

SCHEDULE 6 – PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE AND SURVEY RESULTS

Open House Results

The analysis indicates that there were a total of 392 visits to the site as of September 14, 2020. In addition, 49 participants downloaded documents from the site and 93 participants visited multiple project pages.

Survey Results

The survey included 16 questions, as well as a request for any additional comments. The results were downloaded on September 14, 2020, which indicated that there were 29 contributors to the survey. The questions are outlined below, together with a summary of the responses and Planning staff's proposed directions (staff response) arising from the results:

Question 1 – Premier Gateway Zoning By-law 2000-0138 requires a minimum area for lots ranging from 0.4 ha (1 acre) to 1 ha (2.5 acres) depending on the location and zoning of the lot. As flexibility in the by-law allows undersized lots to be utilized, do you feel that the minimum area size for new lots should be reduced?

- (a) Yes – 46.7% (14)
- (b) No – 53.3% (16)

Question 2 – Please provide what you feel would be appropriate minimum lot areas for the Prestige Industrial (M7) and Gateway (G) Zones. (Open response question)

Four (4) respondents requested a minimum lot area of 0.4 ha (1 acre) and three (3) respondents requested a minimum lot area of 0.2 ha (0.5 acres).

Staff Response – Given the results and Planning staff's preference to maintain these existing standards (smaller lots are not ideal for industrial/commercial/employment uses), staff will not be proposing any amendments to these standards.

Question 3 – Please advise whether the maximum building height for lots located on the north side of Steeles Avenue in the Prestige Industrial (M7) Zone should:

- (a) Increase to 14m – 33.3% (10)
- (b) Stay the same (10.6m) – 46.7% (14)
- (c) Increase beyond 14m – 20.0% (6)

Question 4 – Please provide what you feel would be an appropriate maximum building height. (Open response question)

Responses ranged from 14 metres to 30 metres to no maximum height requirement.

Staff Response – Two-thirds of the respondents would like the maximum building height to increase, with the majority of these being to increase to 14m. The Town has also received several Minor Variance applications in recent years to increase the max height in the Premier Gateway from 10.6m to around 14m. Given this and Planning staff's preference to provide a modest increase to the maximum building height requirement in

order to avoid the need to consider Minor Variance applications seeking relief of only a few metres, staff will be proposing to increase the maximum building height to 14m.

Question 5 – Are there any other uses that should have their parking requirements revised?

- (a) Yes – 34.5% (10)
- (b) No – 65.5% (19)

Question 6 – Please identify which uses need to have their parking requirements revised and propose new parking requirements for these uses. (Open response question)

No specific uses were identified. Responses ranged from requests for transport terminals and outdoor storage uses (truck/commercial parking) to prohibiting surface parking lots and requiring all parking to be underground.

Staff Response – Given the results, Planning staff will continue to propose changes to the parking standards for uses where appropriate. Most of the changes proposed to be made to the parking standards are consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2010-0050.

Question 7 – Do different loading requirements need to be provided for commercial/institutional uses vs. industrial uses?

- (a) Yes – 48.1% (13)
- (b) No – 51.9% (14)

Question 8 – I suggest that the loading requirements for commercial/institutional uses should be (Open response question):

No specific loading requirements for commercial/institutional uses were identified.

Question 9 – I suggest that loading requirements for industrial uses should be (Open response question):

No specific loading requirements for industrial uses were identified.

Staff Response – Given the results, Planning staff believes the existing standards should be maintained as they are consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2010-0050, which makes no distinction between industrial and commercial/institutional uses.

Question 10 – Staff is proposing to remove the maximum lot coverage requirements for buildings and structures because the maximum coverage is already determined based on factors such as minimum stormwater management and landscaped open space requirements. Do you agree with these proposed revisions?

- (a) Yes – 82.1% (23)
- (b) No – 17.9% (5)

Staff Response – Based on the input received there appears to be public support to remove the maximum lot coverage requirements.

Question 11 – Are there any additional setbacks that should be considered for revision?

- (a) Yes – 22.2% (6)
- (b) No – 77.8% (21)

Question 12 – Please identify which minimum building setback requirements need to be revised and propose new minimum setbacks for these requirements. (Open response question)

Responses included two (2) requests for increased setbacks from residential areas; one (1) concern regarding reduced setbacks along Steeles Avenue; and one (1) request for reduced setbacks from the natural heritage system.

Staff Response – Based on the input received, Planning staff will continue to propose changes to the setbacks that are appropriate.

Question 13 – The Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) requires minimum building setbacks from Highways 401 and 407. The current minimum setback requirement in Zoning By-law 2000-0138 is 25 m (~82 feet). Does this minimum setback need to be reduced?

- (a) Yes – 24.1% (7)
- (b) No – 75.9% (22)

Question 14 – Please propose a reduced minimum required setback. (Open response question)

Responses ranged from 10 metres to 20 metres.

Staff Response – Given most respondents indicated a preference to maintain the minimum development setback from Highways 401 and 407, Planning staff is proposing to maintain the MTO setback at 25m (~82 feet).

Question 15 – Do the new (draft) Premier Gateway Employment Area Urban Design Guidelines provide enough direction to ensure high-quality and sustainable design for new development while being flexible enough to respond to changes in the market and the needs of businesses?

- (a) Yes – 69.2% (18)
- (b) No – 30.8% (8)

Question 16 – Please outline how the new (draft) Urban Design Guidelines could be improved. What could be added or removed? (Open response question)

Responses included requests for specific green development standards; transport terminals and outdoor storage uses (truck/commercial parking); mixed-use development; and increased setbacks from the natural heritage system.

Staff Response – Based on the input received the current draft Urban Design Guidelines appear to form a good framework for evaluation of future development, subject to final review.