Following up on the Coldsprings Area, has the City looked at intensifying other employment areas within the City to meet the targets. For example, the Trent Lands had approx. 10MM of services installed for the Clean Tech site. which will be underutilized.	Details are outlined in the Land Needs Assessment Report, which is posted onto the City's Official Plan Update webpage and ConnectPTBO Page. Cleantech Commons and the intensification of existing employment areas has been factored into the Land Need Assessment.
20	Will the OP include PSW's in a specific designation - either in the Natural Heritage Area Mapping, or otherwise? Have the PSW boundaries been site specifically evaluated as part of the OP process?	Provincially significant wetlands have been added to the Natural Areas designation mapping, but not distinguished. The draft Official Plan includes the commitment to evaluate all wetlands in the city.
21	Does this city plan incorporate the downtown revitalization project or is it a completely different venture?	Yes and yes - more detailed policy is outlined in the Master Plan; while the Official Plan facilitates those ideas, the Official Plan is not correct vehicle for all the details within the Master Plan.
22	#2. When will the Transportation Plan Study be fully released? Will it address transportation needs in relation to the two new Employment Area designations - Chemong Road North, and Coldsprings? Will same include financial impacts in regard to these matters?	The Transportation Master Plan is intended to be completed by March 2022. We are providing information to the project team on forecasted growth in relation to employment areas.

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
23	Thanks for that answer about how equity and equality are addressed within the draft Official Plan. From my perspective, equity is the process of getting to the outcome of equality. A focus on equity makes overt the social in-equities that exist, and the challenge of the intersectionality of those social inequities for certain individuals (e.g. low income, racism, sexism, etc.)...and a firm declaration of "nothing for us without us" is the kind of explicit noting of, and importance of using an equity lens in City planning. A good example of this is section 7.1 "Indigenous People's of Canada and the Duty to Consult." It's tough work...but the long-term success of building a community "for everyone" depends on it.	Noted.
24	There was specific mention within this presentation about the official plan increasing road allowance in association with bike lanes. Can you verify that this increased allowance is only in the presence of bike lanes?	Most Official Plans speak to required road rights-of-way, which can be for a host of reasons, including bike lanes, intersection widenings depending on requirements of that site/road.
25	Does the City have a study or documentation that can be reviewed as how the employment lands were determined for the Coldsprings Area and details of the intensification of other area other than the Lands Needs Studies.	A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe provides guidance with respect to the location of employment areas, more specifically the Growth Plan indicates that municipalities should designate and preserve lands located adjacent to or near major goods movement facilities and corridors, including major highway interchanges, as areas for manufacturing, warehousing and logistics, and appropriate associated uses and ancillary facilities. See comment #6 from Session 1 of the Public Information Sessions.



## What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
26	Help understand the duration - Official Plan's view for industrial lands. When would the new industrial lands go online?	It is difficult to provide a timeframe at this time because it is early in the process. Designating lands within the Official Plan is the first step in the process.
27	Which scenario does schedule E (trails and bikeways) represent based on the different scenarios in Cycling Master Plan consultations recently?	The Cycling Master Plan is still underway and subsequent amendments may be required to the Official Plan to reflect the recommended scenario. This plan does not key in on a specific scenario at this time.
28	Why was the Central Area boundary extended to the south to include the south side of Lansdowne Street? There are incentives that go hand-in-hand with the expansion of the Central Area	This change brought Morrow Park and Memorial Centre into the Central Area boundary. For continuity, we like to bring in both sides of the street when providing a designation.
29	Concerns about the maximum building heights in downtown. Why does it have lower height restrictions than mixed-use corridors, which allows up to 12 storeys in some areas? The Growth Plan seems to place the Central Area as the primary area for intensification. Concerned that this places the downtown at an unequal footing or disadvantage to other areas.	The designation of the Urban Growth Centre in the Growth Plan does not mean its necessarily the primary area for intensification area; it does however come with specific policies and a density target. The draft Plan intends to promote intensification of different types throughout the city and balance the density target with other factors such as, compatibility with adjacent development, cultural heritage resources, urban design. Through the community design charrette there were concerns regarding additional height in the downtown.

## 5.0 Session 4: September 2, 2021 at 6:30-8:00pm

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
1	Can you shed some light on adoption and implementation timelines?	Upon Council adoption of the new Official Plan, the Plan is sent to the Province for final approval. It is estimated that this takes 5-7 months for review and approval. Following Provincial approval, the plan is in effect.
2	Does the plan significantly change the city's ability to regulate/compel re: housing, or is that dependent on provincial guidelines? Mostly affordable housing but would be happy to hear answer re both.	<p>There is no tool available in the Planning Act that the City may use at this time to compel/require affordable housing. The City may use a number of indirect methods, including the generating revenue through a community benefits charge which in turn may be used towards affordable housing.</p> <p>See Comment #1 from Session 2 of the Public Information Sessions for more information.</p>
3	What are the impacts of elections and future provincial governments and changes to provincial legislation on this plan?	This is difficult to anticipate; however, changes in provincial government have a significant impact on planning processes and policies. Changes in provincial policy tend to be relatively subtle. Bill 108 and 197 has had a focus on speeding up the delivery of housing. The Official Plan is a living document that needs to be updated to respond to the local context and provincial policies.
4	What is time gap between the adoption of the Official Plan and zoning by law?	The Planning Act requires an update to the zoning by-law within three years of the Official Plan coming into effect.

## What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
5	Will these comments be incorporated into the draft or just be presented to council?	Planning Staff will review all the comments received and make changes where appropriate. All comments will be reported to Council.
6	How will the Transportation and Cycling Master Plan feed into the Official Plan?	See comment #27 from Session 3 of the Public Information Sessions.
7	Will the Official Plan precede a dated zoning by law during the three-year time frame?	Yes, there is a time lag gap between adoption of the New Official Plan and comprehensive update to the zoning by-law. In the interim, applications for a rezoning; in conformity with the new official plan may be considered.
8	Climate Change - Is there a consideration for strengthening language regarding climate change?	See Comment #2 from Session 2 of the Public Information Sessions.
9	For the Coldsprings area you are recommending to change to industrial from residential?	There are recommendations for both industrial and residential lands. More specifically, 80 ha are required for employment area (i.e., Prestige Employment) and 60 ha of community area (e.g., residential and other non-residential supporting land uses).
10	In actioning the complete community concept, how does it acknowledge the aging demographic and walkable amenities and services to support social sustainability and intergenerational responses	Active transportation is important for all groups. The Plan encourages active transportation specifically in non-discriminatory terms.
11	In alignment with Age Friendly Peterborough Plans, we need to address barriers for physical and mental disabilities. Should be taking consideration for older demographic.	Agreed. Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) needs to be implemented. It is a requirement within Ontario, whether or not it is specified in the Official Plan and must be considered for all projects

What We Heard: Public Information Sessions

#	Comment/Question	City's Response
12	What sections deal with Coldsprings Special Study Area and zoning changes?	Policies regarding the Coldsprings Special Study Area are in Section 3.3.6 of the draft Official Plan. Updates to bring the zoning by-law in conformity with the new Official Plan must occur within three years of the new Official Plan taking effect. Zoning changes will be contemplated as part of the comprehensive zoning by-law review and/or secondary plan process with amendments to the official plan and zoning by-law.